HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, March 25, 1975

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

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (AMALGAMATIONS)

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the conference with the Legislative Council on the Bill to be continued during the sitting of the House.

Motion carried.

At 3.13 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to amendment No. 1:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement.

As to amendment No. 2:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment but make in lieu thereof the following amendments:

Clause 8, page 2, lines 41 and 42—Leave out the words "twenty per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "fifteen per centum"; and after the passage "affected by the proposal" insert the words "or fifty such ratepayers whichever is the greater number of ratepayers"

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendment No. 3:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment but make in lieu thereof the following amendment:

Clause 8, page 3, lines 4 to 6—Leave out all words in these lines and insert in lieu thereof the words:

"unless—

(*a*) a majority of the ratepayers of any one area affected by the proposal and voting, vote against the proposal; and

(*b*) the number of ratepayers voting against the proposal in that area comprise at least forty per centum of the total number of the ratepayers on the voters roll for that area."

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

I am pleased to note that the Legislative Council has done its part in relation to the arrangements agreed upon by the managers and I hope members in this place will do likewise. There were three points in dispute. The first dealt with the provision that, to be effective, a decision of a council had to be expressed by an absolute majority of the elected members of the council. This provision was previously discussed in this place and I held the view (and I still do) that it is unnecessary; but I thought it was infinitesimal so, accordingly, in the interests of getting unanimity I had no hesitation in accepting the Legislative Council's point of view.

The second point subject to discussion was the number of people that should be required to petition for a poll to be held, bearing in mind that the poll would be held only after the councils concerned had reached agreement. It seemed that the number required virtually to initiate a vote of no confidence in the council ought to be fairly high, so 20 per cent was inserted. The Legislative Council amended that to 10 per cent and the managers agreed on a compromise of 15 per cent which, incidentally, was the percentage promoted in this place by the Opposition with an amendment to the Bill, but the managers added to that a proviso that the number required for a petition to be acceptable should be 15 per cent or 50 ratepayers, whichever was the greater number, bearing in mind that in some councils 15 per cent would be fewer than 50 ratepayers.

The third point of disagreement was undoubtedly the major one. The Legislative Council sought to delete the one-third provision and to hold the polls in each and every area separately, so that the result in one poll could and would have the effect of nullifying a poll that had been held in another area. The managers met for 3½ hours and at least three hours was spent discussing this problem.

I think that the procedure agreed upon by the managers is undoubtedly the best that was capable of being achieved: the minimum voters against a poll has been restored, but it has been increased. The Bill originally provided that the poll must be voted against by over one-third and that fraction has now been increased to over 40 per cent, which means that, if a poll is held, it will be carried unless there is a majority voting against it and that majority represents 40 per cent of those people entitled to vote. On that basis this Chamber accepted, I think rather reluctantly, the amendment in the interests of getting this procedure under way and in the interests of local government. In fact, the amendment has been accepted to see whether the desired aims can be achieved. We do not know, nor will we know, what will happen unless it has been tried.

All in all, the important point is that the Bill has not been rejected, as I feared it would be. It is fair to say that, during the course of this morning's conference, many of us thought that the chances of saving the Bill were extremely remote. It was probably the determination of the managers to have this measure passed in the interests of local government that produced a result, which I hope will prove to be in the interests of local government.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister has given a fairly full explanation of what happened during the course of the conference, the result of which was satisfactory, bearing in mind that on each side there was a certain amount of give and take, which is necessary at a conference. The recommendations of the conference were that the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to amendment No. 1. In other words, my original amendment regarding the absolute majority of the members of a council has been accepted. Regarding amendment No. 2, members will recall that I tried to amend clause 8 to provide that 15 per cent of the ratepayers could demand a poll. The Government in this place adopted 20 per cent, but that percentage is now reduced to 15 per cent, to which the following rider is added:

or 50 such ratepayers whichever is the greater number of ratepayers.

The Minister has correctly indicated the position that can obtain in small council areas. A schedule was available that showed the number of ratepayers in country council areas. I do not reflect on the councils concerned but, because of their set-up, they have extremely small numbers of ratepayers. The rider is to be inserted as a proviso.

Amendment No. 3 was difficult, and there was much dispute about it. Instead of the proposition I put forward on behalf of my Party in this Chamber, the conference accepted the provision that, only if a majority of voters in each area votes in favour of the proposal, shall it become law, so we have a double protection for

ratepayers. The criteria now laid down for the carrying or defeat of a poll shall be that the question shall be deemed to be carried in the affirmative unless:

(*a*) A majority of the ratepayers of any one area affected by the proposal and voting, vote against the proposal; and

(*b*) The number of ratepayers voting against the proposal in that area comprise at least 40 per centum of the total number of the ratepayers on the voters' roll for that area.

The percentage of 40 per cent aroused much discussion. These are important amendments, because the Royal Commission will now be enabled to proceed with its job. My comments in this regard are directed entirely to the benefit of future local government, because all parties in local government are protected. What we are considering in the third amendment will possibly never occur. Indeed, I hope that most of the council boundary alterations can be effected without this amendment having to be used. The real gamut to be run is to get the elected members of councils to agree. That is the major hurdle to be overcome. In this respect councils will be assisted by the Royal Commission.

The amendments and the Bill we are considering relate to a special section of the Local Government Act. These provisions will apply only while the Royal Commission is extant and is doing its job. However, I do not know how long that job will take. At that time these provisions will be redundant. In the interests of local government itself and in the interests of the Royal Commission I believe these amendments will go a long way towards helping the Commission do its job. The Commission and the councils could have faced much difficulty if these amendments had not been included. It was my earnest hope that the Bill would pass: I did not want to see it defeated. Indeed, had it been defeated local government could have been put back 20 years. Having said that, I support the motion.

Mr. RUSSACK: Much work and expense has been incurred by the Royal Commission and the Select Committee. The report before us is the result of a procedure that will help local government and make it a strong; and able tier of government. We accept that there must be a change, and the only way that that change can be achieved is in the way set out as the procedure to be adopted by the Royal Commission in its discussions with councils. As the member for Torrens indicated, this procedure will apply only in special circumstances, when two or more councils agree to the reallocation of boundaries affecting them. After such a decision has been made by the councils ratepayers who desire a poll can institute such a poll. The conditions are reasonable. We must take into account in such cases that the councils have agreed to a boundary change and, if the ratepayers disagree to the council resolution, such action could be taken as a no-confidence vote in the council that has agreed to change its boundary. As I believe that the conditions laid down and the agreement reached at the conference are reasonable, I support the motion.

Motion carried.

GAWLER HIGH SCHOOL

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Gawler High School Additions.

Ordered that report be printed.

PETITION: PORT LINCOLN HOSPITAL

Mr. BLACKER presented a petition signed by 1 312 residents of Eyre Peninsula stating that the lack of air-conditioning at Port Lincoln Hospital was causing excessive discomfort to patients and staff, and praying that the House of Assembly would support the installation of air-conditioning at this hospital.

Petition received.

PETITION: MEDIBANK SCHEME

Mr. GUNN presented a petition signed by eight residents of South Australia stating that the implementation of the Medibank scheme in South Australia would provide significantly lower health care standards, and praying that the House of Assembly would act to cause the Government to reject the proposal and urge the Commonwealth Government to enact provisions to include pensioners and people on low incomes in the present health scheme.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

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

SUPERPHOSPHATE BOUNTY

In reply to Mr. BLACKER (February 19).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister of Agriculture has told me that the Agriculture Department is preparing a report on the relevance of phosphate fertilisers in South Australian agriculture for consideration by him as evidence for submission to the Industries Assistance Commission.

BEEF INDUSTRY

In reply to Mr. RODDA (February 25).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture informs me that, at the February meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council, he drew attention to the problems at present facing beef producers, and suggested long-term low-interest loans as a means of alleviating their situation. However, as the honourable member would be aware, the difficulties being experienced by Australian producers are also evident overseas, because of a world-wide overproduction of beef. The Australian Minister for Agriculture (Senator Wriedt) is now on a mission to Middle East countries for the purpose (amongst other things) of promoting sales of beef in that region, and a trade delegation is undertaking a similar assignment in Eastern Europe, and I believe will later visit North Africa. The prices at which sales can be negotiated are the result of bargaining between buyer and seller, and the world supply situation makes it a buyer's market.

SUPERANNUATION

In reply to Mr. WRIGHT (February 19).

The Hon. L. J. KING: The fact that many superannuation schemes cover members in more than one State has, upon investigation, shown that it is impossible for State supervision and regulation. It is possible that following the introduction of a national superannuation scheme the Commonwealth Government may be inclined to introduce legislation for the conduct of private superannuation schemes. The Government has no power to require the Bank of Adelaide to produce the trust deed of its provident fund. However, it is doubtful that the terms are so vague that it may not be enforceable. It is usual in trust deeds to provide power to the trustees to determine to whom certain payments may be made. This

power, which must not be used capriciously, is included in order that estate and succession duties on benefits to widows may be avoided, and it is thus a proper power. There is no provision in any law at present which precludes investment of provident funds in the employer's business.

POLICE PICTURES

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (March 6).

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have discussed the matter with the Minister of Education, and it is not considered that any special educational programme is required.

DOMICILIARY CARE

In reply to Mr. EVANS (March 6).

The Hon. L. J. KING: Domiciliary care services are a relatively new innovation in the health care delivery chain and, because of limited resources and more recently the constraint on funds, it has not been possible, since inception of the scheme in 1971, to extend services to all parts of the Adelaide metropolitan area to which the question refers. There are also larger country areas within the State which suffer for the same reasons.

Service facilities in the metropolitan context are provided on a regional (four region) basis with catchment areas relating largely to the geographical nomenclature of each region. The regions are Western Region, Para Region, Eastern Region, and Southern Region. Domiciliary care services commenced in 1971, in what was then regarded as a pilot trial in the Western Region. The other three metropolitan regions have operated since that time and at different intervals. The Mitcham Hills and Stirling areas specifically referred to are located in the Southern and Eastern Regions respectively, and each of those services has been in operation for periods just exceeding 12 months in each case.

Service arrangements are generally common between each region and, at this stage, all service work is conducted from centra] headquarters units. Experiences so far, however, have indicated that decentralisation into satellite service zones away from the headquarters unit is necessary, if outlying regional areas are to be adequately covered. In this manner and as time and resources permit, it is quite likely that areas such as Stirling, Mitcham Hills, Christies Beach, and Blackwood will present themselves as regional zone venues for domiciliary care purposes. In this regard, departmental officers have already had some discussions with a service club in the Blackwood area, that would, in that case, act as an initial sponsor until normal operational mechanisms were co-ordinated. The needs of the community in the areas under question is recognised, and every effort is being made to meet those and other similar commitments.

BUS SERVICE

In reply to Mrs. BYRNE (March 11).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A Bus Service Planning Group has been set up in the Transport Department, and is reviewing all bus routes and services in the Adelaide metropolitan area. The need for public transport along Smart Road, Modbury, will be given due consideration during the course of this review

HALLETT COVE

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (March 18).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No funds have been made available by the Australian Government to preserve any additional areas at Hallett Cove. The South Australian Government has already acquired land around the area of scientific interest to ensure its protection at a cost of about $400 000. No action is necessary by the Government to stop the building of houses and roads immediately adjacent to the site of scientific interest, as the area already acquired around it does so, and no houses or road will be built immediately adjacent to it.

HOUSING TRUST REGIONAL OFFICE

In reply to Mr. NANKIVELL (March 5).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: For some time the Housing Trust has been conscious of the increase in its rental component in the Riverland, and the following table shows the number of rental units in the various towns:

Barmera	58
Berri	136
Loxton	103
Renmark	110
Waikerie	57

The Housing Trust will arrange for an investigation to be carried out for the establishment of a regional office in the Riverland.

ABORIGINAL HOUSING

In reply to Mr. SLATER (March 11).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: As at March 14, 1975, there were 482 Aboriginal funded houses under the jurisdiction of the South Australian Housing Trust. The vacant houses are progressively let, as essential maintenance work is completed and keys are available. Purchase of houses for the use of Aboriginal families in country areas is made following recommendation of the Aboriginal housing policy committee, which sends monthly recommendations to the trust. Purchases in the metropolitan area are made when and where offered.

RAPE

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has the inquiry into rape and related matters been conducted by the Attorney-General's Department and, if so, when will the report be made available?

2. If the inquiry has not been completed, when is it expected that it will be?

The Hon. L. J. KING: It is expected that the study will be completed and a report be submitted to me by mid-June.

BABY FOODS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Have complaints been received by the Public Health Department in respect of the quality of some baby foods and powdered milk products sold and, if so, what has been the nature of these complaints, and were they found to be justified?

2. What action is to be taken to ensure that these products are not sold after the expiration of a time when they may have deteriorated?

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

1. Very few complaints are received about the quality of baby foods and powdered milk products sold. The complaints usually are about staleness or unusual taste. Some complaints have been justified but in these cases no serious defects were found in the products that would have affected the health of the consumer.

2. The regulation under the Food and Drugs Act relating to infants food requires that these products be labelled with the date of packing. This gives no indication as to the life of the product and serves as a guide to the consumer on the freshness of the product and it can assist in stock rotation by retailers. The relatively few complaints

received would not justify any amendment to the regulations. Action is taken during inspections to check the age of those foods dated and encourage regular stock rotation by retailers.

QUESTION REPLIES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. When will the report promised on August 7, 1974, regarding hospital charges, be provided?

2. When will the reply promised on September 11, 1974, regarding sex offences, be forwarded?

3. When will the specific details that were promised on October 2, 1974, in relation to hospital funds, be provided?

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

1. The Australian Government approved an increase in social security benefits operative from August 8, 1974, and the rates of benefits thereafter payable were as follows:

Single patients with no dependents—

	Benefits	Charge (a week)	Trust
	$	$	$
Pension (including supplementary assistance) . . .	35.00	26.25	8.75
Sickness benefits—up to six weeks	31.00	22.25	8.75
Sickness benefits—after six weeks continuous benefit	35.00	26.25	8.75

Cabinet approval had been given previously to equate charges made in Government nursing homes and mental health services hospitals. The basis was the Australian Government's determination that pensioner patients in nursing homes were required to pay three-quarters of the pension towards charges and retain one-quarter for their personal use. As from July 1, 1975, it is intended that no charges will be raised against short-term patients in Government psychiatric hospitals and the charges raised against long-term patients will also be reviewed.

2. The Government does not intend to appoint a Royal Commission into sexual crimes, nor into aspects of prostitution or massage parlours.

3. The detail requested on October 2, is that the State Government did accept the Commonwealth Government's offer of funds for hospital buildings during 1974-75. The amount involved was $3 236 000, which sum has been received and spent.

DARWIN EVACUEES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many Darwin evacuees are housed in Government accommodation at present, and what was the greatest number so housed at any one time?

2. Has the Commonwealth Government met the charges involved by the State Government in housing these people, ,what is the total sum involved, and what proportion of this has yet to be paid?

3. Have funds been made available by the Commonwealth Government for maintenance and any necessary repairs to accommodation in respect of the period involved, and what sum has been incurred in any maintenance and repairs?

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

1. Darwin evacuees housed in Government accommodation:

	At present	Maximum numbers
(a)Community Welfare Department	9	230
(b) State Migration Reception Centre	10	69
(c) Hospitals	Nil	180

2. The Australian Government will meet the full cost of the first two weeks accommodation in State Government institutions and thereafter the difference between the cost of providing accommodation and the tariff rate payable at an Australian Government migrant hostel. No claim has been made to date.

3. The Community Welfare Department proposes to calculate the cost of repairs to accommodation and the replacement of lost and damaged equipment which will be added to the other costs for recoupment from the Commonwealth.

AIR POLLUTION

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. When will air pollution potential warnings be resumed?

2. Is it intended to introduce penalties similar to those for breaking the fire ban in summer for persons disregarding these warnings and, if so, when?

3. Will more emphasis be placed on. educational and instructional programmes encouraging people to compost their garden refuse, rather than burn it?

4. Will facilities be encouraged for the collection of garden refuse for composting by private, council or any other bodies?

5. What other action is it intended to take to reduce the degree of air pollution in the metropolitan area?

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

1. As in previous years, air pollution potential alerts will be issued when the period during which fire bans may be proclaimed has ended. The date remains undetermined in view of the continuing danger of possible bush fires this year.

2. No.

3. The Environment and Conservation Department and the Public Health Department are engaged in a programme designed to increase community awareness.

4. It is the aim of the Public Health Department to encourage the recycling of wastes whenever possible, and the development of facilities for the collection of garden refuse for composting is strongly encouraged. The department has two full-time officers engaged in co-ordination and rationalisation of solid waste collection and disposal.

5. The provisions of the clean air regulations, 1972, enable the control of all non-domestic sources of air pollutants.

TRAFFIC CONTROL

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Are other traffic control systems similar to that presently under trial in the Unley area, involving the closing of roads, to be applied in other parts of the metropolitan area, and, if so, in what areas and when?

2. Are Commonwealth Government funds to be used in the implementation of some or all of these schemes?

3. When is it expected the report on the Unley traffic control trial will be available for public evaluation?

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

1. Decisions involving other areas will be taken when the results of the Unley study have been evaluated.

2. Funding has not been determined.

3. About 12 months time.

JUVENILE AID PANELS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Is the Government willing to accept the conclusions reached by the study group on Juvenile Aid Panels in South Australia?

2. What action has been taken to give effect to the recommendation that "some refinement of the legislation and procedures relating to panels, based on experience gained over the last two years, should further enhance the system"?

3. Does the Minister contemplate any other changes to the Juvenile Aid Panels System and, if so, what are they?

4. Is the Government satisfied that the present Juvenile Aid Panel System is working as well as was expected when it was introduced?

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

1. Whilst the Government is still considering the ramifications of these conclusions, in general the conclusions are acceptable.

2. The action to be taken is still under consideration.

3. Some minor administrative and procedural changes may be necessary to improve the functioning of the panels. Basically the concept of the panels and the current processes are considered valuable and major changes are not warranted.

4. Yes.

POLICE CADETS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many police cadets have been enrolled for each quarterly course from June, 1970, to March, 1975, respectively?

2. If there has been a variation in the number on each course, what has been the reason for such variation?

3. Is the number being trained considered adequate, or are there any limiting factors that prevent greater numbers being trained?

4. How many of the cadets who have graduated are still in the force, how soon after graduation have losses occurred, and for what reasons?

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

1. 610 police cadets have been enrolled from June, 1970, to March, 1975. Numbers in each course varied from 10 to 45.

2. The variation in numbers is related to the times of the year, and the numbers of school leavers seeking employment. September has the smallest courses because students desire to complete the school year, and January or March, the largest.

3. The number being trained, is considered adequate, at present.

4. Courses Nos. 33 to 52 have been enrolled in the period under review, and courses 41 to 52 are still in training at the Police Academy. Of the 235 cadets who have graduated from courses 33 to 40, there have been five separations which have all been within 12 months of graduating. Resignations resulted from officers being unsuited for the work or from other personal reasons.

PORT AUGUSTA GAOL

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What is the capacity of the new and old sections, respectively, of the Port Augusta gaol?

2. Has the old section been condemned or are there any restrictions upon its full use?

3. As the new section has a capacity of 57 or fewer, how were the inmates housed when at January 31, 1975, there were 61 prisoners?

4. What arrangements apply for the gaoling of females at Port Augusta?

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

1. New section (males only) 57. Old section (males and females) about 70.

2. Part of the old administration block is unusable at present and the Public Buildings Department is planning underpinning. Half of the old cell block accommodation, comprising 12 cells and three wards, is vacant, and has been since the new section came into use. It would not be used unless it became absolutely necessary, but it does exist.

3. The 61 inmates on January 31, 1975, comprised 53 males and eight females.

4. Females at Port Augusta are housed in a section of 12 cells and three wards comprising the remaining half of the gaol mentioned in question 2. When the new section for males was being built, these cells were sewered and redecorated, the cell radios and intercommunication systems linked into the principal unit manned by a duty officer, a mess and recreation room, showers, offices and laundry built, and the yard planted in lawn. The three wards are not used as should numbers of females rise above 12, selected inmates would be transferred to the Women's Rehabilitation Centre or Port Lincoln. However, the wards do exist and could be used in an emergency.

TORRENS RIVER

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. What improvements are being undertaken this financial year by the Torrens River Improvement Committee?

2. Is it intended that, under the grant to the Civic Trust of South Australia from the Commonwealth Government for investigations into the Torrens River, the Torrens River Improvement Committee will be consulted in this project?

3. What will be the nature and extent of these intended investigations?

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

1. Nil.

2. I have been informed by the civic trust that it has already consulted the Torrens River Improvement Committee.

3. The investigations will involve a basic survey of the five creeks that flow into the Torrens.

The objectives of the investigation are as follows:

(1) To consider the environment attributes of the creeks and what has happened in the period of human development to downgrade this environment.

(2) Likely future threats to the environment.

(3) What are the potentials for improving the environment under existing legislation.

(4) What new legislation may be needed to improve them as environmental areas.

The specific areas of the investigations are as follows:

(1) Run-off and flooding.

(2) Pollution.

(3) Recreation parks.

RAILWAY STATION BUILDING

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. What is the latest time table for the Motor Registration Division to vacate the Adelaide railway station building?

2. What stage has-been reached in the planning for new facilities for the South Australian Railways Institute, and what amenities will be provided in the new railways building for the institute?

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

1. Early 1977.

2. Planning is in the preliminary stage and it is not possible to say what amenities will be provided.

RAILWAY SYSTEM

Mr. COUMBE (on notice):

1. Has any finality yet been reached on the design and location of the proposed fly-over for the standard gauge rail system adjacent to the North Adelaide station and, if not, when is it expected finality will be reached?

2. Is it yet known how much and what portions of the park lands will need to be acquired for this purpose?

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

1. No.

2. Not applicable.

FISHING LICENCES

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many prawning vessels are now entitled, by the conditions of their prawn authorities, to take prawns in that part of area 3437 situated to the east of a line drawn from Corny Point to Wardang Island?

2. Are these vessels at the same time entitled to take and market other marine produce, such as whiting, snapper and squid?

3. Are these vessels, by the conditions of their prawn authorities, restricted to dredging for prawns during certain hours of the day and, if so, what are those hours?

4. What restrictions exist on netting fish in this area?

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

1. 39 vessels are authorised to take prawns for sale in waters, which include the area 3437.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Nets, other than shark nets, are prohibited in waters exceeding five metres in depth.

MERCURY LEVEL

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many cases of mercury poisoning have been reported during the last 20 years?

2. How many assays of mercury levels in fish are conducted each month and how are specimens selected?

3. Is there any assay evidence to suggest that there is a continuing increase in the level of mercury in fish used for human consumption and, if so, what is the rate of increase, and over what period has this been assessed?

4. What actions are being taken to assess the possible effects of mercury on families consuming large quantities of fish?

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

1. The only case of mercury poisoning to come to the notice of the Public Health Department in this period was caused by occupational exposure to seed preservative.

2. More than 250 samples of the main commercial fish species (including Crustacea) have been tested in a two-year analysis that ended in December, 1974. Large, medium, and small fish from all commercial areas were included in the sample tested.

3. In relation to mercury content of fish species, the National Health and Medical Research Council states that some fish species are able to concentrate mercury in their tissues. Tests indicate that tissue levels vary according to size, age, sex, and the tissue of the fish from which the sample was taken. Generally, the larger the fish the greater the tissue mercury level. In regard to the level of mercury in fish flesh generally, there is no known evidence of increase in fish caught in Australian waters.

4. The Public Health Department is at present planning a survey of persons who consume large quantities of fish regularly. The levels of mercury in blood and hair will be tested.

SOCIAL WORKERS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many social workers are employed at the Royal Adelaide and Queen Elizabeth Hospitals, respectively?

2. What are the average case loads for each social worker at each hospital?

3. Are social work services in these hospitals adequate and, if not, what action will be taken to remedy the situation?

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

1. The Royal Adelaide Hospital employs 14 equivalent full-time social workers, and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital employs 10.

2. In 1974, the Royal Adelaide Hospital provided social work services to about 4 500 patients. At the Queen Elizabeth Hospital statistics are maintained in respect of new referrals only and in the same period there were 2 200 new referrals. It is pointed out that these figures conceal a wide variation in professional case-load depending on the type of clinic, the professional judgment of the social worker and the professional resources available, which vary considerably from time to time. Average figures for each social worker therefore are quite unrealistic.

3. Social work activity in the Government hospital services of South Australia has been the subject of investigation. The overall services are considered to be adequate in the sense that acute problems can be dealt with effectively, but it is agreed by all concerned that services have previously been sub-optimal because of a shortage of professional staff. The S.A. Institute of Technology is developing an associate diploma course in order to overcome some of these difficulties. The development of the domiciliary care services, the proliferation of community health centres, and the support of social work services for general practitioners under the community health programme are all factors contributing to an improvement in the total situation.

LAND COMMISSION

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice):

1. What parcels of land have been purchased by the South Australian Land Commission in the Tea Tree Gully district, and what is the location of each of these parcels?

2. Have these purchases been finalised and, if not, which are still pending?

3. How far advanced are plans for the subdivision of this land?

4. Are the plans, if any, available for public inspection?

5. Is it possible for members of the public to make suggestions regarding the subdivisions?

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

1. and 2.

A. RURAL LAND

Section	Address	Status
2123	Grenfell Road	Settled
Pt. 2124	Cnr. Grenfell and Ladywood Roads	Settled
2151	John Road	Settled
2156	John Road	Settled
2157	Cnr. John and Garfield Roads	Settled
Pt. 2158	Cnr. Garfield and Greenwith Roads	Settled
2117.	Hill Road	Settled
2161	Hill Road	Settled
Pt. 2160	Cnr. Hill and Garfield Roads	Settled
2159	Garfield Road	Settled
2165	Golden Grove Road	Settled
Pt. 2118	Golden Grove-Salisbury Road	Settled
2162	Hill Road	Settled
2163	Cnr. Hill and Garfield Road	Settled

1. and 2.

A. RURAL LAND—*continued*

Section	Address	Status
Pt. 2285	Golden Grove-Salisbury Road	Settled
Pt. 2164	Golden Grove-Salisbury Road	Settled
Pt. 2166	Golden Grove Road	Settled
Pt. 1560	Golden Grove-Salisbury-Grove Roads	Settled
2106	John Road	Notice of acquisition — not yet settled
2140	Yatala Vale Road	Notice of acquisition — not yet settled
2141	Yatala Vale Road	Notice of acquisition — not yet settled
2142	Yatala Vale Road	Notice of acquisition — not yet settled
2150	John Road	Notice of acquisition — not yet settled
833	Cnr. Smart and Hancock Roads	Notice of acquisition — not yet settled
834	Cnr. Smart and Tolley Roads	Notice of acquisition — not yet settled
835	Cnr. Tolley and Smart Roads	Notice of acquisition — not yet settled
1574	Cnr. Ladywood and Montague Roads	Notice of acquisition — not yet settled

3. As can be seen from the foregoing information, the parcels of land fall into two categories: Part A, land zoned for future urban use (Ru A), and Part B, land zoned for immediate residential development. No plans have been made for the subdivision of the parcels contained in Part A. In regard to the land contained in Part B, consultant planners and researchers have been engaged to formulate concept plans incorporating the likely planning implications and development potential of the land so as to ensure that the highest possible standard of development will be implemented and, in accordance with this report, subdivision proposals will be prepared in the near future.

4. and 5. In line with its usual practice, the commission will make application for the issue of letter form A in accordance with the requirements of the Planning and Development Act and its regulations, and as that Act places no requirements for public inspection or suggestion in regard to proposal plans for subdivision, the plans will not be available for those purposes. However, the commission intends that any large-scale concept plans for development in the longer term will provide opportunities for public participation.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many land purchases or acquisitions made by the South Australian Land Commission since October 1 1974, have exceeded $100 000?

2. For each such purchase or acquisition—

(*a*) what was the location and stage of development of the land;

(*b*) what was the purchase or acquisition price; and

(*c*) who was the vendor or landowner?

3. Has the Land Commission purchased or acquired land from Realty Development Corporation and, if so, what were the details of such transactions?

4. What is the total area of land now held by the Land Commission?

5. How many acquisitions or purchases has this involved?

6. What is the total amount of finance now expended or committed for expenditure by the Land Commission?

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

1. Nine.

2. The location, stage of development, purchase price and vendor is shown in the following schedule:

PURCHASES OR ACQUISITION IN EXCESS OF $100 000

District Council of Tea Tree Gully:

Angoves—Acquisition on October 10, 1974—amount in dispute—residential land.

St. Peters College—Acquisition on October 10, 1974—amount in dispute—-residential land.

Mountedam—Acquisition on February 27, 1975—amount in dispute—rural A land.

District Council of Noarlunga:

Cambridge Credit—Purchase $351 000—Rural A land.

Realty Development Corporation — Purchase — $1 408 000—In course of development, now nearing completion.

Redeam—Acquisition—November 21, 1974—vacant land—amount in dispute—rural A land.

Corporation of the City of Salisbury:

Prencourt—Purchase—$275 000—Form A approval—residential land.

Cambridge Credit Corporation—Purchase—$190 000—Form A approval—residential land.

District Council of Munno Para:

Tiver—Acquisition—December 5, 1974—rural A land —amount in dispute.

3. Yes. Details of transaction as above.

4. As at March 18, 1975—1 879 hectares.

5. As at March 18, 1975—55.

6. Total expenditure by the commission to March 18, 1975, including all operations, was $15 700 000.

RIDGEHAVEN INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice):

1. In accidents at the intersection of North-East and Golden Grove Roads, Ridgehaven, since the route of this intersection was altered—

(*a*) how many people have been killed;

(*b*) how many people were injured;

(*c*) how many accidents have been reported; and

(*d*) how many vehicles were involved?

2. Is it intended to improve the safety of this intersection and, if so, what are the future plans and when will the work be carried out?

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

1. Until December 31, 1974 (statistics for 1975 not yet available):

(*a*)1

(*b*) 12

(*c*) 32

(*d*) 63

2. Taking into account accident statistics, traffic volumes and pedestrian movements, this intersection has a low priority. There are at present no plans to improve its safety but it is being kept under review.

TEA TREE GULLY INTERSECTION

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice):

1. In accidents at the intersection of North-East and Hancock Roads, Tea Tree Gully, over the period January 1, 1968, to March 1, 1975—

(*a*) how many people have been killed;

(*b*) how many people were injured;

(*c*) how. many accidents have been reported;

(d) how many vehicles were involved; and

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

2. When will traffic signals be installed at this intersection?

3. How many similar works have a higher priority?

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

1. For period January 1, 1968, to December 31, 1974, (statistics for 1975 not yet available):

(a) 1.

(b) 35.

(c) 76.

(d) 154.

(e) Nil.

2. Installation of traffic signals is based on accident history and traffic volumes, and on this basis not for several years.

3. 90.

MILNE ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice):

1. Is the section of Milne Road, which runs between Golden Grove and Kelly Roads, Modbury, under the jurisdiction of the Highways Department or the city of Tea Tree Gully?

2. If under the control of the council, has the Highways Department any responsibility in respect of this road?

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

1. The city of Tea Tree Gully.

2. No.

GYMNASIUM

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice): Have there been any further developments since October 9, 1974, in the proposal, which has been approved in principle, to establish a gymnasium in the grounds of Highbury Primary School for joint use by students at the school and members of the Hope Valley and Highbury Youth Club?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: While discussions have occurred between the bodies concerned, namely, Highbury Primary School, the youth club, Tea Tree Gully council, and the Education Department, no finality has been reached regarding the type or cost of building that may be eventually constructed. Investigations are still being carried out. It is anticipated that funds for this project will be made available through the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department. All Education Department funds available for major loan work subsidy projects have been committed at present, and Highbury has not been included in the present programme. It is unlikely that an opportunity to include this project in the programme will occur before the end of the 1976-77 financial year.

TAXI-CABS

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. How many licensed taxis operate in the Adelaide metropolitan area?

2. How many taxi licences have changed hands in each of the past 10 years?

3. Is there a recession in the taxi industry and, if so, what are the main contributing factors?

4. Do taxi-drivers who accept a percentage of the fare as salary have to be insured for workmen's compensation?

5. What is the estimated number of taxi licences presently for sale?

6. What is the average price a taxi licence has brought for each of the past 10 years?

7. What actions are being taken to solve the serious problems that seem to be developing in the taxi industry?

8. Is a substantial price rise in taxi fares inevitable, because of steep cost increases caused by fuel tax, increased registration and insurance, plus general inflation?

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

1. 826.

2.

1965	90
1966	106
1967	63
1968	78
1969	83
1970	79
1971	95
1972	82
1973	110
1974	89

32 licences have been transferred up to date in 1975.

3. No.

4. In most cases yes, but there could be specific arrangements between some owners and drivers which would not make them liable under the Act.

5. It is not possible to make such an estimation.

6. The average goodwill value of such licences has been as follows:

		$
1965	white plate	4 000
	green plate	2 800
1966	white plate	4 000
	green plate	2 800
1967	white plate	4 000
	green plate	2 900
1968	white plate	4 200
	green plate	2 900
1969	white plate	4 500
	green plate	3 400
1970	white plate	6 200
	green plate	5 500
1971	white plate	8 000
	green plate	7 200
1972	white plate	9 000
	green plate	8 200
1973	white plate	10 300
	green plate	9 190
1974	white plate	10 290
	green plate	9 280
1975	white plate	10 390
	green plate	9 066

7. The main problem is increasing costs. An application for increased fares to offset these costs is being considered by the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Board.

8. See 7 above.

LIFESAVING CLUB

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. When will work commence on the sealing of the ramp adjacent to the West Beach Surf Lifesaving Club?

2. What has been the delay with this work?

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

1. The work of sealing the ramp adjacent to the West Beach Surf Lifesaving Club is in the hands of the Henley and Grange council. On receipt of an application from the council, the Coast Protection Board would be able to consider the granting of a subsidy towards the cost of the work.

2. There has been no delay as far as the Environment and Conservation Department is concerned.

SPORT GRANTS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the total amount granted to sporting clubs and associations since inception of the Tourism, Recreation and Sport Department, and to whom have these grants been made?

2. Of the amount granted, how much has been supplied by the State and Commonwealth Governments respectively?

3. What secretarial or administrative assistance is, or is intended to be, offered to sporting clubs and associations and, if none, why not?

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

1. Total amount approved for recreational and sporting associations since the inception of the department is $1 668 650.

Payments to date	$
Australian Government . .	142 728
State Government	166 228

2. (*a*) Major projects—Approved contributions

Name of organisation	State Govt. $	Aust. Govt. $
Marion Swimming Centre	150 000	150 000
Whyalla Community Recreation Centre	120 000 (swimming pool) 60 000 (building)	400 000
Campbelltown High School Activity Complex	100 000 (Education Department)	40 000
Loxton Show Hall	71 500 (community welfare $5 000)	71 500
Olympic Sports Field Athletic Track	100 000	100 000
O'Sullivan Beach Recreation Centre	—	29 000
Renmark Swimming Pool	100 000	100 000
Barossa Valley Youth Club	42 666	42 666
Elizabeth Leisure Centre	283 000 ($190 000) T R S ($93 000) S.A.H.T.	283 000
Karadinga: Modbury Recreation Complex	75 000	75 000
Port August Leisure Centre	35 666	78 000
	$1 425 832	$1 369 166

2. (*b*) Minor projects—Approved contributions

Name of organisation	State Govt. $	Aust. Govt. $
District Council of Paringa	7 000	—
Federal Box Factory	8 000	—
S.A. Amateur Gymnastic Assoc, and Burnside Youth Club (joint project)	1 000	—
Henley and Grange Swimming Pool	9 983	—
Elizabeth Netball Association . .	5 000	—
Christies Beach Community Centre	3 600	—
LeFevre Peninsula Community and Youth Centre	1 940	—
Naracoorte Swimming Lakes . . .	4 000	—
Naracoorte Palette Club	633	—
Wallaby Gymnasium Club	500	—
Flinders Park Methodist Sports Ground	1 333	—
Glenlea Tennis Club	1 333	—
St. John's Netball Club . .	3 767	—
Lameroo Youth Centre	540	—
Kadina and District Youth Centre Incorporated	1 567	—
Hahndorf Tennis Club	3 333	—
Woodville Tennis Club	2 000	—
Belair Community Centre Gymnasium	472	—
Clarendon Recreation Ground Committee	2 667	—

2. (*c*) Little athletics

Name of organisation	State Govt. $	Aust. Govt. $
Salisbury Little Athletics	450	—
Ingle Farm Little Athletics Centre	450	—
	$900	

2. (*d*) Adventure playgrounds

Name of organisation	State Govt. $	Aust. Govt. $
Port Adelaide Local Council . .	3 000	—
Corporation of the Town of Hindmarsh	2 993	—
District Council of Riverton . .	2 000	—
	$7 993	

2. (*e*)

Name of organisation	State Govt. $	Aust. Govt. $
Victor Harbor Yacht Club	250	—
	$250	—
Payneham Swimming Pool	7 333	—
Corporation of the Town of Murray Bridge . .	800	—
Ceduna Football Club	1 160	—
Clare Combined Netball Club . .	5 700	—
Robertstown Football Club	2 200	—
Burnside Hockey Club Incorporated . .	3 860	—
Mundoora Community Sports Club	7 844	—
Grange Men's Hockey Club . .	5 200	—
Saddleworth Netball Club . . .	1 310	—
Tailem Bend and District Progress Association	2 400	—
Adelaide Y.W.C.A.	5 000	—
Edwardstown Football Club . .	2 000	—
Mylor Baptist Camp (S.A.. Baptist Union Inc.)	1 700	—
Somerton Surf Lifesaving Club	10 000	—
	$115 175	

2. (*f*)

Name of organisation	State Govt. $	Aust. Govt. $
S.A. Women's Memorial Playing Fields Trust Development of Playing Fields . .	4 500	

2. (*g*) Annual Grants

Name of organisation	State Govt. $	Aust. Govt. $
Surf Lifesaving Association of Aust. (S.A. Division)	14 000 (maximum subject to fund raising)	—
Royal Lifesaving Society	6 000	—
S.A. Amateur Swimming Association	3 000	
S.A. Women's Memorial Playing Fields Trust	1 000	
National Fitness Council	90 000	120 785
Grand Totals . .	$1 668 650	$1 489 951

3. At this stage, because of present limitations in both accommodation and staff, only a small amount of assistance has been provided to sporting clubs, and associations in secretarial and administrative back-up. The department recognises a need for such assistance and intends

to seek accommodation which will provide easy access for outside organisations, particularly at night, for this purpose. The Amateur Athletic Association was assisted with typing and administrative assistance with their fund raising for the tartan track. The department has been able to offer the Sports Policy Committee of the Council of Sporting Organisations a venue for their meetings. Arrangements are presently being made to permit the S.A. Little Athletics Association to use departmental facilities.

NEW INDUSTRIES

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What new industries have been attracted to South Australia this financial year by the Development Division of the Premier's Department?

2. What role has been played by trade agents overseas in encouraging new industries and export markets for South Australian industry?

3. How many persons are employed overseas as trade agents and ancillary staff, and what is the total cost of maintaining the offices this financial year?

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

1. Three new industries have been attracted to South Australia following discussions with officers of the Development Division in the period July 1, 1974, to March 24, 1975. Naturally, however, industrial promotion is a continuous process, and several firms expanded during that period following negotiations commenced at an earlier date. The division is also in close contact with a number of other firms that are likely to make a decision in favour of South Australia in the near future. The member will also be aware that attracting new industries is on one of the many roles of the Development Division. Of equal importance are the division's efforts in assisting South Australian companies to consolidate and expand their present operations, and it is in this field that the division has also been most active over the past year.

2. The trade agents play a continuing role in promoting South Australian manufacture by providing market information, arranging business contacts and itineraries for visiting businessmen and reporting export opportunities.

3. Trade agents are appointed in Japan, Malaya, Singapore and Indonesia. The combined direct payment to the agencies is $12 500 a year plus about $200 a year for servicing costs.

RADAR UNITS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Did the Police Department purchase from overseas some radar units that are unserviceable?

2. If so—

(*a*) how many units were purchased and what was the total cost; and

(*b*) could not these machines be returned and replaced?

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

1. Yes.

2. In June, 1974, four Mesta radar units were delivered, at a cost of $18 000. Extensive investigation and modification have failed to overcome the problem of interference caused by radio sets operating in close proximity, and the sets have not proved suitable for police purposes. In January, 1975, negotiations were commenced with the management of N.I.C. Instrument Company for, the return of the equipment and reimbursement of moneys paid.

GLENELG TREATMENT WORKS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What alterations are being made to the Glenelg treatment works, and what is the estimated cost?

2. Why is it necessary to relay the outlet pipes under the beach and to what depth?

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

1. Capacity of the Glenelg treatment works is being extended to treat and dispose of sewage; buildings and structures are being rehabilitated and upgraded; the two oldest outfalls are being altered; and areas are being landscaped. The total overall cost of this work is $4 400 000.

2. It is considered necessary to remove the drop manhole structures and lower the two outfalls by five metres to reduce the risk of damage to departmental works during rough sea conditions and to improve the appearance of the beach.

CHARITY APPEALS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many public charity appeals have been approved and to whom were such approvals given in each of the past five years?

2. What was the gross and net amount raised by each organisation?

3. Of the appeals held how much was for building purposes and what was the amount of Government subsidy. paid in connection with these appeals?

4. Is this subsidy held in trust for payment to the organisations when required or must these organisations wait for the allocation of funds and, if so, why?

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

I. Provided that the charitable organisations hold the necessary licence issued pursuant to the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act, no further approval is required for an appeal to be launched. It is not possible to obtain the information on numbers of appeals conducted as no figures are available to the Government.

2. Not known.

3. Not known—Government subsidy is payable on approved capital projects and not on amounts raised by appeals. The source of the funds provided by the charitable organisation is not the concern of the Government.

4. There is no question of trust funds, as moneys paid as subsidies are Government funds.

FEMALE TITLE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Was a memorandum issued to Government departments concerning the use of the title "Ms" for women and, if so—

(*a*) on whose authority was it issued;

(*b*) who was responsible for drafting it; and

(*c*) what were its contents?

2. Has such memorandum been varied or withdrawn and which?

3. If withdrawn or varied, on whose authority and why?

4. Has a further memorandum been issued and, if so—

(*a*) when;

(*b*) on whose authority;

(*c*) why;

(*d*) what are its contents; and

(*e*) why has the policy of the Government changed on this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This matter has already been fully answered.

SCHOOL BUILDINGS

Mr. EVANS (on notice): When will construction begin and what type of material will be used on the walls of:

(*a*) Coromandel Valley Primary School;
(*b*) Coromandel South Primary School;
(*c*) Bellevue Heights Primary School;
(*d*) Coromandel Valley Secondary School;
(*e*) Aldgate Primary School;
(*f*) Flagstaff Hill Primary School; and
(*g*) Aberfoyle Park Secondary School?

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

(*a*) Coromandel Valley Primary School. The new school will involve the use of upgraded stone and asbestos and polyurethane panels. The expected beginning of construction cannot be given at this stage but, in view of the delays that have already occurred, the design work on the project is now proceeding with all possible speed.

(*b*) Coromandel South Primary School involves the use of asbestos and polyurethane panels. The siteworks will commence shortly prior to the winter months, but actual construction on site is not expected to begin until the spring.

(*c*) Bellevue Heights Primary School involves the use of asbestos and polyurethane panels but a firm date for the commencement of construction cannot be given.

(*d*) See (*g*)

(*e*) Preliminary work on the Aldgate project is still proceeding and no firm decisions have been made.

(*f*) The details concerning the Flagstaff Hill project will be announced this week by the local member, the Minister of Development and Mines.

(*g*) At present, a study is being undertaken by officers of the department to determine population growth trends in the Blackwood, Coromandel Valley, Happy Valley and Reynella areas so that a school of appropriate size to relieve Blackwood and serve the latter areas can be planned. It is expected that this study will be completed in the relatively near future, but until that time no firm information can be given.

TEACHERS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. What is the percentage of female to male teachers in Government schools?

2. How does this percentage compare over the past 10 years?

3. What is being done to recruit more male teachers?

4. What is the accepted ratio of female to male teachers at primary and secondary schools?

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

1. On the last school day of 1974, 41.86 per cent of teachers were male.

2. On the last school day of 1964, 40.91 per cent of teachers were male.

3. When overseas recruitment occurred some attempt to improve the balance of male teachers took place. Officers from the Division of Educational Services and Resources encouraged male students to apply for courses of teacher education and particularly primary courses.

4. There is no accepted ratio of male to female teachers in secondary schools, although some attention is always given to the balance among the staff in a co-educational school. In primary schools, the department aims to achieve al least one male teacher in two, three or four-teacher rural schools. In six-teacher primary schools, we attempt to ensure the appointment of at least two males. Primary schools are currently not able to attain overall a ratio of one male teacher for every two female teachers in staff. In recent years several male teachers have been appointed to junior primary schools.

CLAY DEPOSITS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Are there any known clay deposits near Millbrook reservoir and, if so, .what is their size, location, and value?

2. Ln valuing property, which has clay deposits, is the same value ascribed whether mining of the resource is either permitted or not permitted in accordance with by-law 56 under the Waterworks Act, 1932-1971?

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

1. No private mines or mineral tenements are held within one mile from the extremities of Millbrook reservoir, although clay deposits are worked near Houghton and Inglewood.. Substantial deposits of weathered shale or clay may exist near the reservoir, but this remains to be proven and therefore no value can be estimated for this material.

2. The calculation of the value of such deposits is dependent upon a diversity of factors, such as the size and quality of the clay deposit, its growth potential in economic terms, zoning and other statutory restrictions that may be imposed. Therefore, should mining be totally prohibited, the material has no economic value but, as zoning and other conditions may be changed, some inherent value must be placed on a deposit when proven.

LAND VALUATIONS

Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. How many new valuation certificates were issued for the financial years 1973-74 and 1974-75 respectively?

2. How many objections were received in each of these years and how many followed their objections through to finality?

3. What was the number of objections upheld?

4. How many objections are still under consideration?

5. How many of the valuations to which objection was raised were increased?

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

1. 1973-74	107 272	
1974-75	103 283	
2. 1973-74	1 110	(All objections are followed
1974-75	2 090	through to finality.)
3. 1973-74	190	reductions 895 no alteration
1974-75	255	reductions 1 677 no alteration
4. 1973-74	23	
1974-75	140	
5. 1973-74	2	
1974-75	18	

At present 54 appeals to the Land and Valuation Court are waiting to be heard, being 23 for 1973-74 and 31 for 1974-75.

FILM CORPORATION

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. How many of the South Australian Film Corporation's 64 uncompleted films, as at the end of June, 1974, have since been completed?

2. Is it an accepted fact that a country needs 40 000 000 people to be able to achieve a self-sufficient film industry?

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

1. 26 have been completed.

2. It is a widely-accepted belief amongst professional film-makers that a nation needs at least 40 000 000 people to support, without oversea sales, a film industry. The Chairman/Director has mentioned this fact a number of times to support his belief that for South Australia to have a viable film industry it must plan its productions for international sale. It does not mean that countries with a population of fewer than 40 000 000 cannot achieve a self-sufficient film industry? What it does mean is that smaller countries must place a great emphasis on international sales, distribution agreements, and co-productions. In the establishment of a new industry it can be expected that it will take a number of years to achieve a large number of international contacts sufficient to support a thriving industry.

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What are the names of the contractors and the seven films that the South Australian Film Corporation stated are being produced for it in South Australia?

2. How much money has been invested in the two pilot episodes of the unsold series *Stacey's Gym?*

3. How much money has the South Australian Film Corporation borrowed and from whom?

4. How much money has the South Australian Film Corporation invested in the film *Picnic at Hanging Rock?*

5. Are Government departments allowed to let contracts for departmental film requirements to producers other than through the South Australian Film Corporation?

6. What percentages does the South Australian Film Corporation add to films it has produced for State Government departments?

7. What moneys have been spent on the film *Who Killed Jenny Langby?*

8. Did the Premier's Department withhold moneys for the South Australian Film Corporation until late in 1974 and, if so, why, and what amount was involved?

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

Contractor	Title	Sponsor Department/Instrumentality
Production Centre Pty. Ltd.	*Water Treatment*	Engineering and Water Supply
Bosisto Productions	*A Road in Time*	Highways Department
David Stocker	*Farm Business Management*	Department of Further Education
Production Centre Pty. Ltd.	*An Experiment in Medium Density*	South Australian Housing Trust
Bosisto Productions	*Fruit Fly*	Department of Agriculture
Scope Films	*Starring Jack Thompson*	South Australian Film Corporation
Production Centre Pty. Ltd.	*Westlakes*	Commercially sponsored — Westlakes Development Corporation

2. The first pilot for *Stacey's Gym* was a joint venture with the Australian Film Development Corporation investing 50 per cent of the budgeted cost, South Australian Telecasters Limited 25 per cent, and the South Australian Film Corporation the balance of the budgeted cost. The second pilot was funded by the South Australian Film Corporation as a training exercise for local South Australian technicians and actors and actresses. The corporation, in line with commercial practice, does not publish the budget details of its productions.

3. Savings Bank of South Australia	$1 000 000
C.B.C. Savings Bank Limited	$100 000
	$1 100 000

4. The corporation investment in cash and value of services and facilities represents about one-third of the production costs for this film.

5. No.

6. To 16 mm productions, 50 per cent on direct costs. To 35 mm productions, 33 per cent on direct costs.

7. As stated previously, details of production costs are not available for publication.

8. Because of a change in administration arrangements for funding Government film production, moneys appropriated for this purpose did not become available to the corporation until late in 1974. The amount so appropriated for 1974-75 was $430 000.

Mr. EVANS (on notice):

1. What orders have been received by the South Australian Film Corporation for 16 mm films, both educational and documentary?

2. How many films has. the South Australian Film Corporation distributed for the Tasmanian Film Unit and the Papua-New Guinea Film Unit, and what were the film titles?

3. Which network finally gained the right to purchase the film *Who Killed Jenny Langby?*

4. How many films were transferred from the South Australian Education Department to the South Australian Film Corporation?

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

1. 315 prints of corporation 16 mm films have been sold.

2. None.

3. The Australian Broadcasting Commission' purchased the television rights for two television screenings of *Who Killed Jenny Langby?*

4. 11 793 prints.

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What are the names of the present staff of the South Australian Film Corporation, what are their official titles, when were they appointed, and what are their salary ranges and present entitlement, respectively?

2. What are the qualifications of all persons employed as other than typiste-stenographers, clerks, storemen, or drivers?

3. What subcontractors or part-time employees have been employed in each month since the commencement of operations of the corporation up to February 28, 1975; what were the terms of contract or employment, and what moneys were paid or are owing to each?

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

1. and 2. It is not possible in the time available to prepare all this information.

3. The corporation is a business organisation and considers this question objectionable and improper. The Government agrees. If the honourable member has a specific case he wishes to raise, it will be examined.

STURT LAND

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Does the Government own open land at Sturt and, if so:

(*a*) how much;

(*b*) when was it bought;

(*c*) for what purpose;

(*d*) for what is it being used now;

(*e*) for what purpose does the Government intend to use this land in the future; and

(*f*) is such land suitable for use as a Municipal Tramways Trust bus depot?

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

(*a*) The Highways Department owns 10.3 ha of open land in addition to the 3.64 ha. on which its depot is sited in the area bounded by South Road, Marion Road and Sturt Road. The land held by the Minister of Education in this area is in the process of being transferred to Sturt College, Flinders University and the Marion council for recreation purposes.

(*b*) The 10.3 ha was bought in June, 1965.

(*c*) For the Noarlunga transportation corridor by the Highways Department, and for school projects by the Education Department. The latter are no longer required.

(*d*) Leased vineyard.

(*e*) See (*a*) and (*c*).

(*f*) No.

PEDLAR CREEK BRIDGE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the bridge over Pedlar Creek on the Main South Road now closed to traffic and, if so, why is it closed?

2. If it is closed, when was it closed and when is it expected to be reopened?

3. What work, if any, has to be done on this bridge to make it safe and at what estimated cost?

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

1. Yes. Damage to a structural element arising from malfunction of expansion joints.

2. February 17, 1975. Because of complexity of repairs, the reopening date is not known.

3. Because of complexity of repairs, the cost cannot be estimated with any degree of accuracy.

HILTON PROPERTY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is the property at 59 Rowland Road, Hilton, owned by the Highways Department and, if not, by whom is it owned?

2. Is this property at present occupied and, if so—

(*a*) by whom;

(*b*) for what purpose;

(*c*) under what title; and

(*d*) for how long?

3. What is it intended to do with this property and when?

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

1. Yes, and it is now 140 Burbridge Road.

2. Yes.

(*a*) Michael William Kempster and Megan Anne Burgess

(*b*) Restaurant

(*c*) Lease

(*d*) Three years ending March 28, 1976.

3. The property is held for the purpose of widening Burbridge Road.

THEATRE 62

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has any financial assistance been given by the Government to Theatre 62 since it opened and, if so—

(*a*) what form has it taken;

(*b*) how much is it;

(*c*) when has it been given;

(*d*) how has it been spent;

(*e*) is any of it yet unspent;

(*f*) what action is it intended to take now to recover any such assistance, and, if no action is intended, why not?

2. Is it intended to give any further financial assistance to Theatre 62 and, if so—

(*a*) when;

(*b*) how much; and

(*c*) why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has been impossible for the Arts Development Branch of my department to prepare a reply to this question in time. The Arts Development Branch is overworked at the moment, and the most I can offer is to make a senior officer available to discuss the matter with the honourable member.

RAILWAYS COACHING BOOK

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Are the amendments to the South Australian Railways Coaching Book, 10th Edition, as set out in the *Government Gazette* on February 27, 1975, accurate, and, if not—

(*a*) in what respects are they inaccurate; and

(*b*) what action is it intended to take?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: These amendments related to fares that had applied since June 1, 1974, and as such were accurate. However, since then, there have been increases in country fares since December 1, 1974, and metropolitan fares since February 1, 1975. Further amendments to the coaching book are in hand and will be gazetted as soon as possible.

INSURANCE COMMISSION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Will the State Government Insurance Commission insure any insurable risk and, if so, upon what terms?

2. If it will not insure on any risk, why not?

3. What is the policy of the State Government Insurance Commission regarding the acceptance of insurance upon insurable risks when such insurance has already been refused elsewhere?

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

1. The honourable member should be referred to section 12 (1) (*b*) of the State Government Insurance Commission Act, 1970. The commission would follow the usual practice of any prudent underwriter, and any risk proposed would be treated on its merits.

2. Nowhere in the State Government Insurance Commission Act, 1970, is it obligatory for the commission to insure a risk, if it is considered not prudent to do so.

3. Normally the commission, would consider accepting any class of risk refused by private insurers, but naturally would have to treat each case on its merits and must be in a position to decline business in terms of section 12 (1) (*b*).

BUILDING TRADES WORKERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): When is it intended to present the report on the strike by building trades maintenance workers, promised in the House by the Premier on Wednesday, March 19, 1975?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Metal Trade employees of unit 23 (Public Buildings Department) were awarded an $8 a week disabilities allowance by the Australian Conciliation and Arbitration Commission. Following that decision the various building trades unions have claimed that, in addition to the present disabilities allowances applying to their members, they should receive the full $8 a week awarded to the Metal Trades employees. If the claims were granted, it would mean the following amounts would be paid to building trades employees of unit 23 as against the $8 a week for metal trades employees:

	A week $
Bricklayers	11.70
Carpenters	11.85
Builders labourers	10.50
Painters	10.00
Plasterers	11.55
Plumbers	14.20

Conferences have been arranged with the unions concerned, and they have been adamant that any offer less than their claim is not acceptable and that their members are willing to stay out indefinitely until their demands are met. The Metal Trades employees have indicated that, if the building trades employees receive more than $8 a week, they will be asking for an increase in their allowance.

The Public Service Board notified the South Australian Industrial Commission on Friday, March 21, 1975, of the dispute. At a conference on the dispute in the Industrial Commission the unions were invited by the commission to lodge applications to vary their respective awards. The unions completely rejected this suggestion, and demanded that the Public Service Board concede their claims. The board considers that to grant these claims would result in more and further prolonged industrial unrest, and is adamant that the matter should be resolved by the Industrial Commission. A further conference was to be held between the parties at 3.30 p.m. on March 24, 1975.

NATIONAL COMPANIES ACT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has the Government examined the possibility of legislation to require public companies incorporated in South Australia to hold their annual general meetings within South Australia?

2. Are there valid reasons why such legislation should not be introduced and, if not, when will such legislation be introduced?

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

1. No.

2. A Bill for a National Companies Act is in course of preparation by the Australian Government. It would be confusing and undesirable to amend the South Australian Companies Act further until it is known whether the Commonwealth Bill will become law.

MILLSWOOD ENTERPRISES

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): Did the South Australian Government grant financial assistance to Millswood Enterprises Proprietary Limited or its associated companies, during the 1970-73 period and, if so, what assistance was given for each year during this period and what was the profit or loss of this company for each year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The South Australian Government has riot granted financial assistance to Millswood Enterprises Proprietary Limited. It is not clear what the honourable member means when he refers to associated companies. If he has a specific company in mind, can further details be supplied.

MONARTO

Mr. BLACKER (on notice):

1. What is now the time table for commencing construction of Monarto?

2. Has the time table of construction work been altered recently, and, if so, in what manner?

3. Have plans for the water treatment plant and the artificial lake been completed?

4. What other construction work is now in the detailed design stage?

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

1. At the Ministerial meeting in November, 1974, the Australian and State Governments agreed that the first stage of development of Monarto would be based on a population target of 25 000 to 30 000 by December, 1983. The construction of the Monarto Development Commission is based on this. It is expected that the construction of the first roadworks and some engineering services will start early in 1976, construction of housing in late 1977, and construction of major city centre buildings in late 1977.

2. No.

3. No. The water treatment plant is in the detailed design stage. An investigation into lake operating methods is not yet complete. The project is still in the planning stage.

4. In addition to the water treatment plan, other work in the detailed design stage is an inter-change on the freeway to provide road access to the city, a portion of the arterial road system, and the sewage treatment works.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has the Government a confirmed financial commitment of about $40 000 000 for the development of Monarto during the 5-year period from 1975 to 1980?

2. If $40 000 000 is not correct, what is the confirmed financial commitment for this period?

3. What is the committed financial contribution by the. Commonwealth Government for this period?

4. What part of the Commonwealth Government contribution is expected to be made as grants and what part as loans?

5. What is the expected financial contribution by the State Government for this period?

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

1. No.

2. A programme for development of Monarto for the five-year period 1974-75 to 1978-79, which indicated an estimated net expenditure of $125 000 000, was presented to the Minister for Urban and Regional Development (Mr. Uren) at a meeting of Ministers in November, 1974. He supported the estimate of $125 000 000 as being acceptable for such a programme. A firm commitment will be sought from the Australian Government when the Ministers meet in April of this year to consider a programme of development that will cover the five-year period 1975-76 to 1979-80. Agreement was reached on the funding of 197.4-75 expenditure on the basis of .the Australian Government's input of $6 000 000 or 80 per cent of the commission's approved budget of $7 500 000, whichever is the lesser amount. The moneys will be available by way of grants and loans, grant moneys being in land purchase for non-urban use, planning studies, and tree planting.

3. 4. and 5. See 2. above.

HOUSING TRUST APPLICATIONS

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. How many applications does the Housing Trust have before it at present?

2. What proportion of the applications relate to the type of housing and purchase plans offered?

3. On average, based on the previous two months, how many applications are received weekly?

4. How many houses were completed by the Housing Trust during 1974?

5. On average, based on the previous two months, how many applications are granted a week?

6. Is there a delay in fulfilling applications, and, if so, what is the cause of this delay?

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

1. At December 31, 1974, there were 26 485 applications for housing before the Housing Trust.

Note—These figures are actual and are taken out each quarter. They are the figures supplied to the Australian Department of Housing and Construction, as required by it each quarter. These figures do not allow for wastage.

2. The applications are made up as follows:

Rental applications—		
Family dwellings	14 901	
Cottage flats (pensioners)	2 884	
		17 785
Sale applications—		
Bank Finance Scheme	4 200	
Rental Purchase Scheme	4 500	
		8 700
		26 485

3. Based on the applications received over the past two months, the average weekly number is as follows:

Rental	221
Sale	96
	317

4. During 1974, 1 242 new dwellings were completed, but, in addition, 322 older houses were purchased and renovated under the Special Rental Housing Scheme.

5. Based on the allocations of houses over the past two months, the weekly average is as follows:

Rental	74
Sale	14
	88

6. There has always been a. delay in fulfilling applications and this delay varies considerably depending upon type of housing required, location, size, etc. At the present time, the trust is considering applications for rental housing becoming available in the metropolitan area which were lodged in the early months of 1971. In the Elizabeth/Salisbury area, the waiting time has now extended for family type housing to almost two years.

7. In the first seven months of this financial year, 1 877 houses were commenced, compared to 1 590 houses in the same period last year, and the number of houses now under construction is 2 179 compared to 1 589 at January 31, 1975. The Housing Trust expects its rate of completions to show a marked increase soon. With the additional funds recently made available by the Australian Government, the Housing Trust will be able to maintain its planned programme and hopes to be able to complete more than 1 500 housing units during the present financial year. The application rate has remained at a very high level over the past three years and this no doubt reflects the accommodation problems being experienced by many families. There is still a shortage in South Australia of rental housing for which the rents charged are within the capacity to pay of those on low incomes. A vast majority of this group in the community are relying on the Housing Trust for assistance. The high costs of purchasing housing privately precludes most lower and even many middle-income earners from buying, and the extremely high rentals sought by the private investors and landlords forces most on the lower level of income to depend on the State housing authority for assistance. The Housing Trust has more than 35 000 rental properties of all types and as is the case with most housing authorities, it relies extensively on vacancies occurring to assist the housing demand. The vacancy rate in recent months has decreased sharply and this has resulted in a lengthening of the waiting times.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Is the intended restriction by the Commonwealth Government on the uses for P.V.C. likely to reduce the marketing potential of ethylene dichloride from the Redcliff petro-chemical complex?

2. Is there likely to be a reduced marketing potential, how significant will it be, and does it alter the likely viability or potential size of the complex?

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

1. Ethylene dichloride is the basic raw material from which P.V.C. is produced. As a consequence, the markets for P.V.C., both in Australia and overseas, will be influenced by factors relating to its use.

2. The question of the safety of P.V.C. has been raised recently, and this is one of the aspects being considered in the reassessment of the markets and the viability of the Redcliff project.

AYERS HOUSE

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Have negotiations to change the lessee of the restaurant at Ayers House from Mr. P. H. Cramey to a company been finalised?

2. If negotiations have been finalised, who is the present lessee?

3. If leased by a company, who are the directors and shareholders of this company?

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

1. No.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

SWIMMING INSTRUCTION

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What is the necessary Education Department qualification to be held by a person who acts as an instructor-in-charge under the part-time swimming instruction scheme?

2. What standards and achievements must be obtained to be granted this qualification?

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

1. The necessary Education Department qualification to be held by a person who acts as an instructor-in-charge is the Education Department Swimming Instructor's Certificate.

2. The standards and achievements required for the granting of this qualification for people of at least 17 years of age are as follows:

(*a*) Practical:

(1) Swim continuously in a style suitable for demonstration purposes, entering with a neat dive or shallow header.
   a. 25 metres front crawl;
   b. 25 metres back crawl;
   c. 25 metres breast stroke;
   d. 25 metres side stroke;
   e. 25 metres el. back stroke.
   (These are maximum distances.)

(2) Perform—
   a. a feet-first surface dive and recover an object in at least 2 metres of water;
   b. any surface dive and recover an object in at least 2 metres of water.

(3) Remain afloat for five minutes using any methods desired (except drown proofing), entering with a stride jump.

(4) Demonstrate—
   a. survival swimming (drown proofing) for five minutes;
   b. the survival travel stroke over 50 metres.

(5) Demonstrate—

a. a throwing assist (using weighted rope);
b. a reaching assist (using pole or other extension);
c. a non-contact rescue;
d. a defence tactic;
e. one contact rescue on an unconscious patient.

A pass must be obtained in all sections of the practical.

(*b*) Theory:

Answer satisfactorily a written paper on teaching swimming and diving, swimming techniques, artificial respiration, water safety, life-saving and first-aid. (6 x 11 hour lectures are given by Physical Education Branch.)

(*c*) Instruction:

Satisfactorily instruct a class of pupils for at least 10 lessons. (This section is waived for applicants with teacher training.)

FOOTBALL PARK

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. Has the Government made a financial grant, loan, or guarantee to Football Park?

2. If financial assistance was given, in what form was this assistance, what were the conditions, and what was the extent of this assistance?

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

1. The Government has guaranteed bank advances to Football Park in the form of a term loan of $2 000 000 and overdraft facilities of $250 000.

2. The specific conditions relating to a guarantee is a confidential matter between a lender and his banker. In the case of this guarantee I would inform the honourable member that the conditions were those normally sought by a guarantor in addition to those requested by the bank, and were mutually agreed to by the lender, the South Australian National Football League and the Treasurer.

PETROL TAX

Dr. EASTICK: When will the Treasurer put his money where his mouth is—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: —and remove the wholly inflationary and iniquitous petrol tax that his Government has inflicted on the people of South Australia?

The SPEAKER: Order! The first remark is out of order.

Dr. EASTICK: Since this impost on the South Australian public was first introduced by the Treasurer he has said on numerous occasions how unhappy he is with it and how he looks forward to being able to remove it at the earliest opportunity. He made such a statement for the first time in this House during the Committee stage of the Business Franchise (Petrol) Bill. In subsequent statements he has said the same thing. In the *News* of January 14, the following article appears:

Mr. Dunstan did not rule out the possibility that if the Commonwealth provided substantial additional finance to South Australia the recently introduced petrol tax might be dropped. "I cannot say what would happen to the petrol tax," he said. "I would certainly like to have enough money to reduce a number of taxes."

Under the heading "$20 000 000—but no tax relief" in the *News* of February 14 the Treasurer is reported as saying:

I haven't given up on fighting to have the petrol and cigarette tax dropped.

In the *News* of February 27, under the heading "5c petrol tax may be lifted soon: Dunstan" the Treasurer is reported as saying:

Negotiations are continuing with the Commonwealth, and I am hopeful that it will yet prove possible to lift the tax.

Yesterday, under the heading "States to thrash out cash demand" and the sub-heading "New hopes of removing South Australia's 6c petrol tax" appears the following report:

The Premier, Mr. Dunstan, will make a new attempt to have South Australia's 6c a gallon petrol tax removed next week.

As I suggest that the people of South Australia are becoming sick and tired of this sort of assertion without any positive action, I ask the Treasurer when he will remove this impost, which is causing concern to South Australians.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government will remove petrol and cigarette taxes when it is assured that the forward revenues of this State will be such that we can do without the $20 000 000 a year that comes in from those taxes, and without reduction—

Mr. Gunn: You never—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Eyre further infringes the Standing Orders, he will suffer the consequences.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position is that, if we were to reduce the revenue of the State by $20 000 000 for next year, without having any compensating revenue increase, I would have to reduce markedly the services of the State.

Dr. Eastick: All this is window dressing, then?

Mr. Venning: A lot of hot air!

The SPEAKER: Order! I issue a final warning for this afternoon that any member who infringes Standing Orders will suffer the consequences of the implementation of Standing Orders. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There have been continuing negotiations between the Commonwealth Government and ourselves about ways to provide the State with finance so that we can remove consumption taxes. I will meet the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasurer next Tuesday, when this matter, amongst others affecting the State, will be discussed. I will make an announcement about what can be done in this area when finality has been reached, but, if the Leader wants me to announce that we are removing these taxes without our having an assurance that I can replace them in revenue, he is asking me not to put my money where my mouth is but, in fact, to promise the sacking of thousands of public servants.

Dr. Eastick: What rubbish!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If we do without the $20 000 000 in revenue, we will have to sack teachers, nurses and doctors, because there is no other way in which this State can achieve a reasonable provision in its revenue to make sure that our cheques do not bounce. If the Leader believes that we are to replace our revenue in that way, he had better stand up and say whom he would propose to sack.

Mr. GUNN: Is'the Minister of Development and Mines aware that the petrol franchise tax, together with the Commonwealth Government's decision to remove the fuel equalisation subsidy is causing much concern and is creating many problems among miners at the opal fields of Coober Pedy and, to a lesser extent, Andamooka? On a recent visit to Coober Pedy I was told (and observed) that motor spirit was selling at 84c a gallon and distillate at 42c, and that, because of these large increases in fuel costs, 52 blowers were standing idle at Coober Pedy. My observations were made in a 20-minute trip around the town. It is estimated by my constituents in this area that at least another 50 blowers and much other equipment could be standing idle at the field. The machines are idle because

of the high cost of fuel, which, because of Commonwealth and State action, has increased by about 18c a gallon in the past few months. In view of the serious situation, I ask the Minister whether he will discuss this matter with representatives from the opal fields to see whether urgent action can be taken to rectify the situation. In addition, the cost of gelignite has increased significantly. This cost increase is affecting opal miners who cannot use nitro-filled explosives because of the many accidents that have occurred on the opal fields recently when miners have been using this type of explosive.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I cannot understand why such a question has been directed to me. I am well aware that the community to which the honourable member refers is a mining community, but surely it cannot be argued that, simply because it is a mining community, matters concerning education, environment, or water supply should be referred automatically to the Minister of Development and Mines. The matters to which the honourable member refers are well in hand with the Premier, who has in this Chamber made statements on these matters, and I have every confidence in his ability to provide a satisfactory solution that will benefit the people not only in that area but in the State as a whole. There was one matter that I think comes sufficiently within my province to enable me to give an undertaking to the honourable member: the price of gelignite and the general problems associated with the use of explosives by miners. I will take up the matter for the honourable member and bring down a considered reply.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say what action the Government has taken to solve the problems being experienced by many operators in the petrol resale industry? About 10 days ago, I asked the Premier whether any special action had been taken to overcome a series of anomalies that had been identified in the general area of motor spirit retailing. The Premier, in reply, said it was necessary for an operator who had a problem to contact the Automobile Chamber of Commerce. The Secretary of the chamber (Mr. Mill) has said that he has counselled several people who have told him about the problems they face with regard to continuing to hold a licence to trade in motor spirit. In today's *News* appears a lengthy statement by Mr. Mill about the difficulties many people are having. His recommendation to them is, in effect, that they continue to trade while the difficulties are sorted out. Can the Treasurer say whether this matter has been considered by the Government or Cabinet; whether there is a solution to it; and whether any action is being taken to overcome the difficulties? I appreciate that Mr. Adams, the officer responsible for this matter, can only recognise the Act as it stands and cannot make alterations or change arrangements to allow for persons in difficulty to trade or to contract to pay their licence fees over an extended period of time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As Treasurer, I am entitled to consider hardship in this area, and the Automobile Chamber of Commerce has been told that cases of hardship should be detailed and reported to the Government. Although the overwhelming majority of petrol resellers has paid licence fees, a very small number has proved to be in genuine hardship, and those cases are being investigated in detail. The Government is not taking action against those resellers on their continuing to trade while an investigation is being made of their circumstances, and a proper consideration will be given to their circumstances when they are reported to me. The Government has not forced anyone to leave the industry and take advantage of collecting the extra moneys. People who have left the industry and who have not provided for paying their licence fee deserve no consideration. Although a high proportion of the licence fee has been collected without difficulty, a few resellers are shown to be in difficulty. Their cases are being considered, and the Government will take no Draconian action while their cases are submitted to the Government and are under proper consideration.

APPRENTICE JOCKEYS

Mr. OLSON: Will the Attorney-General confer with the Chief Secretary with a view to bringing apprentice jockeys under the Chief Secretary's control? Bearing in mind that horse-racing is considered by its protagonists to be an industry and also that country apprentices in most trades receive 800 hours tuition during their apprenticeship, consisting of city training of four fortnightly periods in the first and second years and two fortnightly periods in the third year (in addition $15 a week is paid for board at the Pennington Hostel and travel warrants are issued), will the Attorney ask his colleague to arrange for some form of schooling for country apprentice jockeys, now that horse trainers gradually are being forced away from suburban areas?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will take up the matter with my colleague.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether he is aware of the latest figures of industrial disputes in South Australia issued by the Australian Bureau of Statistics indicating that over the past two years the number of industrial disputes in this State has increased by more than 400 per cent, which is by far the highest percentage increase for any State in Australia? Further, can the Minister say why South Australia has outstripped the other States to such an extent under his Government, and can he also say what action he intends to take to correct the position?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member has gone back a fair way in order to get his figures on this matter.

Mr. Coumbe: No.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: If he looked at figures today, he would find a vast difference apparent with regard to industrial disputes, particularly in South Australia. We are continually taking action, through the Industrial Court, to control disputes.

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

Mr. ARNOLD: Can the Minister of Works say what are the present water storages in Lake Victoria, the Menindee Lakes and the Hume dam, as well as the major tributary flows in the Murray River system? The Minister will be aware of the dramatic increase in salinity level that has occurred once more in South Australia as a result of the reduced flow released from Lake Victoria, with the salinity levels now running at between 1 100 electrical conductivity units and 1 400 e.c. units throughout the length of the Murray River in South Australia. Will the Minister examine the capacities in the various storages and the flow rates, discussing the matter with the relevant Ministers in New South Wales and Victoria? I do not think that any Minister would suggest that South Australia can continue to endure the salinity levels now existing here if it is to continue to have a horticultural industry.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although the situation outlined by the honourable member is serious, I do not think he would expect me to have with me the information he has requested.

Mr. Arnold: No.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When the flow of water was released from Lake Victoria in an attempt to mitigate the serious circumstances that obtained a few weeks ago, it was pointed out that, when that flow ceased, there would be an increase in the salinity level in the Murray River. This was inevitable, because the ground waters would continue to flow back into the river once the level dropped. That increased flow was responsible for an increase of about 1 m in the level of the river. I am fully aware of the serious situation existing at present, as is the River Murray Commission, which is currently meeting to consider the problem. I have done (and will continue to do) all I possibly can, in conjunction with officials in other States and the commission, to alleviate the difficulty, if that is at all possible. We cannot continue to use more than our entitlement; the honourable member knows as well as I know what are the consequences of such action. The honourable member can rest assured that everything possible has been and is being considered in order to have improved the present serious situation. Unfortunately, this is not the first time such a situation has occurred on the Murray River.

FISHERIES RESEARCH

Mr. RODDA: Following his reply to my question of March 12, can the Minister of Fisheries say what positive steps are being taken to ensure that shark fishermen can continue to earn a living in this industry, following the recent prohibition on the sale of shark? The Minister concluded his reply of March 12 as follows:

Constant research is being undertaken, and two weeks ago a conference of Directors of Fisheries canvassed this matter. We are trying to draw up an Australia-wide programme for additional research in this field.

The reply given on notice to the member for Bragg today seems to indicate that there is only minimal effect from the mercury content in fish in Australian waters. At the weekend a fisherman told me that he has to earn an income of $300 a week before he receives even 1c from the industry. Unless something is done urgently this group of people will be forced on to the labour market and the use of much valuable capital equipment will be lost.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The regulations announced by the Commonwealth Government relating to the limit of mercury content in fish have not been firmly adopted by the Commonwealth Government. As I have said many times, I still hope that the submissions I have made will result in these regulations not being introduced. The situation has not been changed. I am not sure of the type of shark fisherman the honourable member is talking about. For the last three years the Victorian Government has declared a maximum mercury content in shark limit of .5 parts per million, and for some time fishermen in that State have refused to handle large sharks. Perhaps the honourable member is talking about those shark fishermen who have previously had a market in Victoria for sharks not exceeding 100 cm in length, subject to their being certified by a Fisheries Department officer that before their heads and tails were removed they were shorter than 100 cm. The fact that a market in Victoria still exists for such sharks should have no impact on the current position. That being so, the fishermen who have been relying on that form of shark fishing are unaffected, and I would suspect that, because of that minimum size, they will not be affected even though the Commonwealth legislation be enacted. The only effect I can see would be perhaps a scare within the community in Victoria, where there is a large shark-eating community, and such a scare might have an impact by way of buyer resistance although, frankly, I do not think that is likely. I repeat that, in view of discussions that have been held by me with the Commonwealth Minister, as well as those held by the Premier with the Prime Minister two or three weeks ago, I still hope that those regulations will not be proceeded with and, if that is the case, I can see no change of situation in the shark fishing industry.

SURGICAL OPERATIONS

Mr. SIMMONS: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, say whether there is any provision in South Australia such as I believe exists in parts of the United States of America for a review of the frequency of, necessity for, and success of operations performed by medical practitioners and, if there is not, will he investigate the possibility of providing this safeguard?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague and bring down a reply.

TRAFFIC SIGNALS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation, in the absence of the Minister of Transport, say whether the Municipal Tramways Trust has asked the Adelaide City Council to investigate the possibility of installing a "turn right" arrow at the intersection of North Terrace and King William Street? I understand that, on most occasions, the Bee-line bus proceeding from North Terrace into King William Street makes a right turn into King William Street against the red traffic light. Indeed, during a recent traffic survey conducted in the area three Bee-line buses, in the space of 15 minutes, turned right into King William Street against the red light. In the interests of the safety of bus passengers and the better flow of traffic at the intersection, I ask whether representations have been made to the City Council to rephase the lights to include an arrow to allow Bee-line buses to turn right safely into King William Street and, if representations have not been made, will the M.T.T. take up this matter with the council as soon as possible?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be happy to refer the matter to the Minister of Transport so that he may consider the honourable member's suggestion.

STATE FINANCES

Mr. McANANEY: In view of the large deficit in the Australian Government Budget this year and the slowing down of the economy caused by incompetent government, can the Treasurer say what taxes he intends suggesting to the Prime Minister should be increased or what services the Australian Government should eliminate so that the Prime Minister can make funds available to the Treasurer in order to solve the self-inflicted financial problems of the South Australian Government caused by increased expenditure of over 30 per cent so far this year?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the honourable member no doubt will be aware from his deep study of economic matters, it is important for the Commonwealth Government in a time of reflation to run a deficit-financing programme. It is not possible under the Commonwealth-State Financial Agreement for the States in the long run to do likewise. The States are prevented from doing so under penal interest rate provisions.

Mr. McAnaney: If the Commonwealth can't—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

Mr. McAnaney: I was only giving—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If there are in Australia unused resources of manpower and equipment, a deficit-financing programme is proper: the idea has been welcomed by business in Australia that this programme should be proceeded with by the Commonwealth.

Mr. McAnaney: Not when unemployment is caused by—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Heysen wants to continue his infringement, he, too, will suffer the consequences. Any further infringement will mean an automatic warning to all members concerned.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: All States have proposed to the Commonwealth (and this includes States governed by Liberal Governments) that it should grant additional finance to the States through deficit financing. True, the present deficit of the Commonwealth is running at about $1 600 000 000, but the addition of $20 000 000 to that sum will not really create a marked inflationary pressure. It will, however, reduce the cost-inflationary pressure within this State.

GEORGETOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Education take the necessary action to earmark urgently sufficient funds for the purpose of paving the playing area at Georgetown Primary School? A few weeks ago, when I was invited by the school committee to inspect the playing area I was surprised to see the state that the playing area was in. It almost appears as though nothing has been done since the school was built, but I suppose something has been done since then. Having conferred with the appropriate authority, I consider departmental officers do an excellent job in this regard, but the current shortage of money is probably the problem.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There have been certain difficulties in the minor works programme for this financial year because of over-spending, and this has resulted in some projects that we wanted to undertake straight away having to be deferred for some time.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Venning: Order!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I appreciate the attitude taken by the member for Rocky River, but I know that some other members do not. I will examine the position at Georgetown referred to in the honourable member's question and find out what can be done.

HIGHBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Works say whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department can now include a small group of houses in Paradise Grove and Paradise Close, Highbury, in the sewerage programme for that area? I have raised this matter over a period of years, the most recent occasion being on March 5, when I was told that a proposal to sewer this area would be considered as soon as firm subdivision proposals were received for all the land on the northern side of Lower North-East Road and to the west of Paradise Grove. A constituent has drawn my attention to the fact that sewerage facilities are currently being installed (presumably by a developer) in the subdivision to which the Minister has referred.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will examine the honourable member's question, find out what can be done, and bring down a report for her as soon as possible.

POST-GRADUATE STUDENTS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether his department has developed any policies in relation to the employment of Ph.D. graduates in South Australia? A recent press report indicates that the Minister's department has investigated the employment in this State of graduates who hold that degree. That report states that 400 such persons are studying at Adelaide University at present, that the cost of educating one of these graduates is $45 000, and that policies should be developed immediately to ensure the employment of these persons. Therefore, I ask the Minister whether his department has followed the recommendations in the report and developed policies along these lines.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I could ask the honourable member whether he was interested in taking this course. However, as I understand that the Commonwealth Government has a scheme to train these people I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

PRIVATE HOUSE BUILDING

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Minister of Development and Mines, as Minister in charge of housing, say what action the Government will take to encourage the building of private houses so that the grave housing crisis in South Australia will be alleviated as soon as possible? My question is supplementary to my Question on Notice, the reply to which states that the Housing Trust now has before it 26 485 applications for rental or purchase houses. That is interesting, because in reply to a question I asked in March last year I was told that the number was 15 833 and, in reply to another question asked at the end of July, I was told that the number had increased to 18 200. The Commonwealth Government (which, of course, is a Labor Government) has made it extremely difficult for people to build private houses. That Government has increased the interest rates and has made it extremely difficult for private people and private developers to get the necessary loans to build houses. We in this State have had the greatest increase in the cost of housing in Australia and, of course, the policies of our State Government have caused that great increase. I refer here in particular to the new workmen's compensation legislation. The Government of this State has further broken down or destroyed the incentive for private companies to build houses. In addition, a reply that I have received today to another question shows that the Land Commission is quickly tying up all available land in the metropolitan area and holding it from development by private companies. The position is critical and the increase in the number of applications to the Housing Trust shows the extent to which people in this State cannot get houses. I ask the Government to reverse its policies and have some feeling for people who would like to buy private houses.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: It is difficult to know how to stay within Standing Orders and yet reply to a second reading speech such as the honourable member has made. However, the first thing I want to say is that the honourable member's timing is rather astray. He has criticised a position that obtained some time ago when finance was difficult to get. I remind him that this Government has been very active in negotiations with the Commonwealth Government to have more finance made available in the Home Builders Account, and this has now been done, not only in the 5½ per cent area but also by an administrative arrangement whereby we can make more money available in the 6¾ per cent area to those who are

above the 95 per cent means test Laid down in the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement. As I have told the honourable member previously, it takes time for this money to work its way into the economy and have the effect that it should have on housing activity. There really were only two areas in which the honourable member had any specific criticism of anything that this Government had done that he alleges would have adversely affected building activity. One was in regard to the Workmen's Compensation Act. I think it is about time the Opposition came out with a clear statement about what it wants done about that Act and say just what sort of position a workman would be in if he was injured under Liberal Government legislation. It is all very well to criticise the effects of a piece of legislation: it is another thing to come up with a clear statement on the way the Opposition, if it was in Government, would amend that legislation. If the Opposition is in any way dinkum about this matter, it must indicate its position on this legislation. The other aspect of State Government activity that the honourable member has criticised concerns the operation of the Land Commission. The area in which this Government has performed extremely well in respect of the housing sector is in land price control, particularly because of our initiative in introducing legislation to establish the Land Commission and to institute urban land price control. There is no way this Government will back-pedal in the initiatives that it has taken regarding the Land Commission. It is important that land come on to the market quickly and that there be a Government competitor in this field that can set the level—

Mr. Dean Brown: It's a monopoly.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The definition of "monopoly", as I recall it, is where an agency is the only one operating in the field. It is news to me, in fact, that no-one other than the Land Commission is subdividing at present. I was not aware of that. Indeed, I understand that various private companies are subdividing, so I do not understand how the Land Commission could be called a monopoly. It is operating in the field in competition with private enterprise, and that seems to be entirely proper. The honourable member was careful not to mention one thing in relation to the Housing Trust's waiting list, and that was the rate of wastage in the queue. There is always wastage in the queue, and this has to be taken into account with regard to evaluating any set of figures. The other matter to be taken into account is the wastage at present existing in Liberal Government States on the Eastern seaboard of this country.

MURDER CASE

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government will institute an inquiry into serious allegations recently made relating to the case of Noel Russell McDonald, who, in the Supreme Court on September 15, 1970, pleaded guilty to murder, with a view to establishing whether or not a retrial should be ordered? Statements have been made recently by a brother of the convicted man, in the press and in discussion with other people, asking for a retrial for his brother. He says that, until the day before the trial in the Supreme Court, McDonald intended to plead not guilty to murder. Expert evidence given at the Magistrates Court indicated that the gun involved was faulty. On the day before the trial, McDonald is said to have been advised that if he pleaded guilty the case would be dealt with immediately and that as a juvenile he would be sentenced to detention at the Governor's pleasure (an effective sentence of about five years). However, he was told that if he pleaded not guilty the case could be protracted, continuing past his 18th birthday, when he would be liable for the death penalty if he was found guilty of murder. Of course, this is not true. However, McDonald maintains that it was because he believed what he had been told that he changed his plea to one of guilty. None of his relations was notified of the change of plea. Indeed, I understand that one relation attended the Supreme Court on the afternoon of the day on which the case was set down, only to be told that the case had been heard in the morning and that McDonald had pleaded guilty. Having pleaded guilty, McDonald is not able to appeal. Apparently, he is now eligible for parole, but he and his family are more concerned to seek a retrial, since they believe that a miscarriage of justice may have occurred.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Under a procedure provided in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, a petition can be lodged by a person who seeks the exercise of the Royal prerogative. There are ways in which that can be adjudicated on. If the prisoner to whom the honourable member refers seeks a review on the grounds referred to, his proper course is to petition. Of course, the petition will then be properly considered; there are appropriate procedures for having it investigated. I know nothing about the matter apart from what I have read in the newspapers, and it does not seem to me that statements in the press are the appropriate way in which a review of a case of this kind should be sought. I have had no communication from anyone connected with the case. I can only say to the honourable member that, if he is communicating with any of the parties concerned, he should inform them that the prisoner (or his brother if the brother is espousing his case) should seek legal advice so that he can be informed of the appropriate procedure for having the matter reviewed.

LYELL McEWIN HOSPITAL

Mr. DUNCAN: Is the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, aware that the Lyell McEwin Hospital Board has determined that, after July 1, when the Medibank scheme is introduced, this hospital's beds will be distributed as follows: 70 per cent for standard ward care, and 30 per cent for preference or private ward care? Part of an article which appears on page 3 of yesterday's *Advertiser* and which is headed "300 doctors reject Medibank hospital plan" states:

> Another development from yesterday's meeting of doctors was that beds at Elizabeth's Lyell McEwin Hospital have been earmarked for public patients and there will be no private beds available.

The Federal President of the Australian Association of Surgeons (Dr. Hoare) is quoted as saying:

> Although doctors and surgeons are prepared to treat people at Elizabeth, this decision of the hospital board will mean that those people who wish to continue to contribute to private health funds to ensure private medical care will have to seek it in another place.

That statement is a further deliberate lie in the continuing campaign by the Australian Medical Association in this country to try to denigrate the Medibank service.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not make any comment while explaining his question.

Mr. DUNCAN: I should be grateful if the Attorney-General could say what was the position regarding the Lyell McEwin Hospital. A great many people have been misled by the statement in yesterday's *Advertiser* to which I have referred; in fact, I believe the statement was designed intentionally to mislead the people of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not make comments in his explanation.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member's familiarity with the affairs of his district is so well known in this House that I have no doubt that the material he has placed before the House is well based. I will refer it to my colleague in order to have it confirmed.

VICTOR HARBOR COURTHOUSE

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Attorney-General arrange for public waiting-room facilities to be installed within or near the local courthouse at Victor Harbor? My attention has been drawn to an undesirable situation existing near this site on court sitting days when those awaiting a hearing are required to stand on the footpath outside the court. Their subjection to public exposure is seen to be quite undesirable, as it could cause undue embarrassment to them or their family connections, because, although they might already have been charged to appear at the court, they might be innocent of any offence, or they might simply be witnesses of the Crown or of other parties. Inclement weather prevailing in the winter months makes the scene physically miserable and grossly uncomfortable for those involved. It is understood that ultimately a new courthouse and police headquarters will be constructed at Victor Harbor, and one would expect that the current deplorable situation would then be improved. However, there appears to be no firm evidence at this stage about when that project will commence. Therefore, I should also appreciate from the Attorney any information he has about the matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain information and furnish it to the honourable member.

ROAD MEDIAN BARRIERS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation ask the Minister of Transport whether the Highways Department intends to use concrete redirectional median barriers in an effort to reduce the number of serious head-on vehicular collisions now occurring? 1 cite as an example that last week a young man was killed as a result of crossing in his vehicle from one lane on part of the main South-East road to another lane, on which no effective barrier existed to stop his vehicle. If there had been a concrete median barrier, as now designed and as used in the United States of America, that type of accident could not have occurred. We find on main roads now that, where the metal barriers are used, they are not strong enough to redirect a vehicle. The vehicle goes either over the top or the barrier gives way if speed is involved and a head-on smash occurs with a vehicle travelling in the other direction. Two films are available in Adelaide, entitled *A Shape of Safety,* and *Slip forming the Safety Shape,* which show the effectiveness of the barrier. The basic characteristics of the barrier, called the safety shape, are described in a pamphlet produced by an industry. The characteristics are listed as follows: adequate strength to resist penetration; good redirection of vehicle following impact; driver control maintained following collision; little or no barrier damage from vehicular impact; little damage to vehicle body unless angle of impact severe; detailed test data available. There should be no great increase in cost compared to that of the traditional type of barrier in use today. As many head-on collisions are taking the lives of people in the community, I ask the Minister to ask his colleague to obtain a report from the Highways Department on whether it intends to use this type of barrier in order to reduce the more serious types of accident occurring today.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Undoubtedly, the Minister has considered this aspect as a safety device. However, I will refer the matter to him and ask what decision he may have reached.

HOUSING TRUST REGIONAL OFFICE

Mr. NANKIVELL: As in his reply to my question of March 5 the Minister said that the Housing Trust would arrange for an investigation to be carried out on the establishment of a regional office in the Riverland, will he obtain an indication from the trust of when the inquiry will be undertaken?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Immediately.

REDWOOD PARK SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain a report for me regarding what stage has been reached in the erection of a proposed new primary school to be built on four hectares of land fronting Milne Road, Redwood Park, to relieve pressure of increasing enrolments at neighbouring primary schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Is the proposed new school to be known as Redwood Park?

Mrs. Byrne: Yes.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will check this matter for the honourable member and bring down a reply.

SUPERANNUATION FUND

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say whether he has written to the Public Service Association regarding amendments to the Superannuation Fund? I understand that the association is concerned about certain anomalies in the fund, particularly as regards section 51. Although last Thursday the Premier said that he had written to the association about another matter in connection with the fund, I understand that the association has not yet received the letter. Is there a communications breakdown between the Government and the association?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When I made that statement in the House, I had dictated a letter to the association but, following the honourable member's representations in the House, I had the questions raised concerning the superannuation measure reported on to me by officers, as a result of which I did not sign the letter when it was presented to me. I had dictated the letter before the honourable member asked me his question. I have had additional reports sought from officers, as a result of which I have directed that the matter stand on the Legislative Council's Notice Paper while I make further investigations and consult with the association.

TORRENS RIVER BRIDGE

Mr. SIMMONS: Will the Minister of Transport ask the Highways Department to investigate the desirability of constructing a bridge across the Torrens River, at Torrens Avenue, Lockleys, to replace the old wooden bridge reported in this morning's *Advertiser* as being closed because it was unsafe? The report states that the old wooden one-way bridge is used by about 1 000 cars a day, and undoubtedly an improved bridge would be even more popular. The bridge is also used by many secondary school students to cross the river. The closing of the bridge will force many cars seeking access to the Rowell Road bridge to use certain narrow back streets that are used by many primary school students who attend Lockleys North Primary School. Such a practice will add to the traffic hazards in the district. As I have received many complaints about the closing of the bridge, I ask what consideration is being given to its replacement.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain a considered reply for the honourable member.

NATIONAL HEALTH SCHEME

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Does the Premier know the exact details of the Medibank scheme, which is to operate from July 1? It seems that there is complete confusion in the public mind. What are the details of this scheme, and does anyone know them? I suspect that the Government does not. Country hospitals do not know their position; doctors do not know; and members of the public do not know whether they should, on July 1, cancel subscriptions to medical funds. If they do, I suspect that the result would be complete chaos.

Mr. Coumbe: They will be well advised not to cancel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I should think so. If a large percentage of people do not continue these payments, the scheme may collapse. I have received requests for information from hospitals and doctors in my district. They have apparently been threatened by Dr. Shea that they will not get a subsidy if they do not join the scheme. They are not sure, and it seems that hospitals, doctors, and the public are completely confused. Therefore, I ask the Premier whether he knows all the details of the scheme and, if he does, whether he can say something that will enlighten the public, who are completely confused on the issue.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I certainly know the main outline of the scheme and how it affects the public, the profession, and hospitals, but I remind the honourable member that the scheme is not something that can be described in a five-minute reply. It is a complex scheme about which details have been published at considerable length.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You are not speaking of the series of misleading advertisements?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Details have been properly published at the expense of the Commonwealth Government, and those statements are correct. The statement the honourable member made concerning some threat by Dr. Shea is not correct.

Mr. Venning: It is correct.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Will the honourable member kindly produce evidence, if he says that it is correct? Under the Medibank scheme, from July 1, patients in public wards in Government and recognised hospitals will be able to obtain treatment on the Medibank basis, and, in addition, those attending for attention at surgeries of general practitioners will be able to have their doctor claim on Medibank, if he prefers to bulk bill for 85 per cent of the approved fee (and that would cover the whole cost to the patient). Alternatively, the doctor may charge the patient, who can then claim 85 per cent of the approved cost. That is the general outline of the scheme. The honourable member should refer for details either to advertisements that have been published or to the considerable quantity of material which has been published by the Commonwealth department and which at length gives details of this scheme. I am sure that the department will be pleased—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Should people continue to pay subscriptions to private funds?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is a matter for them. If people want to be covered for private ward treatment and for treatment in non-recognised hospitals in private circumstances, they should still insure, and that applies to pharmaceutical benefits, too. The Medibank scheme will not cover dental or physiotherapy treatment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier is replying to a question, and he will not be subjected to interjections and have to reply to those interjections. Interjections are out of order, as are replies to interjections. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member wants details of this scheme, I suggest that he does the normal thing that I should think anyone here would do, and go to the authority responsible, which is the Commonwealth department.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You said read the advertisements!

Mr. Dean Brown: You said last week—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Dean Brown: Didn't you—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Davenport.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Honourable members have this material readily available to them, as it has been readily available to Government members. We have read it and made use of it.

Dr. Tonkin: We are not talking about—

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the honourable member for Bragg. It is apparent that honourable members will not take notice of the authority of the Chair; they will take notice only of warnings and the consequences.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that the honourable member does something a little active on his own behalf, as Government members have done.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: SEX DISCRIMINATION BILL

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Earlier in the session I gave an undertaking to members that the Government would introduce during this session a Bill relating to sex discrimination and a consequential Bill relating to the Industrial Code. |t had been the intention of the Government to introduce these measures today and to leave them on the Notice Paper to be dealt with later in the session so that there would be an opportunity for members and the public to. examine them and make representations relating to them. Unfortunately, the British measure on sex discrimination has only recently been introduced in the Parliament. It contains many provisions I believe the South Australian Parliament should examine because they could be usefully incorporated into the original proposal which has come to this House from a Select Committee that was appointed after consideration of the original Bill introduced by the member for Bragg. Parliamentary Counsel has informed me that, since considering the British provision, it is almost impossible to complete the drafting of the measure in time for its introduction this week. I regret that that is the situation, but there has been great pressure on the Parliamentary Counsel and he has been working long hours since receiving the relevant information from England. In consequence, the measures will have to be postponed and introduced in the last part of the session, in June. The Government will put the measures before the House in June and try to set aside sufficient time for members to debate and pass them then.

TEACHER HOUSING AUTHORITY BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 2 (clause 4)—After line 4 insert new definition as follows:

"Minister" means the Minister of Education.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): 1 move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

The amendment means that the administration of the Bill, when it becomes an Act, is committed to the Minister of Education, and that is what was. originally intended. In future it may become an inconvenient situation, and it may lead to an attempt to amend the Act. However, I do not think it is a matter of enough significant consequence to disagree to the amendment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Again, we should congratulate the Council for making the intention of the Bill clear. The Minister's statement that the amendment is not a matter of enough significant consequence to disagree to is an inappropriate comment. In Victoria, the Act is administered by the Minister of Housing. That was done by amendment after the original Teacher Housing Authority was established in that State. Far from its being an amendment of insufficient consequence to be disagreed to, I think the interpretation would more properly be that it is essential to make the meaning of the Act clear. In that circumstances, the Opposition supports the motion.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not think the comments of the member for Kavel should go unanswered. Acts do not normally specify who is to administer them, for a number of good reasons. First, a Government may change its attitude about the person to whose care the Bill should be committed, and it could be proper in this instance that the Act should be administered by the Minister of Housing. Specifying the Minister of Education in the Bill means that if a change is to be made in the future, it can be made only by an amendment. I should have thought the honourable member would see the advantage of having sufficient flexibility. Secondly, if a Minister's title is changed (the title Minister of Education might be changed to Minister of Education and Science), the Bill would have to be amended. Recently the honourable member supported a Bill to amend the Art Gallery Act, transferring the administration of the Act from the Minister of Education to the Premier. Changes such as contained in the amendment have been made in the past by Liberal Governments, and it is inconvenient and silly to have to amend an Act in order to do it. The point I made was that the matter was not of sufficient moment to warrant an argument with the Upper House, and I should have thought the honourable member could work that out.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister has got himself a bit agitated about the fact that it happens to be in the public's interest to know who is in charge of the Teacher Housing Authority. If we follow his argument we can understand the rationale behind much that the Government does. When it speaks about inconvenience, it is speaking not about inconvenience to the public but about inconvenience to the Government of the day. If the Minister of Education is to administer the Act, the Act should say so.

Motion carried.

MANUFACTURERS WARRANTIES BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 11 (clause 3)—Before "manufactured" insert "the quality, utility, capacity, performance or durability of"

No. 2. Page 3, lines 6 to 9 (clause 4)—Leave out all words after "by reason of" in line 6 and insert:

(*a*) an act or default of the consumer or some other person (not being the manufacturer, or his servant or agent);

or

(*b*) a cause independent of human control,

occurring after the goods have left the control of the manufacturer."

No. 3. Page 3, lines 12 and 13 (clause 4)—Leave out all words after "circumstances" in line 12 and insert:

(*a*) that were beyond the control of the manufacturer;

or

(*b*) that the manufacturer could not reasonably be expected to have foreseen."

No. 4. Page 4, lines 24 and 25 (clause 9)—Leave out paragraph (*b*)

Amendment No. 1:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

This amendment relates to the definition of express warranty, which in the Bill as it left this House meant any assertion or statement in relation to manufactured goods, etc. The Legislative Council has inserted before "manufactured" the words: "the quality, utility, capacity, performance or durability of". I cannot think of any subject matter other than those which would be likely to be, or even could be, the subject of an assertion or statement that could be classified as a warranty. Although I doubt that the amendment does anything significant, I am prepared to accept it.

Mr. COUMBE: The manufactured goods referred to in this clause have been qualified by the words proposed to be inserted. It is tied up with the phrase "merchantable quality" mentioned later in the Bill. It spells but the definition of manufactured goods under express warranty. The question of merchantable quality was the subject of debate in this Chamber earlier. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. L. J KING: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

This amendment relates to the defences available to a manufacturer with respect to an action on the statutory warranty. As the clause stood, it provided a defence where the damage was due to an act or default of some person not being the manufacturer or his servant or an agent. The Council has inserted "consumer or some other person". I do not think it makes any difference, because "consumer" is obviously included in the word "person", anyway.

Mr. COUMBE: I support the amendment because 1 think it does clarify the situation. This amendment gives another line of defence and I think it is important, although the Attorney-General may not agree with that.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be disagreed to.

This amendment relates to the exclusion of liability of a manufacturer in relation to spare parts. Clause 4 (4), as it left this place, provided:

A manufacturer of goods is not liable upon his statutory warranty as to the availability of spare parts if the unavailability of spare parts arose from circumstances that the manufacturer could not reasonably be expected to have foreseen.

The Legislative Council has inserted, after "circumstances", the following paragraphs:

(*a*) that were beyond the control of the manufacturer: or

(*b*) that the manufacturer could not reasonably be expected to have foreseen.

I suggest that that is an inappropriate amendment. The scheme of the Bill is that there is on the part of the manufacturer a statutory warranty as to the availability of spare parts. That provision is contained in clause 4 (1) (*d*), which provides that the manufacturer may exclude his liability by taking reasonable steps to bring to the notice of a purchaser at or before the time of purchase the fact that spare parts would not be available. It provides a further defence, even if he has not done that, that the shortage of those spare parts was not reasonably foreseeable. That is how the Bill left this place.

The Council would say that, even if he had not indicated to the purchaser that spare parts would not be available and even though it was foreseeable that the spare parts would not be available, he should have a defence if the circumstances of the shortage were beyond his control. That is inappropriate, because a manufacturer might foresee (or the circumstances might be such that he should foresee) that spare parts would not be available. Tn those circumstances, if he refrains from telling the purchaser that spare parts would not be available, he should not be able to escape liability merely because the availability may be beyond his control, which is a likely situation. If the circumstances are such that the manufacturer should foresee that spare parts would be unavailable, he should tell that to the purchaser whether or not that unavailability is beyond his control. It is the "foreseeability" that imposes on the manufacturer the obligation to tell members of the public who are buying his goods that spare parts will not be available, even if the circumstances of such unavailability are beyond his control. Consequently, I think that this amendment is inappropriate and would open the way to malpractice. I therefore recommend that the Committee disagree to it.

Mr. COUMBE: I believe that the clause as it left this place was adequate and covered the position in the best possible way. The Legislative Council's amendment complicates the matter. As I believe some second thought is being given the matter, I oppose the amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 4:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be agreed to.

This amendment deletes paragraph (*b*) of clause 9—the regulation-making power. Paragraphs (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) and (*d*) are simply examples of the matters on which regulations can be made: they do not limit the generality of regulation-making power to make such regulations as the Governor may think necessary or expedient to prevent any misleading practice in the use of written warranties. Apart from that, I think most of the subject matter of paragraph (*b*) is covered in one way or another in paragraphs (*a*), (*c*) or (*d*).

Mr. COUMBE: I am pleased that the other place has inserted this amendment and I am delighted that the Attorney has seen fit to accept it, because paragraph (*b*) was the paragraph to which I drew the attention of members previously. When I looked at the four criteria contained in clause 9 is was paragraph, (*b*) that caused me most concern. Paragraph (*a*) regulates the form of any such warranties; paragraph (*c*) prescribes or regulates the manner in which they are to be written, typed or printed; and (*d*) prescribes penalties. However, paragraph (*b*), which the amendment deletes, provides:

prescribe, or regulate, the conditions or limitations to which they may be subject;

We on this side took grave exception to paragraph (*b*), because we thought it was contrary to the real meaning of "regulation". If it were necessary to write conditions or limitations on warranties, they should be in the legislation, not enacted by regulation. The Legislative Council has seen fit to delete paragraph (*b*), on which I compliment it. For these reasons I support the motion.

Motion carried.

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

Because the amendment would provide an avenue for an unscrupulous manufacturer to avoid the consequence of failing to comply with the warranty.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendment No. 3, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 9 (clause 2)—Leave out "amended by striking out the passage" and insert "repealed".

No. 2. Page 1, lines 10 to 16 (clause 2)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 3. Page 2, lines 1 to 20 (clause 5)—Leave out the clause.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

The amendments relate to one substantial amendment, and I must say that they have taken me somewhat by surprise. As the Bill left this place, it. provided facility for the increase in an individual member's' capital in an industrial and provident society, and also made a provision that was consequential on the 1966 amendment enabling a member who had increased his capital to $4 000 in a society that had been formed before 1966 to increase his voting power up to that $4 000. The Legislative Council, by its amendments, seeks to delete that provision. I can only say that it has taken me by surprise, because I was not aware of any representation being made for the removal of that provision. Certainly no representations were made to me about it. When . the Bill was introduced it was as a result of representations from people who saw it would be of advantage to their members to be able to contribute additional capital without being given additional voting power.

I oppose the Legislative Council's amendments. It seems to me that the principle of the 1966 Act is correct: it is a basic principle of a co-operative that each member should have an equal say in voting. A co-operative is unlike a commercial organisation, a profit-making company, where it is reasonable that voting power should be proportionate to the amount of capital contributed. A co-operative enterprise is not a commercial undertaking in which capital is invested to make a profit: it is an aggregation of individuals to promote their interests in a co-operative way, and the principle of co-operation, since its inception at Rochdale (I think, in the 1840's), has been based on the idea that each member should have an equal voting right, irrespective of the amount of capital he has contributed. I am sure that this principle is correct, and the Government would not consider departing from it.

Mr. COUMBE: The Industrial and Provident Societies Act is valuable legislation for certain co-operatives, particularly as regards income tax, the operations of

co-operatives generally, and the fact that in various parts of the State they perform a useful purpose. They are flourishing in the Riverland and also in the Adelaide Hills, where they handle fruit. I think the Attorney knows that some fruit co-operatives in the Hills have had much money to deal with, and he would also know that the Commonwealth Commissioner of Taxation had considered this problem, and a physical way in which to overcome income tax has been adopted. Before 1966, there were few complaints. I am perfectly aware of the $4 000 upper limit. However, I should appreciate the Attorney's expanding on his explanation, particularly on why he considers this amendment would not help co-operatives and also on what he really has against these amendments in relation to the amending Bill of 1966.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Legislative Council's amendments would provide that the one member one vote principle would not apply to societies formed after the commencement of the 1966 Act. I regard the principle of one member one vote in co-operatives as fundamental to co-operation, and it should apply to all societies. As I am not aware of any agitation that it should be repealed, and as no representations have been made to me, I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. COUMBE: The crux of the matter is that Statute rights established by law in 1966 have been varied in some co-operatives, and it has been considered that some organisations are advantaged. This is a further effort to rectify the present position as it affects co-operatives in the Murray River area. The Murray River Wholesale Co-operative Limited (and especially the auditors of that company) considers that this amendment is necessary. Because the member for Chaffey is absent at a deputation, I speak on his behalf, but I am sure that he would put the case much more strongly than I can. This amendment should be accepted in order to allow co-operatives to operate correctly.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Mr. Broomhill, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe (teller), Eastick, Evans, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Max Brown, Burdon, McRae, and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Allen, Goldsworthy, Gunn, and Wardle.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments negative the purposes of the

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

LISTENING DEVICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's message that it had disagreed to the following amendment inserted by the House of Assembly:

Page 1, line 9 (clause 2)—Leave out the clause.

Mr. COUMBE: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I draw your attention to the state of the Committee.

A quorum having been formed:

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its amendment.

The other place has amended the Bill to delete a provision that was deliberately placed in the principal Act. Members will recall that the principal Act provides that the use of listening devices, although prohibited as a general rule, is permitted where it is in the public interest to use them or where they are used for the protection of an individual's legitimate interest. The Legislative Council amended the Bill by deleting that provision from the principal Act.

The Bill was then amended here to restore the provision in the principal Act, and the Legislative Council has rejected that amendment so the effect of insisting on the provision inserted by this place is to leave the principal Act, in this respect, in the same position as it was, namely, so as to enable listening devices to be used where that was in the public interest or where their use was necessary to protect a person's legitimate interests.

I explained the matter when I moved the amending provision here, pointing out why the provision was necessary. Without it, the Listening Devices Act could be a mischievous piece of legislation because it might put people in a position where they could not use a listening device where it would be in their own legitimate interests to use one. In the case of blackmail, for instance, it might be necessary for a person to protect himself by using a tape recorder. It would be wrong to make it a criminal offence to do what any sensible person would feel reasonably impelled to do to protect his safety. Of course, one can think of examples where the public interest may demand the use of a listening device. I would regard the listening devices legislation as being mischievous if it included the sort of provision which the other place has tried to insert but which we have resisted. I therefore ask members to insist on our amendment.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Attorney has canvassed the history of this matter. It seems strange to me that a Government which has previously supported a Privacy. Bill, including such a wide definition of "right of privacy" that it would have caused great difficulty to the Judiciary, should now bend over backwards to protect people who seek to use listening devices. If we allow a person to use such a device if it is in his lawful interests to do so, who will decide what are those lawful interests? It seems to me that the Government's attitude in relation to the Privacy Bill is irreconcilable with its attitude in this case..

Motion carried.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its disagreement to the House of Assembly's amendment.

MARGARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (INCREASES)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 20. Page 3096.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This is a simple Bill. In 1974, quotas of table margarine were increased for the last three quarterly periods of this year to the equivalent of 2 100. tonnes a year. This Bill gives effect to what was agreed last year at a conference on this matter. The Bill provides as the quota for the last three quarterly periods of 1975 an increase of a further 50 per cent to the equivalent of 3 150 tonnes a year. Previously, a fractional amount was referred to, but this reference has now been deleted. Should manufacturers in South Australia fully use their quotas, the per capita availability for consumption of table margarine manufactured in South Australia will be comparable with the average per capita availability in other States.

I point out that even now it is difficult to buy table margarine in shops. About two weeks ago I experienced this difficulty when I wanted to buy margarine at my local supermarket. Although plenty of cooking margarine was

available, I could not obtain any table margarine; that is a lamentable state of affairs. Some people are told by their doctors that they must, for health reasons, eat table margarine. Although I do not wish to reflect on the dairying industry, what I have said is a fact of life. Therefore, we should ensure that table margarine is correctly labelled and that the quota is sufficient so that people have a choice of the type of margarine they buy.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Mallee): I thank the Deputy Leader for adequately dealing with this matter. I was absent from the House making a few inquiries of the dairying industry about the effect of the increase in quotas on that industry, and I have been informed that there are no problems associated with the increase. The butter manufacturing industry in South Australia is perfectly happy about the increase in the margarine quotas: It accepts that this will bring the production of those in this State who are licensed to manufacture table margarine on to the same per capita basis as that in other States.

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

WILLS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 13. Page 1957.)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I support the Bill at the second reading stage. In Committee, I will move amendments, and the matters I wish to deal with will best be dealt with at that stage.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Will attested by a beneficiary."

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

To strike out "and inserting in lieu thereof the following subsections:"; and to strike out new subsections (2) and (3).

Members will recall that in 1972 Parliament passed an amendment to the Wills Act by which it provided that in future a testamentary disposition would not be void simply because the beneficiary was a witness to the will. Parliament did that because it was thought that the rule that had existed for a century worked hardship in some cases when a beneficiary inadvertently witnessed a will, not knowing that he thereby disqualified himself from taking a benefit under the will. As that was a pioneering, and innovative measure, it was thought appropriate to insert precautions, so Parliament inserted special procedures for proving a will in such a case. These special provisions led to considerable administrative difficulty because, in each case of a will lodged for probate, the Registrar of Probates had to satisfy himself whether the conditions for the operation of these special procedures existed.

That led to much irritation on the part of those who were propounding wills in cases where these provisions had no application at all, and to some- delay in the processing of applications for probate through the Supreme Court probate office. For that reason, several representations were made for changes. Much thought was given to how the objectives of the original legislation might be reached without the complications produced by the special provisions.

Whilst these matters were being considered, the Hon. Mr. Potter introduced this Bill in another place in an attempt to solve the problems created by the. special procedures inserted in the original legislation, and there is much to be said for the provisions he included in his Bill. As I say, when he introduced it, the consideration of the submissions made and of the. course to be adopted had not been completed by the Government or its advisers;

We have now reached the stage, however, where we can formulate a fairly clear view of what is needed and I have concluded that the way to deal with the situation is simply to eliminate all special procedures, leaving the legislation in the situation in which testamentary dispositions are no longer void merely because the beneficiary is a witness to the will. We will simply leave it at that, leaving the ordinary rules of procedure to operate on that subsequent provision. The result of my amendments, if carried, will be that a beneficiary will not be disqualified simply because he witnesses a will. If any question is raised whether a testator executed a will validly or whether he knew and approved of its contents, those propounding the will will be required, under the ordinary rules, to prove these things. If some person alleges that, although the testator knew and approved of the contents, he was influenced by fraud or undue influence to sign a will that he would otherwise not have signed, that person may caveat the will by issuing appropriate proceedings and proving those facts.

I think it is best that the ordinary procedural rules, well established and understood, and the rules relating to fraud and undue influence should be left to operate on this changed condition of the law. In his Bill, Mr. Potter went most of the way with what I am saying, but he left in one special provision that immediately (and this illustrates how difficult this type of special provision is) required a qualification. His special provision was the reversal of onus of proof on the question of fraud or undue influence where the beneficiary was a witness. Immediately he included that, he felt impelled (and rightly so) to provide that that provision was not to apply where a person with professional qualifications was the executor and attested a will. That immediately creates difficulty. I doubt whether the provision reversing the onus of proof in the case of fraud or undue influence is really of any value.

Once again, it gets us into the difficulty of having special procedural provisions applying to this one aspect of the law of wills. I suppose that, when an innovation is first introduced, it is natural to tend to surround it with special precautions; it is approached with a degree of hesitation. Now, however, our minds are settled about it. The provision has been on the Statute Book for almost three years, so that we are now more or less accustomed to the idea that there is no real reason why a beneficiary should be disqualified from taking a benefit simply because he witnessed the will. If there is any question whether the testator knows and approves the terms of the will, the person propounding the will must prove it. If there is a question of fraud or undue influence, it can be dealt with adequately under the ordinary rules of law applying to fraud and undue influence. Although I appreciate the initiative taken by Mr. Potter and do not in any way disagree to the principle in his Bill, I think it a tidier way to deal with the situation simply to eliminate special provisions altogether. That is what my amendments are designed to. do.

Mr. NANKIVELL: From reading speeches made in another place, it seems that the question that has been raised by the Hon. Mr. Potter is better covered by the Attorney's amendments. He said that the normal processes of law will now apply in the case of a challenge against the validity of a will signed by a beneficiary. I see nothing wrong with this. There may have been reasons in the past that made it improper for a beneficiary to witness a will. It may not have been possible at the time to obtain an independent witness. The will could have been

invalidated if it were not properly witnessed, whereas by these amendments it is possible for someone present and able to witness the document to do so without being prejudiced by his action where he is a beneficiary or a private executor.

Although that does not invalidate the will, as the legislation stands now the benefit that the witness may have received could be invalidated. I support the Bill, which was introduced to solve specific problems in the Act. I also support the Attorney's amendments, which improve the legislation in accordance with the expressed wishes of the Hon. F. J. Potter when he introduced the Bill. The Opposition supports the amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONSUMER CREDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 19. Page 3030.)

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The genesis of this measure stems from the dedication of the Attorney-General to doctrinaire Socialist policies. Allowing for some theoretical value (and that is doubtful), it is a completely obnoxious measure, which seeks to destroy the banking system as we know it in South Australia. Indeed, I believe the net is wider than that, because the amendment to the definition of "revolving charge account" involves building societies and arrangements by stock firms to provide credit. I accept that this altered definition will not vary the situation of major emporiums, which will continue their activities in this regard.. .

A direct inference can be drawn from the measure that the Attorney doubts the integrity. and, indeed, the ability of the banking system to provide adequately for people in this State. Banking organisations in this State, in concert with their colleagues in other States, for a long time have provided excellent facilities and opportunities for the people of this State. I refer the Attorney (and especially the member for Mitchell) to a statement made by the Premier in an address to the annual meeting of the South Australian Association of Building Societies at a dinner held in Adelaide on. February 21, 1975, when he said:

> We have, happily, come a long way from those unfortunate and unnecessary days last October, and the building society movement is fully restored to its accustomed and proper esteem in the public mind. It's all history now, but I think that, in what will I hope be the last word on the subject, I should here make special mention of the National Bank. Its prompt action in offering support of millions of dollars if required was a major factor in stemming the rising panic and, in doing so, the bank earned the gratitude of the State Government and members of this association.

This is a correct tribute by the Premier to one bank, but its action was also taken by other banks. The Premier's opinion is clearly indicated, even if his colleagues do not hold the same opinion, about the integrity and capability of the banking system to support the community. That statement clearly indicates the understanding that the Premier has of the important part they have played.

When considering the history of this measure, one recognises the difficulty that occurred when the bank card system was launched in another State. Many cards were sent to people who had not asked for them; some doubts arose as to who were the recipients; and some people received several cards. It seems that previous experiences have been analysed and have been used to solve problems that were associated with the introduction of these cards. On December 16, 1974, the Attorney-General indicated to the Associated Banks in South Australia that he intended to review legislation in respect to this issue. A letter the Attorney-General sent to the associated banks on this issue states:

> The increased involvement and proposed involvement of banks in the consumer finance field calls into question the wisdom of the present blanket exemption of banks from the provisions of the Consumer Credit Act, 1972. There are sound reasons for thinking that many of the provisions of that Act should apply to all consumer credit transactions whether or not the credit provider is a bank. One aspect of the matter relates to credit cards, and the Premier and I have had discussions with representatives of the banks on that subject. I think that it is important that the matter should be explored in detail as soon as possible between representatives of the banks and my officers to arrive at some suitable limitation of the present exemption from the provisions of the Consumer Credit Act. In view of the advanced state of the banks' plans for the introduction of credit cards in South Australia, the matter is one of some urgency. I suggest therefore that your representatives contact the Registrar of the Credit Tribunal, Mr. Noblet, as soon as possible to commence detailed discussions.

For various reasons, no specific action was taken on that request. However, on February 17, 1975, a letter over the signature of the Attorney-General went to the Chairman of the Associated Banks in South Australia. The letter, which was headed "Consumer Credit Act", states:

> I refer to my letter of December 16, 1974, and to your reply dated January 17, 1975. On February 13, 1975, representatives of various State Government departments met with Mr. H. D. McDonald and other bank officials to discuss certain aspects of the bank card scheme. Further meetings are planned and the matter is now in hand so far as bank card is concerned. However, my letter indicated to you that the bank card scheme was only one aspect of the matter and that other banking transactions may well be affected by the amendments to the Consumer Credit Act which are presently under consideration. Mr. McDonald has advised that his terms of reference are limited to the bank card scheme.
>
> I am considering amendments which would ensure that a consumer would receive the same information and the benefit of the same protections whether the person from whom he borrows money is a finance company, a building society, an insurance company, a bank or any. other lender Or institution. I am considering a proposal that the only portion of the Consumer Credit Act from which the banks and other presently exempt institutions should be exempt is Part III (Control of Credit Providers) and that banks should be required to comply, for example, with section 40 in all their credit contracts. In this regard the special position of bank overdrafts obviously requires consideration,
>
> I am giving to your association, and to the banks who are not members of it, the opportunity of making any representations and submissions on the possibilities outlined above. These should be made in the first instance to the Registrar of the Credit Tribunal, Mr. M. A. Noblet, S.M. As I am hoping to introduce any amendments decided upon in the current session of Parliament, I would be obliged if you would treat this matter as one of some considerable urgency.

That letter was replied to on February 19 by Mr. Clifford, the Chairman of the Associated Banks in South Australia, as follows:

> Thank you for your letter of February 17 in which you refer to the discussions which have so far been held regarding possible amendments to the Consumer Credit Act in so far as it concerns the bank card scheme. Thank you also for the information concerning the proposed direction of thinking as to possible amendments to the Act relating to not only banks but other lending institutions as presently exempt from the provisions of the Act. I would expect that a submission on behalf of the banks would be lodged with the Registrar of the Credit Tribunal, Mr. Noblet, S.M., by approximately March 10.

I have been informed that that document was made available to Mr. Noblet on March. 10. It had been prepared as a

submission, and was subscribed to by the Associated Banks in South Australia, the Commonwealth Trading Bank of Australia, the Savings Bank of South Australia, and the State Bank of South Australia. It was specifically on the subject of the Consumer Credit Act, 1972-1973, and it was prepared and accepted by that group on March 7. Having been asked to indicate the effect of the proposed measures on the banking system, the members of those organisations saw fit to make a considered contribution to Mr. Noblet, yet it is impossible for members of those organisations to find within the legislation any sign that tangible consideration was given by the Government to the submission they had been asked to make. So that there may be no misunderstanding about the kind of work that went into preparing the document and about the importance of the issues as seen by members of the banking organisations, 1 want to refer at length to the document presented to Mr. Noblet. Under the heading "Reduction of banking exemption" it states:

On February 17, 1975, the Attorney-General advised the Associated Banks in South Australia that he was considering a proposal.

I have already referred to that. It continues:

The Attorney-General's advice offered the Associated Banks in South Australia, and banks who are not members of it, the opportunity of making any representations or submissions on the above proposal.

I have already referred to that, too, and I have already indicated the number of organisations that came together to prepare the document, which continues:

The submission covers all aspects of the provision of bank credit relevant to the provisions of the Consumer Credit Act, with the exception of the bank card scheme, which is not, as yet, operating in South Australia and is the subject of separate discussions due to the particular nature and features of the scheme.

I think it is important to realise that the organisations themselves recognised the peculiarity of the bank card scheme and highlighted the fact that it was a different subject and one which was not to be included in the submission made to the nominee of the Attorney-General. Under the heading "Official monetary control" the submission states:

All banks in South Australia, other than the two State-owned banks, are subject to the Australian Banking Act, 1959-1974. The State-owned banks, of course, operate under State legislation. A major feature of the Banking Act is the provisions requiring the compliance of banks with the prevailing monetary policies of the Australian Government. In this regard, State-owned banks observe a co-operative stance. The particular aspect of monetary policy applying under the Banking Act which raises a number of considerations in relation to the exemption banks enjoy under the Consumer Credit Act is the power of the Reserve Bank of Australia under section 50 of the Banking Act to determine interest rates payable to or by banks. In February, 1972, the Reserve Bank of Australia limited the application of the officially determined maximum lending rates applying to bank loans to loans drawn under limits of less than $50 000 (including savings bank housing loans) and to personal instalment loans. Banks are free to set their own rates for larger loans and bridging loans of less than $50 000 within the general requirement that such interest rates are below those charged by non-bank lenders. Banks are therefore subject to the maximum loan interest rates determined from time to time by the Reserve Bank for loans coming within the definitions of the Consumer Credit Act. In terms of monetary policy requirements, interest rates on larger loans and other loans exempted from the maximum interest rate requirements also generally vary with the changing level of bank interest fates as determined by the Reserve Bank of Australia from time to time.

So, the parameters within which members of banking organisations function have been clearly indicated. It is clearly indicated that, apart from any direction that may be forthcoming from the South Australian Government, there are strict rules under which members of the banking fraternity are called on to conduct their business. The submission continues:

If bank loans which are subject to the above control and variations due to the requirements of official monetary policy pursued from time to time by the Australian Government were to come within the ambit of the Consumer Credit Act, a major administrative and substantial cost burden would be incurred by virtue of the provisions of Part IV, section 40, of the Act and the necessity to issue a new advice with the individual calculations involved to every borrower in the State so affected. Such cost burden would lead to an overall increase in the cost of bank finance to the community generally. In prevailing conditions, this would be a marked contradiction to the present aims of monetary policy, including the general lowering of interest rates to stimulate economic activity and reduce unemployment. Due to official monetary policy requirements, involving the flexible use of interest rates as a monetary weapon, it is necessary for banks to provide in consumer loans (as defined in the Consumer Credit Act), other than personal instalment loans, for interest rates to be altered at any time during the currency of the loan. In most cases, banks do not vary the instalments, thus increasing or reducing the term of the loan and the total credit charge.

In bringing these matters to the Attorney's attention, I believe it is necessary to ask him whether the submissions of this representative and responsible group were considered by him and his advisers. It is clear that the information outlined here relates to their normal activities and that they are activities determined by monetary policy and by the Australian Banking Act. They are determinations and actions which are completely responsible and which are seen to be responsible by virtue of the community service that these organisations have carried out in South Australia over the extent of their undertakings in this State. Referring to banking policies, the submission states:

The policies pursued by banks in relation to their borrower customers include:

(*a*) the provision of copies of documents and advice of full details of all charges on request by the borrower;
(*b*) full advice to borrowers of any variations to original arrangements;
(*c*) greater leniency to borrowers having difficulty in keeping to arrangements than required under the Consumer Credit Act;
(*d*) nominal charges for documentation; and
(*e*) the maintenance, in most cases of interest rate variations, of existing instalments with a view to assisting the borrower.

Banks are now subject to the provisions of the Act as regards "charges for procurement of credit", "harsh and unconscionable terms" and "advertising", and in view of their policies outlined in paragraph 3.1 it would appear that removal of the existing exemption would not give any further protection to consumers but rather may lead to a deterioration in their present advantages.

Under the general heading "Effects of removal of present exemptions" (and I think this is important as an indication by these people of the problems that will ensue if the Bill is passed) it states:

The general effect of the removal of the present exemption from the Consumer Credit Act applying to banks would include the following:

(*a*) A substantial increase in administration and costs, much of it resulting from variations in interest rates arising from changes in official monetary policy. Particular administrative difficulties are also imposed by the branch structure of banking which is not matched by other financial institutions. In addition, banking advices to customers are mostly dispatched by mail and the requirements of the Act would impose a considerable additional cost burden on the banks.

(*b*) Banks are also concerned with the lack of national standardisation which would result from the need to vary a wide range of documents to accord with the Act.

(*c*) It would be more difficult to vary terms and conditions to suit the requirements of customers —in this regard it should be appreciated that most loan arrangements with banks are flexible and that numerous requests are received every day, verbally and by telephone, for minor variations to original arrangements such as deferment or waiver. of reductions or instalments on all types of loans.

(*d*) Casual undocumented overdrafts would seem to be precluded under the Act.

Many people in South Australia and elsewhere have benefited from their bank manager affording them considerable undocumented overdrafts to tide them over a difficult period. That is one of the services provided by banks, and it is recognised as being extremely important in relation to day-by-day trade. I am hot talking only about the business or commercial undertakings: this relates also to overdrafts to householders, and applies to many people in our community. The submission continues:

(*e*) The loss of present leniency to customers facing difficulties in servicing their loans due to the need to comply strictly with the provisions of the Act.

(*f*) Increased costs to borrowers.

Still continuing under the general premise of the effects of the removal of the present exemption, the submission states:

In relation to overdrafts, the Attorney-General has advised that lending in this form will require special consideration. Even if the problems of applying the Act to such revolving credit were overcome, the fluctuations that occur in interest rates must continue to pose a continuing difficulty for banks in complying with the Act. It should be appreciated that borrowing by way of overdraft on current account, where the borrower pays interest only on the amount he is overdrawn from day to day, is a very cheap form of borrowing. Any complication of this type of lending could lead of necessity to its withdrawal, resulting in much greater expense to borrowers.

I do not suggest that it is a gun-at-head exercise or that this is the type of reaction that could be expected from the banking organisations. Clearly, they have shown a greater degree of responsibility in the past, but they have made the point that, like anyone else, they are in business not so much to make a profit but not to make a loss. If they are having fears that that series of undertakings will increase their costs, they must be borne by either reducing the benefits available to the community or increasing the associated cost structure. The banks continue to point out the position as follows:

The prohibition on the compounding of interest in section 42 cuts across the traditional manner of charging interest by Australian banks, a system which, due to its rate of interest and the charging of interest on daily balances, results in a cheaper form of finance than many loans permitted by the Act.

The Hon. L. J. King:. There's absolutely nothing about any of these topics in this Bill. You realise that, don't you?

Dr. EASTICK: That is an interesting comment. The Attorney is trying to draw the wool over the eyes of members on this side by making a statement of that kind. I ask him to look at the latter clauses of the Bill, which provide that regulations can be made relative to the functions of the Act in any way, whether the regulations are permitted under the provisions of the Act or not. I will come to that matter later.

If the Attorney suggests that what I have been saying is not relevant to the Bill, he will have a good answer to my belief and the belief of many members of his profession in this State about the intention in including subclause (3) in the final clause of the Bill. The way in which the regulations can apply to functions that are not permitted under the Act is a completely new type of approach that fits in well with my earlier comment that this Bill is part of a doctrinaire Socialist policy. Again referring to the information made available by the industry, the submission states:

With the exception of loans made by the State Bank of South Australia involving the on-channelling of Government moneys, bank loans for housing are subject to interest rate variations arising from official monetary policy requirements. Following the significant lift in interest rates in September, 1973, and at the request of the Australian Government, banks agreed to hold the rise in housing, loan interest rates below the general rise in interest rates and also to vary the term of the loan, where possible, to avoid higher instalments for borrowers, particularly lower-income earners. Similar action in relation to the term of loans occurred following the further increases in interest rates in July, 1974.

I point out to the Attorney and his colleagues that interest rates did not increase because of the desire of the banking system: the banks were directed to increase rates by the policy of the Australian Government, which is of the same political persuasion as members opposite. The submission continues:

Such action to assist customers would be rendered more difficult and more expensive if banks were more generally subject to the provisions of the Consumer Credit Act. It may be thought that personal instalment loans are a case for more general application of the Consumer Credit Act. However, if the present exemptions from the Act were removed, banks could be deterred from varying the terms and conditions of the loan to assist customers experiencing hardship. In addition, such action could well result in a diminution in this valuable form of credit to consumers in this State. This form of credit is also subject to a specific maximum rate of interest in line with monetary policy requirements. In the case of term loans and farm development loans, the removal of the exemption could deter banks from providing such finance to small businesses operating under personal proprietorship or partnerships rather than under a corporate structure. Extraneous fees such as establishment fees, loan service fees and commitment fees may be impossible to convert to an annual rate in accordance with the regulations under the Act. While the nature of fees varies from bank to bank, loan service fees are based on an equitable relativity between borrowers. If banks have to abandon these fees in favour of some system appropriate to the requirements of the Consumer Credit Act, customers could lose the benefits of the present equitable arrangements. The law relating to banker and customer has been built up through long experience and is international. Section 47 of the Act places an onus of disclosure upon banks which goes far beyond a banker's normal duty to a guarantor and constitutes what the law of banker and customer would regard as a breach of a banker's obligation of secrecy. The power given to the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs by section 12 cuts across the traditional privacy of bank records to an unprecedented extent.

This matter has been considered in depth by the Associated Banks in South Australia, the Commonwealth Bank, the Savings Bank of South Australia, and the State Bank, and these organisations have made a series of submissions to the Attorney, through his nominee. In that part of the submission, those organisations state:

The banks submit that they provide consumer credit in the forms covered by the Consumer Credit Act on a basis that is cheap, relative to other forms of credit, convenient and equitable. Any amendments to the Consumer Credit Act to bring the banks more fully within its ambit would have little value for consumers and, in fact, be to their disadvantage. It should be appreciated that overdraft lending to individuals is at present the least remunerative area of banking, although it is demonstrably the cheapest and most flexible means of providing the credit needs (often unexpected and urgent) of private individuals and small business men, farmers, professional people, and the

like. If these procedures, developed over many years, whereby ordinary people's needs are met with a minimum of fuss and expense are to be subjected to restrictions then inevitably this class of lending will tend to be restricted and those borrowers will be forced to have resort increasingly to the higher interest less flexible personal loans provided by banks and finance companies. In addition, the banks are subject to special Australian legislation governing their operations and should not be penalised by State legislation when charges are required in banking arrangements with customers as a result of national monetary policies implemented by the Australian Government. This submission would not be complete without reference to the basic purpose of consumer legislation—protection to the consumer. It is submitted that it simply is not a characteristic of banks to mislead their customers as to the nature and extent of their liability or to withhold essential information. Banks are already subject to the provisions of the Act relating to harsh and unconscionable terms. They also show a great deal of tolerance before exercising their legal rights in recovering moneys. In short, consumers simply do not need from banks the sort of protection that is envisaged by the proposed extension of the application of the Act. It is therefore submitted that the Attorney-General does not proceed with the proposal to vary the present exemption applying to banks under the Consumer Credit . Act.

Clearly, that was a responsible representation to the Attorney and, as I have stated, there is no clear indication, having regard to the Bill before the House, that any part of that representation was considered or even given more than a cursory glance by either the Attorney or his officers. I have indicated that the bank card system is an area completely divorced from the other areas that we have considered. It is important that that system, when introduced, operate properly and that there be no suggestion at any stage that it is against the best interests of the community. However, this all-embracing legislation presented by the Attorney goes beyond the stage of reasonable precaution that could be expected with regard to bank cards. The Attorney has suggested that I have not been referring to the provisions of the Bill. I draw attention to clause 4, which provides:

"revolving charge account" means an account—
(*a*) to which amounts due are under consumer contracts or credits are debited;
(*b*) upon which a credit charge may be made from time to time on the outstanding balance of the account or upon some other balance struck for that purpose.

My advice on that definition is that it could clearly encompass not only the total transactions of the bank but also would probably impinge materially on the activities of building societies and have a disastrous effect on rural houses such as Elder Smith Goldsborough Mort Limited, Bennett and Fisher Limited', and Southern Farmers Co-operative Limited. That definition will hinder the work they do in the interests of the community at large. The Government's intention to make alterations by regulation can be seen in clause 9 (*b*), which inserts the following new subsection:

(3) A regulation made under paragraph (*ha*), (*hb*) or (*hc*) of subsection (2) of this section may contain a provision to the effect that the regulation shall apply to—
(*a*) credit providers generally, notwithstanding the exemptions in favour of certain classes of credit providers contained, in this Act;
or
(*b*) credit providers of a particular class notwithstanding an exemption in favour of credit providers.
of that class contained in this Act,
and where a regulation contains such a provision it shall apply accordingly and a credit provider to whom the regulation applies who is guilty of a breach of, or noncompliance with, a provision of the regulation shall be liable to any penalty prescribed in relation thereto.

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Act, a penalty can be created by regulation, and no limit is set in the Bill. We are being asked to give the Government a second bite at the cherry regarding this legislation. The Government wants to be able to alter these provisions, including penal provisions, by regulation; it seeks to make these alterations away from the direct examination of Parliament.

Should the Attorney-General say later that regulations come before the scrutiny of Parliament, I point out that, in many cases, that scrutiny may only be possible months after the regulations have been promulgated. When the House is not sitting, members on both sides, as well as members of the Subordinate Legislation Committee, will not have the opportunity to block regulations straight away. What we are being asked to pass in this Bill is against the best interests of the South Australian community. I intend to vote against all stages of the Bill. The Attorney has failed miserably to consider adequately the expert advice available to him from people who work in the industry. - The good work these people have done for the benefit of South Australia was referred to by the Premier on February 21. As this Bill has no place on the Statute Book, I oppose it.

Mr. BECKER secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUILDING SOCIETIES BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 19. Page 3029.)

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): The Opposition supports the Bill. Some amendments to the Act are necessary; I understand the Government is aware of minor omissions in the Bill and that the Premier will move amendments later in this connection. Building societies, as we know them, have played an important role in connection with house building. 1 suppose that many members have contributed to and borrowed from this type of institution. The philosophy of my Party is to support any enterprise that encourages an individual to save, thus securing his future. We offer as much encouragement as possible to this type of organisation. However, there must be necessary controls and restraints to protect the money of investors. The Bill creates a Registrar of Building Societies. It is expected that this work will mainly be carried out by the Public Actuary, who will have the right to inspect, control, and intervene in the affairs of a society if he believes that it is going in an adverse direction that is not in the interests of those who are investing in or borrowing from the organisation.

Legislation relating to building societies was passed in 1881, when they were first given approval to operate in this State. The largest society now has assets worth $67 000 000, whereas the smallest organisation has assets worth only $40 000. However, I am told that the latter organisation is seldom heard of and does not really operate in this sphere.

I cannot understand why some societies are not to be allowed a trusteeship, although they are at present operating satisfactorily and have sufficient liquidity to qualify for trustee status. The Adelaide Permanent Building Society is such an example, and I hope that the Attorney will indicate why a trustee status has not been readily available to this organisation. I believe that clause 10 should show a subclause (1), and perhaps the Attorney will have this omission rectified. Also, I believe that clause 17 (4) should provide for a requirement of "the Registrar" instead of "the Minister", and I hope that error will be corrected, as it would be useless to appeal to the Minister. Clause 36 (5) provides that section 36 does apply to a Star Bowkett society, whereas I believe it is intended that the provision should not apply to such a society.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Are you referring to the second reading explanation of the Bill?

Mr. EVANS: No, I am referring to what I think are errors in the Bill. Clause 38 refers to the power to prohibit the raising of funds, and I believe that the heading of Division III should be "Power to Prohibit Raising of Funds by a Society", whereas the word "restriction" appears several times in this clause. I think the wording of clause 39 (1) should be changed to provide that the society is carrying out the objects of the society instead of "carrying on business". Clause 41 (4) is not explicit enough to cover the case of a building society wanting to borrow on the security of a building, or where the security pledged far exceeds the amount to be borrowed. However, I understand that an amendment is to be made to this clause. In clause. 47 (9) "shall" has been omitted after "share".

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: There's an amendment on file.

Mr. EVANS: I cannot speak to that. This Bill has been rushed into the House by the Government, and I am telling the Minister of details that should be corrected. This is another instance in which Opposition members have not been given sufficient time to ask people associated with this legislation what problems there may be, so that we may put our interpretation on any difficulties, if there are any. If the Minister denies members of Parliament the right to take that action, or criticises them for taking such action, he does not believe in the democratic process. The Bill is acceptable to the Opposition, but a foreshadowed amendment by the Premier to Part IV, referring to affiliation of societies, needs to be scrutinised.

I have been told by those who advise the Government that I need have no fears about the right of building societies to affiliate to Australian or international organisations, because of the provision of clause 25 (8). I have been told that it is intended in the regulations that affiliation to the Australian Association of Building Societies or the International Union of Building Societies will be allowed, but a statement is needed from the Minister before the Bill is passed setting out what the Government intends to do in the regulations. It would be ridiculous to tell building societies in South Australia that they could not affiliate to these Organisations, because it is from negotiations and contacts with them that our societies broaden their concepts and learn from experiences of societies in other countries.

The Opposition supports this Bill because it believes- in encouraging people to save to buy their own houses. The previous Australian Labor Party Premier (Hon. Frank Walsh) said in 1961 that, as a cornerstone of our democracy, people should be encouraged to own their own houses. The building societies set out to help people do that, and I hope that every member supports this legislation and gives it a speedy passage through both Houses.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the Bill. Clause 23 (1) provides:

A society may apply to the Registrar for his approval of a proposed amalgamation of the society with another society, or other societies, notwithstanding that the approval of shareholders has not been obtained in accordance with this Part.

The society would be using the shareholders' finances, so surely they should have some say in this matter. Clause 27 (1) provides:

The Minister may, upon the recommendation of the Registrar, by notice published in the *Gazette,* fix a maximum rate of interest for the purposes of this section.

Clause 27 (3) provides:

This section does not apply in respect of a loan that was lawfully made before the commencement of this Act.

I believe that the rate of interest should be fixed because this would prevent the victimisation of borrowers when high interest rates are forced upon them, as has been done lately. Such borrowers worry about losing their houses. I think that the Minister should have some say in fixing the rate to prevent the possibility of victimisation of those borrowers who face increased interest rates over the years. Under existing legislation it is lawful to continue to charge high rates of interest on existing loans, despite the signing of a contract that specifies an interest rate. In some recent cases an original interest rate of 71 per cent has been increased to as much as 10¾ per cent. I believe this matter deserves some thought. Clause 42 provides:

Any property to which a society may become absolutely entitled by foreclosure, surrender, or extinguishment of a right of redemption, shall as soon as practicable be sold and converted into money.

That clause does not state what is to happen to the money when certain property is sold. Clause 43 (1) provides:

The Treasurer may on the recommendation of the Registrar execute a guarantee in favour of any person or body of persons for the repayment of any advance made, or to be made, by that person or body of persons to any society.

Clause 43 (3) provides:

The guarantee may cover the interest and other charges charged or to be charged in respect of the loan.

This makes it possible for the Treasurer to guarantee a loan through a society; he could guarantee a loan to any organisation. In fact, he could guarantee a loan to the Trades Hall under the provisions of this clause. I should like the Treasurer to explain whether that is the concept behind the clause, because it seems to be a distinct possibility to me. Clause 43 (4) provides:

Any sums that may become due and payable by the Treasurer under any guarantee given by him pursuant to this section may be paid out of the General Revenue of the State without any further appropriation.

It seems to me that the Treasurer can do exactly what he wants to do under the provisions of this subclause. Clause 47 (3) provides:

The rules of a society shall not provide for the holder of shares to be repaid his share capital at any specified date or time.

As far as I am concerned, this means that a shareholder might not receive moneys owing to him. I should like the Treasurer to explain the provisions of that subclause when he replies. Clause 51 (3) provides:

The acts of a director shall be valid notwithstanding any defect that may afterwards be discovered in his appointment or qualification.

The powers provided for a director under the provisions of this subclause are extremely wide. Clause 51 (7) provides:

A director shall not be removed from, or be required to vacate, his office by reason of any resolution, request or notice of the directors, or any of them, notwithstanding anything in the rules of the society.

Under this subclause a dishonest person could not be sacked. The other aspects of the Bill relate to money held by shareholders in these societies. I have referred to what I consider are the main provisions of the Bill, and I should like the Treasurer to deal with the matters I have raised.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Contents of rules." .

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

In paragraph (*b*) after "employees" to insert "and against other insurable risks assumed by a society in the conduct of its business". .

This amendment ensures that the rules of a building society contain appropriate provisions requiring the society to insure (where insurance is appropriate) against risks inherent in carrying on business as a building society. For example, it is obviously desirable for a society to be required to insure its business premises against damage and to insure against theft in view of the large sums of money that it may have on its premises. This amendment is therefore designed to protect the members of a society by ensuring its financial stability.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 14 to 16 passed.

Clause 17—"Power of Registrar to modify rules."

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

In subclause (4) to strike out "Minister" second occurring and insert "Registrar".

This is purely a drafting amendment, because the clause should provide for an appeal to the Minister against a decision of the Registrar.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 18 to 22 passed.

Clause 23—"Approval notwithstanding absence of approval of shareholders."

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Treasurer say why this provision has been inserted? It seems fair to me that, because shareholders' moneys are being used, they should have some say regarding the amalgamation of a society with another society.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The aim of the clause is to cover exceptional circumstances in a case where the Registrar, who is the independent authority looking at the effective financial probity of these societies, finds it necessary to intervene. At times, it may be necessary, in the public interest, for decisions to be taken in this way. In some cases, societies can be under pressure from a section of shareholders. As this may not be in connection with a matter that is in the public interest, consequently arrangements of this kind may be necessary to ensure the continued operation of the society and the protection of those who have deposited money with it.

Mr. Mathwin: You don't think this will be dangerous for the shareholders?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On the contrary; in one case of which we know, this is one of the reasons why the Bill needs to be passed now.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The total decision in this case is vested in the Registrar. As a decision of this magnitude must be taken, perhaps the Minister should be referred to, although I do not suggest that the Registrar would not consult him. If the final decision were taken by the Minister, any room for argument would be removed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We did not consider it was necessary to have the approval of the Minister, since basically this was a financial situation in which the Registrar would have independent authority to make a decision. On the other hand, we would not seriously resist the suggestion that the approval of the Minister also be granted. We will look at this matter for the Leader, and it can be considered in another place if he wishes to press it.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Treasurer inform me what decision is taken on this matter, so that I can bring it to the attention of my colleagues in another place?

Clause passed.

Clause 24 passed.

Clause 25—"Registration of an association."

Mr. EVANS: What type of association will be approved by regulation, as prescribed in subclause (8)? It has been suggested that affiliation is possible to an international union of building societies that has affiliations in about 40 countries. I hope that type of affiliation will be permitted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it will be. It would not be possible to specify in the legislation all those associations that societies might join. Being interstate or international, they obviously change from time to time, so it would not be appropriate for us to specify them in the Bill. Regulations will be made specifying the kinds of organisation to which the honourable member refers.

Clause passed.

Clause 26 passed.

Clause 27—"Rates of interest."

Mr. MATHWIN: Subclause (3) makes lawful the continued charging of high rates of interest, even though contracts may have been signed by borrowers. If people have had to pay a higher rate of interest, the rate will not be reduced, unless the Minister gives such a direction.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not intended to interfere with existing contracts. If those contracts are for a fixed rate of interest, they will have been made on the basis that that is the investment made by the society. It would be wrong for the Government to interfere with an existing lawful arrangement by prescribing a lower rate of interest than that fixed lawfully in the contract. If there is an existing lawful contract, the provision of a maximum interest rate will not interfere with that contract. Regarding future contracts, the Minister may, on the recommendation of the Registrar, fix a maximum rate. That will mean that from then on the societies will not be able to lend at more than that maximum rate.

Mr. Mathwin:' What if you bring it down?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is not a question of bringing the rate rown, as this clause is not designed to affect existing contracts: it is to specify from the time the maximum is fixed what the maximum will be thereafter.

Clause passed.

Clauses 28 to 35 passed.

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

Clause 36—"Liquidity."

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): I move:

In subclause (1) (*c*), after "society" second occurring, to insert "except a loan secured by mortgage over the business premises of the society".

The first amendment is inserted at the request of the building societies. The effect of the amendment is to provide that the amount of any loan secured on the business premises of the society shall not be taken into account in assessing the liquid position of the society. It is considered that capital expenditure incurred by a society and secured by a mortgage over its business premises should not be brought into account when determining the extent of its liquid revenues.

Mr. EVANS: As the term "business premises" is not defined, should it be "premises", denoting the administrative section of the premises?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: "Business premises" are premises for the purpose of the business of the building society which, in the case of the Hindmarsh Building Society, would include its data centre at Marden. I admit that it is a broad definition, but I do not know what other premises to which the honourable member might refer would not be included in the definition.

Amendment carried.

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

In subclause (5), after "does", to insert "not".

This amendment is consequential on the one already carried.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 37 passed.

Clause 38—"Power to prohibit raising of funds."

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

In subclause (2) *(b),* subclause (5), and subclause (6) to strike out "restriction" and insert "prohibition".

The amendments to this clause are merely drafting amendments that obviate inconsistency in the terminology of the clause.

Mr. EVANS: Is the Treasurer satisfied with "restrict" instead of "prohibit" in the title of Division III?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 39—"Acquisition of property."

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

In subclause (1). to strike out "carrying on business as such" and insert "carrying out the objects of the society".

The amendment slightly modifies the provision setting out the purposes for which a society acquires real property; its effect is minimal, but it has been requested by the building societies.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 40 passed.

Clause 41—"Borrowing powers."

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

Tn subclause (4), after "society" second occurring, to insert "(but this subsection does not apply to a security granted by a society over land or premises used or intended for use by the society as business premises)".

The amendment relates to a provision of the Bill that prevents a society pledging property whose value exceeds by more than 25 per cent the amount of the loan. The amendment is designed to make it absolutely clear that this restriction does not apply to a loan secured by mortgage on the business premises of the society.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 42—"Disposal of certain property."

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the money received remain with the society?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is the society's property, similar to the action of any mortgagee who forecloses and sells up a defaulter. The society takes the benefit to itself. It is money in the society; just as the security is a security for the society, so is the money from the foreclosure.

Clause passed.

Clause 43 passed.

Clause 44—"Members."

Mr. COUMBE: In the case of an amalgamation, no doubt the societies would have to agree to the terms. Will the rights of all members be protected in the event of an amalgamation taking place?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, they are completely protected by the existing rules of the society, but an amalgamation may create a new society in which existing rights of membership are merged, together with rights of membership for people who then join the newly formed society. Existing rights of membership will be preserved in any amalgamation.

Clause passed.

Clauses 45 and 46 passed.

Clause 47—"Share capital."

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

In subclause (9), after "share", to insert "shall".

This is purely a drafting amendment.

Mr. COUMBE: Has consideration been given by the Government to upgrading the funds of building societies (and I am not referring necessarily to trustee investments) to that type of funding, trustee investments being guaranteed by the Government? The societies have a special role to play in the community and may not be of the same stature as other lending institutions that enjoy the privilege of trustee investment classification.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Consideration has been given to that, but at this stage we do not intend to move further than what is provided in this Bill.

Mr. EVANS: Can the Treasurer reply to a matter raised in the second reading debate about whether, in a case like the Adelaide Permanent Building Society, the Registrar can be approached to upgrade the society to trustee status, the benefit of which the society is denied at this stage? Will the Bill give more control in this field and also enable trustee status to be granted?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is possible for the Adelaide Permanent Building Society to apply, but no application has been made so far. It would be possible to make a proclamation for the society to have trustee investment status. Before a decision was made, we would have to examine the total assets, the liquid funds, and the period that the society had been in business.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 48 to 76 passed.

Clause 77—"Default by society."

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

In subclause (2) to strike out "five hundred dollars" and insert "one thousand dollars".

This amendment increases the penalty applicable to a society that fails to furnish a return or information required by the Registrar. It is felt that this is an important duty and that, if a society fails to comply with it, it should suffer a substantial penalty. The amendment therefore provides for a penalty of up to $1 000.

Mr. EVANS: I consider that the Committee needs a better explanation of why the Treasurer wishes to double the penalty.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: On more mature reflection, we think that $1 000 is a greater deterrent to a society that fails to provide information to the Registrar. It so happens that, given certain of the things that have happened in the more recent past regarding one or two building societies, it would be an advantage. I am speaking not of the major societies in South Australia but of smaller ones.

Mr. EVANS: I take it the only way such a penalty could be imposed would be by a court?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is right.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 78 to 87 passed.

Clause 88—"Report."

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

In subclause (1) to strike out "October" and insert "December".

This amendment extends to the end of December the time within which the Registrar must make his annual report. The amendment is made because the Registrar feels that

he may not get returns of information from the societies upon which his report will be, in part, based until towards the end of the calendar year.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 89—"Regulations."

Mr. EVANS: Will the Treasurer consider the aspect of insuring against loss and default before the Bill passes another place, so that such a clause can be included if it is thought necessary?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will consider the matter.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SHEARERS ACCOMMODATION BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 22 (clause 5)—After "employment" insert "and the occupier of the land on which the shearing shed is situated".

No. 2. Page 2 (clause 5)fter line 3 insert new definition as follows:

"occupier" of land includes any person responsible for the management or control of the land:

No. 3. Page 2, line 8 (clause 5)—Leave out "holding" and insert "land".

No. 4. Page 3, lines 5 to 7 (clause 8)—Leave out subclause (2) and insert new subclause (2) as follows:

(2) Where an inspector proposes to carry out an inspection under this section—

(*a*) he shall, before entering the land on which he proposes to carry out the inspection, give reasonable notice, orally or in writing, to the occupier of the land of his intention to carry out the inspection;

or

(*b*) if it is not reasonably practicable for him to give notice before he enters the land, he shall, as soon as practicable after doing so inform the occupier that he is an inspector and that he intends to carry out the inspection.

No. 5. Page 3 (clause 9)—After line 20 insert new subclause (1a) as follows:

(1a) The Minister may, upon the application of a person to whom a notice has been given under this section, extend for a further period not exceeding twelve months the time specified in the notice as the time within which the requirement must be complied with.

No. 6. Page 3, line 26 (clause 9)—Leave out "sixteen" and insert "eighteen".

No. 7. Page 3 (clause 9)—After line 26 insert new subclause (3a) as follows:

(3a) A person to whom a notice is given under this section may, within one month after the date on which the notice is given, by instrument in writing, appeal to the Minister against any requirement contained in the notice.

(3b) The Minister shall give proper consideration to any such appeal and may confirm, vary or revoke the requirement.

Consideration in Committee.

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

I accept this amendment because in a new subclause in clause 8 the word "occupier" is used, and it has not been defined. The amendment also corrects a drafting error.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

The Government intends that any person in charge of the property should be notified before an inspection is begun. The difficulties that have been discussed will be overcome by the new subclause.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I find it difficult to accept this explanation of amendment No. 2. 1 respectfully ask the Minister whether he has referred to the correct note.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am referring to the second amendment on page 2 (clause 5, line 3). That is a drafting amendment.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister has moved to insert a new definition of "occupier". Is that what the Minister is moving? That is the amendment on the roneoed sheet.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: In clause 5 a definition of "occupier'' is necessary, because the manager or owner may not be present on the property. It is required that a person can be contacted and give authority to someone. Because of the insertion in clause 8 of a new subclause, another definition is necessary, and the purpose of the first amendment to clause 5 is to include that definition and to correct a drafting error. "Occupier" means a person who has some authority, not necessarily someone who is saying, "I have no authority here; the boss lives in England." This amendment relates to the person who is on the property when the inspector enters the property; he is the man responsible for any instructions that may be given by an inspector.

Dr. EASTICK: A few moments ago the Minister indicated that "occupier" was to be inserted in the place of "manager". Obviously, "manager" does not appear in the principal Act.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: It could be a manager.

Dr. EASTICK: We have witnessed sufficient already of the Minister's inability—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Come on!

Dr. EASTICK: —to comprehend what is before the Committee. To enable the Minister to ascertain what this is all about, I move:

That progress be reported.

The CHAIRMAN: Is the motion seconded?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Mathwin, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, and Venning.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Allen, McAnaney, and Wardle. Noes—Messrs. McRae, Virgo, and Wells.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion to report progress thus negatived.

Motion to agree to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 carried.

Amendment No. 3:

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

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

The subclause in the form passed in this place would create many practical difficulties and could unnecessarily increase the costs involved in ensuring that the Act is complied with. The Government agrees that the intention of the subclause is that a person in charge of a property should be notified before an inspection is commenced.

Mr. Chapman: We are dealing with amendment No. 3, not No. 4.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The member for Alexandra has got somewhat irate in respect—

Mr. Chapman: I'll get a damn sight more irate if you don't follow what is on the paper in front of you. We are on amendment No. 3, not No. 4. We've not dealt with amendment No. 3.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I think I explained the situation regarding amendment No. 3 in my initial explanation. It seems that I must go through it again, because it is a definition clause—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are dealing with amendment No. 3 which, I understand, is a drafting amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 4:

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be agreed to.

This is a further drafting amendment.

Mr. Chapman: That's what—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

Mr. Chapman: The Minister has told us that it is a drafting amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The amendment strikes out subclause (2) and inserts the following new subclause:

(2) Where an inspector proposes to carry out an inspection under this section—

(a) he shall, before entering the land on which he proposes to carry out the inspection, give reasonable notice, orally or in writing, to the occupier of the land of his intention to carry out the inspection;

or

(*b*) if it is not reasonably practicable for him to give notice before he enters the land, he shall, as soon as practicable after doing so inform the occupier that he is an inspector and that he intends to carry out the inspection.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Without being too cynical, I commend the Minister for having gone right through the new subclause. However, he has not in any way given his reasons for accepting the provision inserted by the Legislative Council I take it that he has moved to have it adopted as it is drafted, without giving any explanation. Can we expect some explanation from the Minister? As he has not given any explanation, for the benefit of members on this side I will explain how paragraph (*b*) came to be inserted in this provision. Paragraph (*a*) of the new subclause inserted by the Legislative Council is worded identically to the amendment that I had accepted in this place. Paragraph (*b*) is a new provision that we should seriously consider. I moved an amendment in this place previously to provide, in relation to an inspector proposing to carry out an inspection, as follows:

... he shall, before entering the land on which he proposes to carry out the inspection, give reasonable notice orally or in writing to the occupier of the land of his intention to carry out the inspection.

At the time, I believed that was adequate. However, since that amendment of mine was accepted, I have been informed (and I accept it) that in certain circumstances it may not be convenient for an inspector to perform the requirements set out. In extreme circumstances, an inspector may not be able to give oral or written notice to an occupier, employer or landholder before entering a property. For instance, a telephone line might be down, preventing his calling, or there might be a flood or a fire that prohibited his notification. These are substantial reasons why an inspector should not be expected to comply with these requirements. In the other place, a new paragraph (*b*) was inserted to provide:

. . . if it is not reasonably practicable for him to give notice before he enters the land, he shall, as soon as practicable after doing so, inform the occupier that he is an inspector and that he intends to carry out an inspection.

This paragraph provides that there must be substantial reasons for an inspector's not complying with the requirements of paragraph (*a*). The Parliamentary Counsel or someone else, without my knowledge, has used the words in. paragraph (*b*) "reasonably practicable". I believe that these words are not sufficiently strong, when relating to the circumstances in which an inspector need not carry out the requirements included in the amendment that this Chamber accepted a week ago. I believe that the words "reasonably practicable" should be replaced with a phrase relating to substantial reasons that prevent the inspector from, either orally or in writing, giving reasonable notice of his intention. Therefore, I cannot support the Minister's motion, moved so clumsily, to have the amendment accepted in its entirety. I oppose the motion so that, at the appropriate time, I may alter the words "reasonably practicable" so that we can preserve the primary intention behind this Chamber's supporting the amendment that I moved last week.

Dr. Eastick: Did the Minister accept that?

Mr. CHAPMAN:. Of course he did. He accepted my amendment last week, saying only, "I support the member for Alexandra; he has pointed out the need for the insertion in clause 8." As a result of the influence of pressure groups or someone else, the Minister found there was a hole in this exercise. He then called for my assistance and agreement on the matter. My agreement was clearly in line with what will emerge if my suggested alteration is accepted. Although we are not now at the point of dealing with that alteration, this is the only opportunity I have of making clear the real intent of the original amendment to clause 8 and the reason why this Chamber accepted it, with the agreement of the Minister. I ask the Minister to reconsider his motion to accept this amendment of the Council in its entirety, and to consider seriously my request and sincere attempt to have appropriate words inserted in the amendment of the other place, so that an inspector shall be required to give substantial reasons why he has been prevented from giving notice before entering private property.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: It appears to me that the division between Opposition members in this place and in the other place is growing wider and wider.

Mr. Chapman: You know better than that.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: For the honourable member to get up on his scrapers and tell a lie in this Chamber—

Dr. EASTICK: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. About 10 days ago, the Speaker directed that the word "lie" would no longer be recognised as a Parliamentary term. Therefore, I ask that the Minister withdraw his use of that word.

The CHAIRMAN: Did the honourable Minister use the word?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Yes, Sir. If the Leader takes exception, I am willing to withdraw it.

Mr. GUNN: I am rather amazed that the Minister has left it at that, after making wild allegations about the member for Alexandra.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question is "That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be agreed to".

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: When the Bill was last before this Chamber, I agreed to the insertion of certain amendments moved by the member for Alexandra. When it went to another place—

Mr. Chapman: Tell them the story about the interim period.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: A conference was held—

Mr. Chapman: Give the whole story.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the honourable member for Alexandra for interjecting.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I think that all members know that, if I had not agreed to it, the Bill would not have been passed here in its present form. Then a conference was held and—

Mr. Chapman: But you—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I warn the honourable member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member's colleagues in another place did not agree with him. They would not accept the word "substantial", and this is why I say that the honourable member has been misleading the Committee by saying he reached an agreement up there. He did not reach it there.

Mr. Nankivell: In your office?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: He reached it earlier, probably before the Bill went to another place. Let the honourable member deny that. No agreement was reached there, because a member of the other place said that he could not accept the word "substantial" and wanted to know what it meant. He went to consult the Parliamentary Counsel, and that is how the amendment appeared in another place and was accepted there. The member for Alexandra has swallowed the sour grapes because his colleagues in another place did not support him.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I did not attend this Committee for the purpose of telling the whole episode that led up to the situation we now have, but, following the Minister's comments, I see no alternative to bringing to the attention of members what has transpired regarding the Bill.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I agree with some of the Minister's comments but I do not agree that he has told the Committee all the facts surrounding the preparation and submission back to us of this amendment. I go back in the history of this clause to where this place agreed to subclause (2) (a) in its entirety. The Minister and the Government agreed with it unanimously. On the morning after that provision had been agreed to, I received a telephone call from the Minister of Labour and Industry and he told me that he was under some pressure. He did not say what sort.

Mr. CRIMES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Did he say it in the Chamber, or not?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CRIMES: My point of order is that the honourable member is not discussing the Legislative Council's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order, but I ask the honourable member for Alexandra to confine his remarks to the amendment, which relates to subclauses (2) (*a*) and (2) (*b*).

Mr. CHAPMAN: It has been pointed out to me that the comments I was about to make would be unparliamentary, unsavoury, or unacceptable. Whatever category they may fall into, I am only making a statement in my own defence. I am referring to these matters only because the Minister adverted to discussions held outside this Chamber and told members that I was lying to the Committee. I would not have raised this matter except in my own defence.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The question is "That the amendment—

Dr. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the member for Alexandra was on his feet making an explanation. You called "Order!", giving him to understand that you wished to contribute to the debate. The honourable member resumed his seat and you immediately tried to put the question, which would have denied him his right to continue for the full 15 minutes available to him at any one time to debate this matter. You took away the rights of the member for Alexandra to enter into the debate on this issue. My point of order is that, if you needed to reprimand him for some action he was taking, that should not deny him the right to continue his remarks for the whole 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: I cannot uphold the point of order. When I called the honourable member for Alexandra to order, he resumed his seat, and I took it that he had concluded his remarks. At that time the Leader of the Opposition, another honourable member, and the honourable member for Alexandra rose to their feet and I immediately called on the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. COUMBE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I can recall your calling "Order!" when the member for Alexandra was still on his feet. May I ask why you called that way? Why did you call "Order!", which resulted in the obeying of your call by the member for Alexandra and in his sitting down? Why did you call that way and then proceed to put the question?

The CHAIRMAN: At that time the honourable member for Alexandra may have been trying to contest the floor with another honourable member.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I accept your explanation, Mr. Chairman, as long as I have the opportunity to continue my remarks. If nothing else, the discussion has given me the opportunity to consider the merit of the remark that the Minister of Works made a short time ago. I clearly understand what has happened during the progress of this Bill through this place' and another place and its return. I am clear on the conversations that have taken place between the Parties in the intervening period. However, on the basis of the remark made by the Minister of Works, I accept the sort of precedent that he does not want upset.

At the same time, other members of my Party and of the other place know what has happened, so there is no real purpose in going back over that. More particularly, the Minister knows what has happened and he knows what has happened to me. I have been grossly misrepresented, and whether it is fair and reasonable, Parliamentary, or the kind of action taken by most Ministers does not really matter.

Mr. Max Brown: Are you a little jealous?

Mr. CHAPMAN: I would never be jealous of a situation like this one.

Mr. CRIMES: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the member for Alexandra is not discussing the contents of the Legislative Council's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I will not uphold the point of order, but I ask the honourable member for Alexandra to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I will not pursue the matter on that line and will come back to the Bill. Subclause (2) (*b*), in terms of the amendment, commences with the words "if it is not reasonably practicable for him to give notice . . .". That is a reference to the inspector. I suggest that those words are too loose and that they negate the real purpose behind subclause (2) (*a*), which provides

that the inspector shall give reasonable notice orally or in writing. I totally oppose the acceptance of the new subclause and call on Opposition and reasonable Government members to support me.

Mr. GUNN: This provision is totally unsatisfactory, because it gives no protection to an employer and allows a wide discretion in the powers of an inspector. If passed, it will mean that the employer, landholder, or the person engaging shearing labour will have no rights, and the inspector will have power to enter a property at any time. This matter should be reconsidered, and I hope the Minister will show more knowledge about the situation.

Mr. CHAPMAN: After being readvised on procedure by the Clerk of the House, I am now better informed, and it seems that there is some risk in opposing the motion, because the Minister could reject both paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*). I am not willing to jeopardise the position of growers throughout the State. If Opposition members and reasonable Government members support the proposed amendments, growers (and they are the primary concern) can be denied either or both the protective provisions. My only alternative is to express my concern at the way the matter has been handled and at the unfair and unscrupulous way that details have been presented to honourable members. The words "substantial reason" are significant in this context. However, any inspector should act courteously and give reasonable notice, as outlined in the previous amendments, either orally or in writing. The only relief from that responsibility should be in extreme circumstances, or if he had substantial reasons that he could produce that would prevent him from doing so. I can only plead with the Minister, cap in hand, on scrapers or off, or however the Minister describes it. I am not willing to trust the Minister to uphold the interests of growers in South Australia and not to jeopardise their position, so I will not give him the chance to wipe out both paragraphs. However, I ask him to take into account fairly what he knows to be right, what has been agreed on, and what he knows to be real and necessary in carrying out the duties of inspectors.

Mr. COUMBE: Is the Minister willing to accede to the reasonable request made by the member for Alexandra in such a moderate and restrained way?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I am pleased to see that the debate has now lost its animosity, but, as much as I would like to please the honourable member after he has put his case so politely, I am disappointed that I cannot assist him.

Mr. GUNN: I support the explanation given by the member for Alexandra about the course of action he intends to adopt. I spoke earlier to enable him to obtain advice on the matter.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Had this matter started off on this note we probably would have got somewhere. As I have said, these amendments were made in another place, and I ask honourable members to agree to them.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 5:

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CHAPMAN: I beat the Minister to the gun that time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: I was waving my arms about. How long do I have to stand?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister is to move a motion in relation to amendment No. 5.

Mr. CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment to clause 8 standing in my name. We on this side agreed to the motion regarding that clause for the purpose of giving me the opportunity to move my amendment. I had had explained to me that the motion in relation to clause 8 had to be agreed to before I could move my amendment. I was on my feet before the Minister rose.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra will resume his seat. The question before the Chair was "That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be agreed to." That question passed in the affirmative.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Thank you for that explanation, Sir. However, I set out to be advised clearly about the procedure I should adopt. I might have taken the advice wrongly, but my clear understanding was that I must refrain from formally moving my amendment until the debate was completed on amendment No. 4. Having proceeded on that understanding, I now rise to move my amendment formally.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member for Alexandra to resume his seat. We are dealing with the Legislative Council's amendment No. 5. I have explained the situation regarding amendment No. 4. The Minister moved the motion, and the member for Alexandra should have moved his amendment then. As the Minister's motion was carried, the honourable member for Alexandra could not move his amendment.

Mr. CHAPMAN: For the purposes of the record, Sir, can I ask you a question so that I understand what is happening? During the debate, and before the motion was put, could I have moved my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Alexandra could not move his amendment after the Legislative Council's amendment had been agreed to. We are now dealing with amendment No. 5. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 5 be agreed to.

It is fairly clear that if an inspector gives instructions for alterations or improvements to be carried out the Minister can, if the occupier appeals for an extension of time because he cannot get a contractor in a specified time, extend the time for an additional 12 months.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I support the motion. I believe I should explain that it is essential in this day and age, with shortages of material and manpower, that the Minister should have the power to extend for a further 12 months beyond the first 12 months the period for the erection of such premises. Another reason, to which the Minister did not refer, is that there are circumstances in the outback where temporary premises are needed at waterholes from time to time during droughts when sheep are too weak to be taken to acceptable premises. The Minister must at all times be able to permit the use of premises that do not comply with the Act, whether those premises be for men or for the crutching or shearing of stock. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 6:

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 6 be agreed to.

When the Bill left this place a notice under clause 9 could be served on a person who was apparently 16 years of age if he was in charge of the property when an inspector called. However, in its wisdom, the other place has decided the age should be increased to 18 years.

Mr. CHAPMAN: The Minister has now agreed to the amendment of a Bill which, in its original form, was unsatisfactory and reflected inexperience in the way in which it was handled and prepared in the first instance.

The Legislative Council's amendment has reinforced the importance of having practical experience in this field when preparing legislation of this kind or regulations under it. The measure obviously reflects the need for all parties concerned, especially those representing the grower community, to be consulted during the preparation of regulations.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 7:

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 7 be agreed to.

The amendment is acceptable. I believe the member for Alexandra will agree to it.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I probably will, but I cannot let this opportunity go without commenting on its contents. In this provision, a grower is required to give one months notice in writing. Naturally, the Minister has accepted this provision readily. It is good enough for the grower to give notice in writing, but it may not be good enough for an inspector to give notice in writing or orally, within a month or a fortnight or within any reasonable time, as provided in clause 8. This shows how unfair the Minister has been in this case.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. CHAPMAN: I am speaking to the motion, Sir. I am referring to that part of the clause that relates to a grower giving one months notice in writing. This clearly points out the ridiculous anomalies that the Minister expects us to swallow. Not 10 minutes ago he was bawling to the Committee about the burden on inspectors.

Mr. CRIMES: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member is discussing something that has already been dealt with.

Mr. Chapman: You can't take it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Chapman: We are dealing with a principle here.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will rule against the honourable member if he continues to speak while the Chairman is on this feet.

Mr. CHAPMAN: When things are different they are not the same. It is good enough for the Minister to use a principle in relation to one part of the Bill and then to change that principle in relation to the part of the Bill requiring growers to do certain things in writing. If a grower does not give notice in writing, his appeal to the Minister will be invalid. It makes one wonder about the fairness involved, when different provisions apply to employees from those that apply to employers.

Mr. GUNN: I agree with what the member for Alexandra has said. The Minister has readily agreed to the Legislative Council's amendment in this case, yet a few moments ago he would not accept that inspectors should have to give notice in writing. Although employers or landholders must give this notice, a member of the union movement or someone else apparently need not do so. In this case, we see a perfect example of the two-faced attitude of the Minister and his colleagues. Members opposite would support the Minister on this matter, despite his disgraceful and deplorable performance this evening.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): In taking part in my first grievance debate, at the outset I want to express my disappointment that it was necessary for the Government to amend Standing Orders, giving itself power to gag this House, and thus denying the representatives of the people the right to raise matters of great importance. Where else should such matters be debated, if not on the floor of the Parliament? I am sorry that the Minister of Transport is not here this evening.

Mr. Langley: He's sick.

Mr. GUNN: I am sorry to hear that. I wish to refer to the Flinders Highway. A few weeks ago, when I asked the Minister about the matter, he said clearly that the road was in good condition, that it would be regularly maintained, and that there was nothing to worry about. Members may not be aware that about $600 000 has been spent on this project. Although more than $100 000 was allocated this financial year to be spent on the road, at this stage the contractor is standing idle: not one dollar has been spent. As the road is deteriorating rapidly, people who must drive on it have to put up with its condition which, to say the least, is deplorable. Obviously, unless something is done soon thousands of dollars will have to be spent to improve the road sufficiently so that further work can be done on it.

The only maintenance work taking place at present is some grading work. I appeal to the Minister, his officers, and members of the Government to take positive action to improve this road. At present, work has been completed on a portion of the road from Talia; no other work has been done. The contractor's machinery, except for a small patrol grader, is in Streaky Bay standing idle. In the interests of good financial management, work on the road should be. completed forthwith. I realise that the State is being starved of funds, particularly because of the arrogant attitude of the Commonwealth Government and the Commonwealth Minister for Transport (Mr. Jones). Mr. Jones and Mr. Connor represent the greatest disaster that has ever, befallen the people of this country with regard to Ministerial appointments. I hope the State Minister of Transport will have his officers re-examine this matter. Whoever prepared the reply that the Minister gave me obviously had no knowledge whatever of this road. If the Minister doubts what I have said, I suggest that he drive over the road at his earliest convenience. If it is good enough to spend $600 000, it is good enough for the Minister to spend a few thousand dollars to see the road at first hand.

The other matter to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is the matter that I raised at Question Time today, namely, a matter affecting my constituents in the opal-mining industry, which last year had a turnover of about $30 000 000. That is not my figure: it is in the annual report of the Director of Mines. At present, because of the high cost of petrol and diesel fuel, many opal miners are in a severe financial position.

The position on the field is depressed, to say the least, and, because of the foolish and irresponsible decision of the Australian Government to withdraw the fuel equalisation subsidy, the cost of petrol in these locations immediately increased by 12c. These people, who live over 800 kilometres from Adelaide, depend basically on opal mining, an industry that has its ups and downs. Coupled with that decision, this Government introduced the petrol franchise tax, which placed another 6c a gallon on the price of fuel. Therefore, the cost of petrol and diesel fuel has increased by 18c.

As a result, the mining industry in my district has suffered severely. It is far more difficult for people to go out and prospect, because of the difficulties that the Mines Department has placed in their way. I should be pleased if the Minister of Development and Mines would pay attention to what I am saying.

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: I'm listening. Our Act is the envy of the other States.

Mr. GUNN: The Mines Department may think that, but that remark does not apply to the miners. One of the most useful implements with which to go prospecting is a back hoe, but, once a prospector commences operations with that implement, he must register his claim. If he wants to shift his place of operation a couple of times each week or a couple of times a day, he must go to the Warden in the town and register his claim. This state of affairs ought to be rectified, because one of the problems in the opal-mining industry in the town is that little or no prospecting has been taking place. The Mines Department promised to send a drill to Andamooka to do exploratory work. However, this promise has not been carried out by the Minister and we are still waiting for action on the matter. .

Mr. Becker: Has the Minister ever been there?

Mr. GUNN: Yes. The Minister of Environment and Conservation, when he was assisting the Minister of Mines and before he was given a sideways promotion, visited the area with me, the present Minister of Development and Mines, and some other gentlemen. I remind the Minister that opal mining has become mechanised, and people have produced and developed much equipment that is suitable for that industry. I refer particularly to the blower that is powered by 100 h.p. diesel engines. About 52 blowers are standing idle in the town and at least another 50 are idle in the fields because the miners cannot afford the fuel to operate them. Therefore, the miners are suffering severely.

It is all very well for the Attorney to laugh and think that what I am saying is funny, but I should like to see him at Coober Pedy trying to make money in this industry. One of his colleagues went there for a time, and the Attorney knows to whom I am referring. That man did not do any good. In fact, it is a pity the Attorney let him continue in practice,

J appeal to the Minister's good sense in regard to the matter that I have raised and I hope that he will have negotiations with Imperial Chemical Industries about the problems that the use of the explosive nitropril has caused. Nine accidents have occurred because of its use at Coober Pedy and, although this form of explosive is. much cheaper than gelignite, the miners have had to revert to the use of gelignite because of the problems with nitropril. Because of the importance to the State of this industry, I hope that the Minister will try to convince his Cabinet colleagues that action is essential.

Mr. JENNINGS (Ross Smith): This is the first time I have spoken in the adjournment debate, and I do so only because, before I have the opportunity to do so again, 1 shall have been in other parts of the world. In fact, I may get lost going around in circles. The member who has just resumed his seat raised a matter that I thought it most peculiar of him to raise. He commenced to deal with the matter, but quickly got off it. The worst authorities in this Parliament are those who talk about the standard of debate when they have been here for only a short time.

I may be taking credit now for something that I really have no reason to take credit for, and perhaps the Standing Orders Committee should take the credit, but a few years ago. I devoted the whole of my Address in Reply speech to the waste of time that occurred here, when we could speak for two hours each at any time on any matter before the House. Each day Question Time could extend from 2 p.m. to 4 p.m. and, on one day a week, Questions on Notice could proceed for half an hour after that. I do not know what happened, but soon afterwards the Standing Orders Committee made the big improvement that has been continued since then. Any member who has been here for several years, as most will be if they stay here long enough—

The Hon. L. J. King: There's a certain inevitability about that!

Mr. JENNINGS: It has taken me a long time to cover my period of over 20 years here. We used to have Question Time for two hours, and after that, we could talk for as long as we wanted to. I remember Lloyd Hughes, when an Opposition member—

Mr. Coumbe: The Wallaroo Warbler!

Mr. JENNINGS: —asked me to wake him up when a specific matter was to be discussed. At 2 a.m. the matter came up; I woke him; he spoke for two hours; then he went back to sleep on the couch. I must admit that we were all asleep while he was speaking! In most of the years to which I have referred Parliament met for only a couple of months of the year. This is a matter that we have not been told about: poor old Tom would run the State himself for the rest of the time.

Mr. Slater: Try to!

Mr. JENNINGS: He managed to keep it going, and then he would call on Parliament to ratify what he had already done. He had the numbers, so we had to ratify what he had done, and then we were finished. Parliament was a much easier job than it is now. Since then there have been many further improvements: the time for speaking has been reduced and now Questions on Notice are accepted. Those who wish to raise a specific issue may do it on the adjournment, as I am doing now, whether members agree with it or not. We are working less and doing more than we formerly did, and that is the way I think it should be. I congratulate the Standing Orders Committee on what it has done and for its recent improvements, and hope that we will gradually reach the position in which Parliament will be almost a full-time job over more reasonable hours than it has been in the past.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I refer to the petrol franchise tax that is exercising the minds of many people in this State. A report in this afternoon's *News* epitomises a matter that had been brought to the attention of the House by a question from the Leader of the Opposition last week, referring to the serious plight of many petrol resellers in this State. These people, who have to work long hours to make a living, are now being forced out of business because this Government's fiscal measures have become a penal action. In reply to a question the Premier said that, if the petrol tax was removed, many public servants would be laid off: in fact, he said that the number could include doctors and nurses. The statement almost brought tears to our eyes.

Mr. Arnold: What's gone wrong with the system?

Mr. COUMBE: A pertinent interjection. About a month ago, when the Premier returned from a Premiers' Conference with the Prime Minister and the Commonwealth Treasurer, he said he was pleased with the amount he had received: so much so, that he said he could finish the year with a reasonable balance, including an additional amount for the Loan funds of the State. Let us consider what is happening. A report in today's *News* states:

Some South Australian petrol resellers had been forced to quit their businesses because they could not pay the State Government's petrol licence fees, Automotive Chamber of Commerce Secretary, Mr. G. Mill, said today.

Mr. Mill said that at least two operators had left their businesses because of the 6c a gallon petrol impost. The article continues:

> Licence fees for the first quarter of the year were due to be paid by yesterday, but it is understood more than 70 of the 1 100 petrol resellers have yet to pay.

Petrol resellers have to scrape a living the hard way: they are not big boys but ordinary decent working chaps. Licence fees are based on sales volume for the previous year, and Mr. Mill said he had heard of an operator who, having sold 48 000gall. a month last year, was not selling 1 200gall. a month this year. That drop in sales has occurred because members of the motoring public could not afford to operate their motor vehicles as a result of the increased charges for petrol plus the additional cost caused by inflation, which has been brought about by this Government's colleagues in Canberra.

Mr. Payne: That will be only temporary.

Mr. COUMBE: Although there may be a temporary drop in the rate of the increase in inflation; informed people to whom I have spoken consider that the reduction is only temporary and that there will be a further increase later this year. According to the report in the *News,* Mr. Mill says that, in the case in which the reseller is selling so much less petrol, it would be impossible for the reseller to pay his licence fee. What is to happen to people in this critical position, which can affect their livelihood? If the member for Whyalla were a petrol reseller and found himself in the critical position of not being able to pay the licence fee because of circumstances, what would he think about the Government?

Mr. Max Brown: Do you think the practice of discounting might affect the position?

Mr. COUMBE: That is another matter to which I shall refer. Generally, people who previously had a large gallonage sale and who must pay a licence fee retrospectively are finding that their turnover has been reduced. Will the Government allow these people a moratorium? Whether or not the Government is to remove the petrol franchise tax, consideration should be given to people in this position so that time can be allowed for them to pay or for the tax to be removed. I understand that the New South Wales Government is seriously considering a moratorium. I can recall the Premier, when explaining this measure, saying that he was reluctant to introduce it but that he would, at the first opportunity, repeal it if he got the necessary money to allow him to do so. He got plenty of money, according to what he said when he came back from Canberra.

Mr. Evans: Gough was good.

Mr. COUMBE: Yes, but the milk has soured since then. Gough is certainly cheesed off, and the Premier of South Australia has got himself into a most invidious position relying on help from his colleagues in the Commonwealth Government and in other States. On the one hand, the Premier has been let down, and on the other hand we must consider seriously his credibility on this matter. He has been asked several times what is the position regarding this tax. Even today he said he would not remove the impost. However, he did say he was going to Canberra next week to have further talks about the matter. When the Premier returned from Canberra recently he said he had enough money to keep the State going well beyond June 30. On the subject of capital expenditure, he said the State Government could begin all sorts of work.

One often wonders whether we can accept the Premier's credibility. I seriously entreat the Premier to come clean on this matter for the sake of resellers who are finding it impossible, unless the Government introduces a system of moratorium, to continue in business. These people will lose their livelihoods.

The member for Whyalla referred to discounting. Frankly, I have grave doubts about the principle of discounting. Some people believe in it and others do not. 1 know that it operates in South Australia to some extent and that it operates to a greater extent in other States. I have seen people pass by a petrol outlet in my district simply because of the discounting of petrol. Leaving that aside, the impost of this tax is affecting all sorts of people and it is affecting the cost of carrying goods. Everything that the member for Whyalla buys for his house carries the 6c impost. Do not let him grin about—

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

Motion carried.

At 9.24 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 26, at 2 p.m.