HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, November 20, 1963.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.

METROPOLITAN ABATTOIRS.

Mr. HARDING: I congratulate the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke), and I think also the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes), on their questions and comments regarding conditions at the Gepps Cross abattoirs. A recent article emanating from Canberra states:

Australian meatworks have only 12 months to bring their hygiene and sanitation standards up to those of abattoirs in the United States, or be barred from killing for the American market. Several months ago the U.S.A. Department of Agriculture warned Australian authorities that unless Australian abattoirs were brought up to American standard, exports to America would be stopped. Australia's greatest potential market, Japan, sets standards similar to those of the United States.

Can the Minister of Agriculture provide by tomorrow answers to the following questions: (*a*) Does the work at the Gepps Cross abattoirs measure up to the required hygiene and sanitation standards required by American and Japanese buyers? (*b*) Have inspections, plans, and estimates been made in order to bring these works to the high standard of efficiency to comply with the requirements of overseas buyers? (*c*) What is the estimated cost of these additions and improvements?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think it extremely unlikely that any meatworks in Australia would measure up exactly to every requirement of the American market, and I think all of them would have to make some modifications, large or small. Alterations are being made at the Gepps Cross abattoirs to comply with the standards required, but I do not think as much alteration will be necessary as in the case of some other killing works. I am afraid that it will be most difficult to obtain a detailed reply by tomorrow, as I doubt whether the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board will be able to provide a detailed statement at present. However, I have assured the House on previous occasions that the board is undertaking whatever work is necessary to bring the abattoirs up to the required standards.

WOOMERA SCHOOL.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Will the Minister of Education say when a new secondary school is likely to be built at Woomera? In view of the similarity between the educational needs at Whyalla and those at Woomera and the outstanding success of the Whyalla Technical High School, will the Minister give an assurance that a technical high school of the same type as that at Whyalla will be provided at Woomera?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Although I am not prepared offhand to give the honourable member that assurance, I agree that the technical high school at Whyalla has been an outstanding success, and it would appear to me to be a good pattern to follow in a somewhat similar locality. I shall be only too pleased to give the matter more detailed consideration in the Parliamentary recess and to communicate with the honourable member by letter.

SERVICE STATIONS.

Mr. TAPPING: On October 31, in reply to a question I asked about the demolition of houses for the erection of service stations, the Premier said he would obtain certain figures for me. Has he those figures now?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The information sought by the honourable member is as follows:

About 60 per cent of the vehicles registered in South Australia are in the metropolitan area. The following table sets out the increase in numbers of registered vehicles from June, 1959 to June, 1963.

	June, 1959.	June, 1963.	Percentage Increase
1. Registered vehicles in South Australia (excluding trailers)	287,585	338,283	17.6
2. Registered motor cars in South Australia (included in 1)	196,323	248,082	26.3
3. Registered motor cars in metropolitan area (about 60 per cent of 2)	118,000	149,000	26.3

Thus, there is an estimated increase of 26.3 per cent in motor cars in the metropolitan area compared with an increase in retail petrol outlets or service stations of 33.7 per cent (483 to 646).

CADELL SEEPAGE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Some months ago the Minister of Irrigation was good enough to visit the Cadell irrigation settlement to investigate some of the problems there. As I understand he has been working on this project, can he say when the difficulties will be remedied?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: No. I cannot say when the problems will be remedied. Preliminary inspections for the purpose of submitting a report on the main drainage system were undertaken during October, 1963, and a report, with a recommendation from the engineers, is awaited.

RUTHVEN MANSIONS.

Mr. COUMBE: In a press report of the reply given by the Minister of Works to a question yesterday about rentals received from Ruthven Mansions on behalf of the Government I notice that the figures indicate a certain high rental for the number of tenants in this building, and that there appears to be some disparity between the figures stated in the report and those given by the Minister. Can the Minister say whether the figures quoted in the report are correct?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The report in the *News* yesterday of a statement by me was substantially correct. However, anyone reading it may have received the wrong impression (as apparently the honourable member has) that the average cost of the renovations on the flats to be provided was rather high. I said, correctly, that the number of tenants was 22, but that does not mean that the number of flats provided will be only 22. That is not correct. I correct any wrong impression that may have been created on those lines. I gave the cost of the project as £150,000 but the estimate was slightly below that. For any job of this sort it is difficult to estimate accurately the cost of work involving extensive renovations and alterations. The number of flats available will be 44, not 22, so that the cost is reasonable in relation to the number of flats to be provided. I believe the 44 flats include the caretaker's flat so that 43 flats will be available for letting. The rentals have not yet been fixed. The Director of the Public Buildings Department has communicated with the Housing Trust regarding the matter, and I do not doubt that a rental will be fixed when the flats are available for tenancy.

RAIL STANDARDIZATION.

Mr. McKEE: I understand the Minister of Works has a reply to my recent question about rail standardization.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways, informs me that the position with regard to the survey work on the Broken Hill to Port Pirie gauge standardization is as follows:

Between Jamestown and Yongala and between Ucolta and Paratoo trial surveys are in hand. Survey work has commenced between Paratoo and Mannahill, and between Mannahill and Cockburn substantial progress has been made. Various alternative proposals for the production of welded rails are at present being investigated and a decision has not yet been reached.

RAIL AND ROAD COLLISIONS.

Mr. HALL: Yesterday, in a question on notice to the Minister of Railways, I asked how many collisions had occurred in South Australia between rail and road traffic since January 1, 1962. I received a reply baldly stating, "Calendar year 1963, 88." I believed that by putting a question on notice one could expect a reasonable answer if the figures were available, and I understood that the Railways Department had these figures. I now ask the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Railways: First, how many collisions have occurred in South Australia between rail and road traffic since January 1, 1962? Secondly, how many of these accidents occurred in darkness or in times of significantly reduced visibility? Thirdly, what percentage of the collisions that occurred at protected crossings occurred during the hours of darkness or in poor visibility? I hope that the Railways Department can this time see its way clear to answer my questions.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague, the Minister of Railways.

MOUNT GAMBIER CROSSING.

Mr. BURDON: I understand the Minister of Works has a reply from the Minister of Railways to my question about the provision of warning devices at the railway crossing at Commercial Street West, Mount Gambier?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: My colleague, the Minister of Railways states that departmental records show that in the past 10 years two accidents (including that on October 30,

1963) involving rail and road vehicles have occurred at the level crossing at 303m. 37c., Mount Gambier line. Visibility at the crossing is fair, and provided reasonable care is exercised by drivers of road vehicles, it is considered that no unusual hazard exists. This crossing is not listed for equipping, in the near future, with automatic warning devices. However, a traffic count is now in hand, and when completed, he will examine the matter further.

CLEAN AIR COMMITTEE.

Mr. RYAN: Many residents in my district are anxiously awaiting the time when they may submit evidence to the Clean Air Committee. Can the Premier say when this committee will be appointed and when it will commence functioning under the Health Act Amendment Act, 1963?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member has asked a couple of questions on this matter and I know that he is keen to have the committee functioning as soon as possible. I have inquired about the position. Several bodies listed in the legislation have been invited to nominate representatives to the committee. As soon as their nominations are received the committee will be constituted, and it will be able to carry out the functions provided for it in the legislation as from the date it is constituted.

COCKBURN POWER SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: Some weeks ago I asked the Premier to ascertain from the Electricity Trust whether it was feasible for electric power to be supplied to Cockburn from Broken Hill. I understand that this would be possible at present, and I was hoping that the supply would be extended to Olary. Apparently there is more to it than appears on the surface, because it means the conversion of a powerline from Broken Hill to Cockburn to a three-phase system from a single-phase system. I understand that a single-phase system will be used only as far as Thackaringa microwave repeater station, and that can be taken into Cockburn to supply it with power. Can the Premier say whether, if this powerline were extended to Cockburn, the Broken Hill organization could be responsible for the electricity distribution rather than the South Australian Railways? Under these circumstances power should be distributed by a supply organization rather than by the South Australian Railways.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member has asked several questions on this matter and I have taken it up with the Deputy Railways Commissioner in Mr. Fargher's absence to ascertain the views of the Railways Department. They may be summarized as follows:

1. The South Australian Railways would have no objection to Broken Hill power being distributed at Cockburn instead of power from the South Australian Railways.

2. The South Australian Railways would use power supplied from the City of Broken Hill provided that the tariff charged by that city did not exceed fourpence per K.W.H., and that the lump sum to be contributed by the South Australian Railways did not exceed £3,500 as stated in a letter from the City of Broken Hill to the Electricity Trust of South Australia dated March 27, 1963.

HIRE-PURCHASE AGREEMENTS.

Mr. LAWN: Section 47 of the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act, 1960, provides for minimum deposits in such transactions. Since then have appeared press advertisements offering goods for sale under hire-purchase without deposits. I believe that the Attorney-General did take action, but I do not know what he did. In yesterday's *News* under the heading "No Cash Required To Buy," appeared the following advertisement:

How easy it is—just small weekly payments and you can enjoy immediate possession of lovely carpets at bargain prices! Every transaction is strictly confidential and you have every protection in the event of sickness or unemployment!

This obviously refers to hire-purchase agreements. Can the Premier say how firms making these agreements can comply with the Act?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: At the time of the debate on minimum deposits —which, I believe, was initiated by the Leader of the Opposition—I pointed out that whilst it was desirable to provide for minimum deposits it was one of the most difficult provisions to police because so many loopholes existed. If the honourable member will supply me with the advertisement I shall refer it to the Prices Commissioner for investigation. I doubt whether a hire-purchase agreement would be involved. Although the agreement might contain many hire-purchase features, and might provide for weekly payments, it probably is not technically a hire-purchase agreement. Under a hire-purchase agreement

property rights do not pass to the purchaser until all instalments have been paid. If, however, it is an outright sale, although the payment is spread over a period, it does not constitute a hire-purchase agreement. I will have the matter investigated.

GOODWOOD BOYS TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on November 14 regarding the granting of a subsidy to the Goodwood Boys Technical High School Council for the conversion of the old Commonwealth building to an assembly hall?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Following the honourable member's question I have ascertained that almost 20 years ago the Education Department assured the school council that financial assistance would be granted to convert the former Commonwealth building at the school into a hall for general use. Since then the council has been accumulating funds for this purpose. Plans for the work have been approved by the Public Buildings Department and tenders have been called and received. However, no application for a subsidy has reached me, but in view of previous departmental promises I shall give early and sympathetic consideration to the request when I receive it. Nevertheless I repeat my previous statements—made to the honourable member and elsewhere—that it is neither departmental nor Government policy to subsidize the cost of assembly halls until the shortage of suitable classrooms is overcome.

HORSE DOPING.

Mr. FRED WALSH: In yesterday's *News* is a report of the doping of a racehorse named "Brigand". After he won a hurdle race at Victoria Park on November 11 a swab was taken, and subsequently it proved to be positive. The stewards have decided to inquire into the case. A swab taken from a horse that won at Gawler on October 2 also proved positive. At an inquiry the stewards found that the trainer was guilty of negligence in that he did not take proper precautions to prevent the drug theobromide being administered to the horse "Gold Chase". I believe that horse doping is a common practice in South Australia, and in many other States, but that the clubs are singling out certain people who are regarded as "battlers". In order to establish a sufficient deterrent will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to request the Police Commissioner to investigate all proven cases of horse doping in South Australia to ascertain whether any act of fraud or conspiracy to defraud has been committed, with a view to prosecuting those persons alleged guilty of such offences?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will submit the question to the Chief Secretary, but what the honourable member requests is a difficult assignment. It is extremely difficult to detect such offences, but I will ascertain what can be done.

RURAL YOUTH ORGANIZATION.

Mr. LAUCKE: The growth of the rural youth organization in South Australia has been marked since its inception. This organization is providing a particularly valuable service. I understand that at present the organization has an advisory service comprising a senior adviser, Mr. Hooper, and three other advisers to attend to the affairs of about 5,000 members. In view of this large membership will the Minister of Agriculture consider appointing a further adviser.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This organization is growing rapidly and an additional adviser has been appointed. It has a senior adviser and four other advisers. However the latest appointee has not yet assumed duty, although the appointment has been made.

AUTISTIC CHILDREN.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the problem of autistic children?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: As promised, I consulted the Chief Psychologist of the Education Department (Mr. Piddington) concerning the honourable member's question on autistic children and I later received a lengthy report from him. I also sought the opinion of the Superintendent of Primary Schools (Mr. Whitburn), who is also the officer in charge of special schools. He also supplied me with a detailed statement on the subject. Finally, the Director of Education (Mr. Mander-Jones) summarized the position as follows:

Autistic children are those who are absorbed in fantasy to the exclusion of interest in external reality. They form an extremely difficult group of children. Indeed, as they differ so much from each other it may be inappropriate to call them a group at all. Their behaviour is often extremely difficult as they are usually withdrawn from the surroundings in which they live, even their own family, and sometimes identify themselves with odd and bizarre things. Sometimes these children have no speech, some of them are mentally retarded and each requires special and individual treatment.

The formation of a special class for these children would be difficult and unwise, if not impossible. Some may be placed with advantage in opportunity classes, others are at Minda, others in mental hospitals and others are kept at home. Some few are in occupation centres. It may be possible to place a few in a special residential home and school for maladjusted children, and on this aspect I have been having discussions with Dr. Cramond, who is at present preparing a submission. On the other hand, the placing of more than a very few autistic children in such a residential home and school would be unwise as the erratic, sometimes unpredictable and sometimes dangerous behaviour of these children would disorganize it.

Although this condensation of these lengthy reports might appear to be somewhat pessimistic, I propose during the Parliamentary recess to have further discussions with these three responsible officers of the department and also with the honourable member to see how far we can assist these children and also their parents, for whom I have the deepest sympathy.

GRAPE PRICES.

Mr. CURREN: I have been asked by the executive of the Upper Murray Grapegrowers Association to ask a question of the Premier and to quote some of the recommendations included in the Prices Commissioner's report for 1960. The following statement appears on page 5 of that report:

All wineries should be able to pay growers 20 to 25 per cent of their grape prices within 30 days of delivery. Where this is not being observed, steps should be taken at an early date to pay some such amount. Up to 1948, under the Commonwealth Export Wine Bounty, proprietary wineries paid accounts by June 30 or were required to pay 6 per cent interest on the accounts after that date. It is considered that growers should be paid in full by June 30 each year. It is not suggested that all wineries should immediately adopt this policy, as to do so in some cases could involve hardship. Proprietary wineries, however, should gradually condition their business activities to achieve this objective.

Will the Premier ascertain from the Prices Commissioner whether these recommendations have been put into effect by the proprietary winemakers?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not believe that the Prices Commissioner would be authorized under the Act to disclose information regarding any specific firm. Certain limitations are placed on him by the Act, and I doubt very much whether he could go into detail as to which firm had made complete payments and which firm had not. I will obtain a report for the honourable member on the general question of whether the industry has co-operated with the Commissioner regarding his recommendation. I think the answer will be strongly in the affirmative, because I believe that the industry has done its utmost to assist him in his work. Although I cannot get a report of a specific nature, I will get a general report for the honourable member.

LOW-DEPOSIT HOUSING.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I understand that under the Housing Trust's £50-deposit purchase scheme a purchaser who takes possession on a Saturday owes two weeks' repayments. In other words, he is a week behind before he starts, whereas, if he took possession on a Monday, he would have a week before he had to make any repayment. People frequently take possession of houses on a Saturday so that they will have a chance to settle in over the weekend, and I think the problem could be solved if the week were considered to commence rather than to end on a Saturday. Will the Premier take this matter up with the Housing Trust in order to see what can be done?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not sure what the Leader wishes me to do. If he wants me to alter the calendar so that the last day of the week will be not a Saturday but a Friday, I am not sure that I have authority to do that. I gather that the Leader wants to help the purchaser avoid one week's repayment for only one days' possession. The house probably has been available for the purchaser for the whole week or for some days and he has seen fit not to occupy it until the Saturday. Although I do not think the Leader would agree, I would think that the proper procedure would be for the purchaser to start paying from the day he was notified that the house was available for occupation. I think that the date on which the key is handed over is the date from which the repayments should be made. I have great confidence in the Housing Trust, and I do not think that it takes a mean advantage of its tenants. In fact, I believe that this £50-deposit scheme probably is unequalled anywhere in the world. I listened with much interest to the housing programmes that have been put forward as attractive features in the present Commonwealth election campaign, but I consider that none approaches what is already available in South Australia. Certainly none has the features of this low-deposit purchase scheme. However, I will investigate the matter for the Leader.

PSYCHOLOGY BRANCH.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister of Works is probably aware that for some time the Public Buildings Department has been carrying out renovations on the Education Department's Psychology Branch building at Fitzroy Terrace, Fitzroy. Is the Minister of Works aware that for some time no work has been done on the exterior of this building, with the result that in this choice residential area it looks extremely shabby both as regards the outside of the structure and the grounds? Will the Minister take up this matter with the Public Buildings Department to see whether this work can be completed so that this building, which performs an important task for the Education Department, will be more in keeping with its surroundings?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will discuss this matter with the Director of Public Buildings to see just what is required. I think the honourable member will agree with the broad statement that the department has been at some pains and has spent much money to see that the buildings it constructs are worthy acquisitions to their surroundings. I am not aware that work has ceased or that there is any problem about the matter, as the Director has not reported any problem to me, but I will consult him and bring the honourable member's remarks to his notice.

LAND VALUATION INQUIRY.

Mr. RYAN: Last session, a land valuation inquiry committee was set up by this House to investigate land valuations and to report back to Parliament. In the Budget debate, I asked the Treasurer when the committee's work would be completed and a report submitted to the House. Can he say what work has been done by the committee and when its report is likely to be submitted to Parliament?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I noted the honourable member's reference to this matter in the Budget debate, when he drew attention to an expenditure item and asked when the report would be available. I have inquired, and I believe the committee, which has taken a considerable amount of evidence in various places, has now completed taking evidence. I am informed that the report will be available early next year.

WHYALLA BOAT ANCHORAGE.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to a question I asked yesterday about an application by the Whyalla Boatowners' Association for assistance to provide a safe anchorage for boats at Whyalla?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. The honourable member directed an inquiry to me some time ago about this matter, and I asked the General Manager of the Harbors Board to investigate the proposals submitted for consideration by the Whyalla Boatowners' Association. He has done that and has informed me that the cost of the project as outlined by the association would be between £30,000 and £45,000. The actual cost would depend on two factors—whether the association was prepared to continue to assist in the construction on a voluntary basis (which, as it has made an application, I assume it would), and whence the stone material for the breakwater would be derived. Another factor in the cost is settlement during construction which, according to information given to me, could vary the cost of the project substantially. It is not my function to take the matter further, as the provision of fishing boat havens is in the hands of my colleague, the Minister of Agriculture. I have referred the matter to him, and I understand he is already investigating.

PUBLIC RELIEF.

Mr. McKEE: On October 23, the member for Gawler (Mr. Clark) asked the Premier a question about the stopping of assistance paid by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department to widows because of an increase in widows' pensions. In reply, the Premier said that the matter had been considered by the Government, which had decided that rent subsidies should no longer be given to these people. As the Commonwealth Government saw fit to grant these increases after having considered the situation, it realized that an increase was necessary, and I am sure it did not expect that the State Government would take away assistance from these people. Because of this, will the Premier consider reviewing the Government's policy on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member has not correctly stated what I said in the House: I said that in consequence of the Commonwealth Government's making some increases only to some limited categories of people receiving assistance, the State Government had reviewed the whole schedule of assistance to provide that those who needed it most would get the added assistance. As a result of the revision, the State Government was involved not in less but in more expenditure.

Mr. McKee: But some went down.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Nobody went down. For instance, deserted wives, who were not eligible for any Commonwealth pension, received a substantial increase under the new schedule, so the honourable member is not correct in saying that, because the Commonwealth made a pension available, the State Government took advantage of it. What the State is actually doing is paying more than it would have paid under the old schedule, but it is paying it much more equitably.

DENTISTS ACT.

Mr. LOVEDAY: The Premier will recollect that earlier this session I asked if he would introduce an amendment to the Dentists Act to tidy up a certain section, which the Premier will remember needs tidying, as it is inconsistent with what was done in the previous session. As this session has been shortened, and as the Premier said that he thought an amendment would be introduced this session, will he see that it comes before the House as early as possible next session?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will investigate the problem referred to by the honourable member to see if I can comply with his wishes. The session has not actually been shortened; overall, it probably will be lengthened. It is just a matter of how one describes it. Certain members have expressed a wish to be available to take part in the Commonwealth election campaign, and the Leader has frankly said that he is one of them. Because of this, the Government decided that it would deal with as much of the urgent business as possible this week and that the House would be called together on February 18 to do other work that might not have been disposed of. Parliament will not prorogue, but will return in February to complete the session.

FISHING LICENCES.

Mr. CORCORAN: My question concerns the method of issuing fishing licences in this State. Last session, the Minister of Agriculture explained at some length the issues involved in this matter, which he said was then under review. Can he now say if there has been any further discussion on the matter and if it has been decided whether the method of issuing these licences is to change soon?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: There have been discussions on this matter. I will obtain a statement for the honourable member as to the exact position and what is intended.

MOUNT GAMBIER PARKING METERS.

Mr. BURDON: Yesterday, by interjection, the member for Onkaparinga suggested that the member for Port Adelaide should know that there were parking meters in Mount Gambier. As a diligent search by local residents has failed to reveal any such meters, will the honourable member say when he last visited Mount Gambier and what hour he made the observation from which he concluded that parking meters were in use there?

Mr. SHANNON: I admit frankly that my information came from reading the press. I have not been in Mount Gambier for a considerable time, and that, of course, is my misfortune. The Mount Gambier council considered a plan for installing parking meters and, if meters have not been installed, it is only a matter of time before Mount Gambier has them.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (SEAT BELTS).

Consideration in Committee of Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 4 (clause 3)—Leave out "seat belts and ."

No. 2. Page 2, line 9 (clause 3)—After "(*a*)" insert "an anchorage for."

No. 3. Page 2, line 10 (clause 3)—After "other" insert "anchorage for a."

No. 4. Page 2, line 14 (clause 3)—Leave out paragraph (*c*).

No. 5. Page 2, line 15 (clause 3)—Leave out "seat belt and."

No. 6. Page 2, line 21 (clause 3)—Leave out "seat belts and" and insert "seat belt."

No. 7. Page 2, line 22 (clause 3)—Leave out "seat belts and" and insert "seat belt."

No. 8. Page 2, line 26 (clause 3)—Leave out "seat belts and" and insert "seat belt."

No. 9. Page 2, line 31 (clause 3)—Leave out "Seat belts and" and insert "Seat belt."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

The effect of the amendments, which have been made to this Bill by the Legislative Council, is to remove all reference to seat belts, and merely to provide for anchorages for them. At present, 95 per cent of all new vehicles have the anchorages fitted so that it would hardly be necessary for legislation to enforce their installation. Therefore, the amendments completely alter the Bill as it left this place, and as it passed both the second reading and third

reading in this House in its present form without a division. I consider that this House should ask the Legislative Council to reconsider the amendments it has made.

Mr. HEASLIP: I opposed this Bill when it was introduced. Although the House did not divide on it, the House may have been kind to the member when it did not call for a division. I cannot see why citizens of this State should be compelled to spend £10 or £12 to fit seat belts. Every effort is being made to reduce the cost of living of ordinary people, yet this legislation seeks to compel people to do something with which I disagree entirely.

Mr. Ryan: Have you shares in an undertaker's business?

Mr. HEASLIP: I shall probably pay the undertaker at some time. Even if people were compelled to fit these belts they would not be compelled to wear them and obviously the legislation could not be policed. In 90 per cent of cases the law will be ignored. I do not believe in compulsion where it is unnecessary and ineffective: it is both in this case. It is ineffective because many seat belts will not be used. I oppose the Bill as introduced. The amendment of the Legislative Council makes it compulsory for motor car manufacturers to fit the anchorages. This would not cost the car purchaser any more, as the extra cost would be absorbed by the manufacturer. If the manufacturer is compelled to fit the anchorage it will be a simple matter to have belts fitted later. Those who spend the money will use the belts.

Mr. Clark: What is the sense of passing legislation about a simple thing like putting in anchorages?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know. Belts would add to the cost.

Mr. Clark: It is the sort of thing that could have originated only in one place.

Mr. HEASLIP: If the anchorages are in the car it is a simple matter to fit the belts if people want to fit them. I consider that members should agree to the Legislative Council's amendments setting out that anchorages shall be compulsory in any car manufactured after January, 1965.

Mr. BYWATERS: I support the motion, because I consider that we passed with a large majority the Bill in its original form. This is an attempt by the Legislative Council to make this Bill null and void. I can see no other intention. Everything that makes the legislation effective has been removed.

Mr. Heaslip: The fitting of belts in the car will not make it effective.

Mr. BYWATERS: If these amendments are accepted, there may as well be no legislation at all. The member for Rocky River, who is opposed to the installation of seat belts, said that this would add to the motorists' costs. These belts would be fitted to the car and would become standard equipment and their cost would be taken into account in the price of the car. When a person purchases a car for £1,200 to £1,500 the matter of £10 or £15 for seat belts is not important. I believe that belts can be installed for much less than that amount.

Mr. Clark: Even if it did add to the cost, it would ensure safety.

Mr. BYWATERS: The increased cost would be negligible on a new car.

Mr. Heaslip: This legislation does not compel people to wear seat belts.

Mr. BYWATERS: I agree, but once belts are installed in a car people automatically use them. I installed seat belts in my car because I thought they were valuable and that as a legislator I should set an example.

Mr. Heaslip: One out of every five persons with seat belts does not wear them now.

Mr. BYWATERS: I can speak only for myself. I wear mine. I cannot speak for everyone, nor can the honourable member. That is purely his own estimate of the situation. Last Saturday in an accident in my district a motor vehicle on an open road turned over four times: two of the occupants were thrown to the road and killed instantly. The other occupant remained in the car and escaped serious injury. I believe that had the occupants been wearing seat belts all would have survived. Statistics prove that seat belts minimize the death rate and reduce the extent of accidents. I support the motion.

Mr. SHANNON: It has been customary since I have been a member of Parliament for this Committee to stand by its original decision when a message is received from the Legislative Council. The member for Rocky River spoke against this legislation, but his vote was not recorded because no division was called. Any member can call for a division if his objections to a proposal are sufficiently strong. It is a fair assumption that as this Bill was passed without a division most members favoured it. If a conference is called the managers from this Committee will have no alternative but to stand by the unanimous decision that was recorded here initially.

Mr. Heaslip: We have often agreed to the amendments made in another place.

Mr. SHANNON: That is so. If the honourable member were appointed a manager from this Committee he would be duty-bound to stand by the decision of this Committee.

Mr. Heaslip: Yes, if we did not accept the amendments. However, we can accept them.

Mr. SHANNON: The motion before us is that the amendments be not accepted. The member for Mitcham believes that the amendments are not in the interests of his legislation, and I agree. His legislation is designed to save life. It will not prevent accidents, but it will save life.

Mr. RICHES: When seat belts were first introduced into this State I was not convinced that they would be effective. However, experience has revealed that lives can be saved if seat belts are installed in a vehicle and are worn. Last Friday a car overturned in my district and the passenger seated next to the driver was killed. All other passengers escaped. Had the deceased passenger been wearing a seat belt, he probably would have survived. I support the motion. I assume that the member for Mitcham has canvassed the possibilities arising from his motion. It could mean the end of his Bill, because the Legislative Council does not have to agree to a conference. I have had experience before when this Committee has insisted on legislation and the Legislative Council has adjourned it to the distant future so that it could not become law. I assume that the member for Mitcham has reason to believe that if we insist on the legislation there is every chance that the Legislative Council will agree to a conference. I point out that this is a power resident in the Legislative Council. It is a power that I contend should not exist. It is a situation that members of this Chamber will meet increasingly in future.

Mr. CORCORAN: I support the motion. The amendments render the Bill useless. No advantage will be gained from making it compulsory for manufacturers to install anchorages for seat belts in cars. This is already done in 95 per cent of cases. The compulsory installation of seat belts will be a means of educating people to their use and will consequently result in the saving of life. No-one can estimate how many lives can be saved, but if one life is saved the Bill will have served its purpose. I wonder whether the Legislative Council would have treated this Bill as it did had it been a Government Bill. I think that the Council has been most unfair to the member for Mitcham, because its amendments have rendered his legislation useless.

Mr. CLARK: I did not speak during the second reading debate but this afternoon I indicate my support for the member for Mitcham in this matter. The Legislative Council apparently has gone to some trouble in an endeavour to render this Bill completely innocuous. In my opinion, it has made completely idiotic amendments that we cannot possibly accept.

Amendments disagreed to.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments render the Bill nugatory.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 19. Page 1790.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I listened with interest to the second reading explanation and I have compared the Bill with the principal Act. I inquired of the organization concerned, and from the information I received it is obvious that there is complete agreement between that organization and the Government in the matter. I am pleased to see that the people who will now become eligible for registration will have the chance to prove that they are competent people. I support the second reading.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I support the Bill. I compliment the Physiotherapists Board of South Australia on a refreshing bigness in its approach to this matter. Many migrants have come to Australia in recent decades, and they have played a most important part in the development of our country since soon after the end of the Second World War. I understand that about 47 out of every 100 of our work force at present are newcomers to our shores. To have a complete prohibition placed on those who are qualified in physiotherapy, as has been the case, was, in my opinion, rather hard, and to see now that there is to be a discretionary power to the board to register migrant physiotherapists under certain conditions is very good indeed.

These provisions in the Bill are the recommendations of the board. If the board is satisfied that the migrant is qualified as a physiotherapist in a foreign country, that he is competent to practise physiotherapy in this State, and that he is of good character and has an adequate understanding of English, he may be registered here as a physiotherapist. That is a satisfactory approach to a difficult problem, and one that I think will operate

happily for many newcomers to our shores in that their qualifications in overseas countries, if they match up to the requirements of this State, may be considered for registration.

This is a move in the right direction, for it acknowledges the qualifications of certain people under certain conditions. It also acknowledges that we are now prepared to enable certain people who have given qualifications to be of service to their present generation. As the numbers of migrants to this country have been so great, so have the demands on our professional men been equally rising with the rise in populaion. These qualified men coming to us as migrants are being enabled in some instances to play their part in the community and to serve their fellow migrants. The children of these migrants will pass through our schools and universities and will themselves become qualified to practise this and other professions. I stress that this is a most admirable approach towards the matter and that it reflects great credit on the Physiotherapists Board of South Australia because it is acknowledging certain things in a human way, which is good to note.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Bill. I pay a tribute to the work carried out by physiotherapists as a body. However, one or two complaints have been voiced to me about some practices engaged in by people who set up not necessarily as physiotherapists but under some other closely allied names: I think some call themselves manipulators. Others class themselves as chiropractors, or osteopaths, or some other name. I know that these people cannot be known as physiotherapists. Under this Act, certain regulations prescribe examinations and the process of determining eligibility for registration. I make the plea that greater policing of the regulations be carried out, not only under the Physiotherapists Act but under the other allied Acts, to see that practitioners in this art are duly qualified and that their equipment is first-rate, because complaints have been made to me by people who have suffered as a result of receiving attention from the type of people we can only call "quacks". While I have the highest regard for the genuine physiotherapist, I make the plea that the regulations be rigidly enforced to ensure that only first-rate practitioners are allowed to engage in this work.

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

MARINE STORES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 13. Page 1671.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the Bill, which is rather different from what has always been contained in the principal Act; it ventures into a new branch. In explaining the measure, the Minister said:

> For some time Sunday Schools, the Returned Servicemen's League and boy scouts have been raising funds by collecting and selling bottles. These bottle drives are illegal under existing legislation.

From that it can be seen that this Bill is to legalize something which is already going on and which has been going on, as we all know, for a considerable time. Usually, particularly in the last stages of a session, a second reading explanation is more illuminating than a Bill, as we have not as much time to apply ourselves to a Bill as we have to a second reading explanation. On this occasion the second reading explanation was necessarily brief, but the Bill is unusually clear. New section 7a(1) provides:

> The Commissioner of Police may grant to a person society body or association a licence for the collection of glass bottles, if the Commissioner is satisfied that the person society body or association proposes to apply the proceeds of the collection—
>
> (*a*) for the promotion of religious teaching or for a purpose conducive to religious worship or the advancement of religion;
>
> (*b*) for affording relief to diseased sick infirm incurable poor destitute helpless or unemployed persons or to the dependants of any such persons;
>
> (*c*) for the relief of distress occasioned by war;
>
> (*d*) for affording relief assistance or support to persons who are or have been members of Her Majesty's naval military or air forces or to the dependants of any such person; or
>
> (*e*) for the promotion of the objects of the boy scouts association the girl guides association or other like youth organization approved by the Chief Secretary.

New section 7a(2) provides that a licence under subsection (1) shall be issued without fee, and I thoroughly approve of that. It also provides that a licence issued under new subsection (1) may be issued for such period and subject to such conditions relating to the time and locality of the collection or any other matters as the Commissioner thinks fit, which is important. Another important point is contained in clause 4. This is a complicated subject: there are marine store collectors and marine store dealers.

There is a hierarchy. Marine store dealers are one grade up the ladder from marine store collectors, so clause 4 enacts a new subsection (2) to section 14, which merely provides that it shall no longer be an offence for a marine store dealer to purchase, provided that the licence is all right, bottles from a person under the age of 16 years.

I thoroughly support the Bill. I believe it has proven to be a way in which charities, particularly boy scouts and girl guides, can be helped to raise money without begging for it. I think, too, that it is a good lesson for them that they always have to work to earn money. However, I sound a warning that when this Bill becomes law it will impose a tremendous responsibility on people in charge of girl guides and boy scouts. I think any member can envisage a boy scout or a girl guide going to a front door and saying, "Can I collect your bottles, mister?" The householder will say, "Yes, any time you like." I think on every occasion he or she should have to knock on the front door and get permission, as members can visualize the position in which they may be placed at times. The original Act, of course, stipulates the front door.

Another thing involved in this measure is that under the principal Act there is a 5s. licence fee for licensed marine store collectors as we know them today. Recently I was approached by several marine store collectors in my district who said that the licence fee was not high enough. That is the first time in the many wearisome years I have been in this House that anybody has come to me and has said that a licence fee is not high enough! They wanted it increased to keep the riff-raff out of the profession. They were complaining that they ran a considerable risk from day to day of being picked up in possession of stolen goods. I understand that brass and copper are very valuable these days and that apparently some members of their profession are not as honourable as the more respectable members of the profession would like them to be, which is why they wanted the fee raised from 5s. to £1. It will be unfortunate if these gentlemen should suffer, but I do not think so many specialize in bottles these days. Collectors rather concentrate on the more lucrative objects such as batteries, brass and copper. Having regard to the important issues involved, I support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I appreciate the minor amendment to this Act which, perhaps in some way, emanated from questions I asked about a youth club in my district with which I am connected. This club has raised considerable sums to build a new club house and this project will be completed shortly. I suggest that this would not be an isolated instance because many members have experienced the same problem. The boys had collected money for a worthwhile project only to find that they were subject to prosecution. This Bill will correct many anomalies and, as the member for Enfield correctly said, the bodies concerned will appreciate the importance of conducting themselves correctly in return for the introduction of this Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Collections of bottles for religious, charitable and other purposes."

Mr. NANKIVELL: I move:

In subsection (1) (*e*) to strike out "like youth".

This amendment will allow other organizations such as school welfare clubs, parents and friends associations and progress associations in certain districts to conduct bottle drives to raise funds for community purposes.

Mr. Shannon: And emergency fire services too!

Mr. NANKIVELL: Yes. I understand that one is located at Bridgewater, and there are others. This amendment will legalize collections by these organizations.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I support the amendment, which will allow organizations like the Apex Club to collect bottles to raise funds for charitable work. Members of the Apex Club at Hamley Bridge have twice spoken to me about this matter, claiming that the district of Hamley Bridge would be a rewarding field for bottle collection. These gentlemen will appreciate this amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (4 and 5) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 19. Page 1786.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): In accordance with section 9 of the principal Act, there are three scales of contributions by members (£72, £100, or £150 a year) towards the Parliamentary

Superannuation Fund. The minimum qualifying period is 10 years and benefits are in proportion to the contributions paid. Even though there are three schedules of contributions, practically all members contribute at the rate of £150 a year, and thus it is only necessary for me to discuss this schedule, for all alterations made by the Bill retain the existing relationships between the various schedules. Under the principal Act, a member is eligible for a pension of £585 a year after 10 years of service, increasing by £45 a year up to 18 years of service, and then by £45 for each three years of service after that, culminating in a maximum pension of £1,125 a year after 30 years of service.

The major alteration proposed by the Bill increases the contributions by one-third, namely to £200 a year, fixing the minimum qualifying period at nine years instead of 10 years at a reduced benefit and increasing all benefits by one-third with a maximum of £1,500 a year, but as under the existing schedules the maximum superannuation is not available until a member has completed 30 years of service. Three decades is a long time for any member to serve in a Parliament. I know of four serving members who can claim that. In 30 years a member would pay £6,000 to the scheme, and at current rates of interest this would accumulate to well over £12,000 in that period; therefore, the benefits payable cannot be considered over-generous.

The other amendments include provision for reduced contributions from female members. I notice that their contributions are to be two-thirds of the rate of the male members because their dependants and widowers are not covered by this superannuation scheme. The superannuation scheme as amended by clause 7 recognizes that a member must regard Parliament as a lifetime career, for any member over 65 years of age is permitted to retire on a pension at any time provided that he has served the minimum qualifying period of nine years. A member under 65 years of age must be prepared to satisfy a judge that he has good and sufficient reasons for resigning if he has served fewer than 18 years. The member under 50 years of age does not become eligible for a pension at all except for health reasons. His widow benefits in the event of his death prior to that age. However, he may elect to receive a refund of his contributions if he does not want to wait until he is 50 years of age before receiving his pension payments. The rate immediately payable to a widow of a member who had died prior to attaining 50 years of age is laid down in clause 8 (*b*) as equal to three-quarters of the rate that would have been payable to the member. This is a desirable provision of the Bill for it ensures that a young member's family is properly catered for financially in the event of his unexpected death.

My major disappointment with this Bill is that no automatic provision is made for decreasing money values. It should not be difficult to introduce such a measure because in Tasmania and Victoria the pensions are related to the basic wage. Similar provision should be made here. At present, when the value of money falls, ex-members of Parliament and widows find that their superannuation pensions are not suitably adjusted unless a special amendment is made to the principal Act. I believe the adjustment should be automatic, which it would be if the pension were related to the basic wage. The weakness I have just referred to is apparent in the present Bill, because no provision has been made to increase the superannuation payments to persons already receiving benefits, nor is there any provision for members' widows, who are already in receipt of pensions, to receive an appropriate adjustment. I believe there is a need to review this legislation and whilst I am prepared to support the second reading I urge the Premier to refer to the joint committee the information I supplied privately to him after his second reading explanation as well as my remarks today, particularly concerning former members and widows of former members.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I support this Bill with which members generally agree. However, I want to speak on one particular aspect and to raise various points in support of my contention. It will be necessary for me to speak from a woman's viewpoint as well as from the viewpoint of a member of Parliament. In examining this aspect of the legislation we must recognize that advances have been made in this State in recent years so far as women assuming public office are concerned. The attitude of most thinking people is that this is good for the community. I was most interested in reading and in hearing yesterday some of the remarks that the Minister of Education made about women. On Monday, when he was speaking in support of the only woman candidate in this State in the Commonwealth election, he had much to say on the subject. We

all know that the Minister has been a champion of women's rights in South Australia, and that in his own department he has advanced women to positions of high authority. As he himself says, and as we as members know, they have held these positions with great distinction and have carried out their duties as responsible officers. At the Glenelg meeting on Monday the Minister said:

I have repeatedly and publicly called attention to the fact that in no other democratic country in the world have women been given fewer opportunities to fill public positions than in Australia, and that, in this respect, until recent years no other State has been more backward than our own. Fortunately the position is being slowly remedied in this State where we now have a woman in each House of Parliament.

He then referred to the fact that he, as Minister of Education, had been able to avail himself of the opportunity of appointing women to some of the highest and most responsible administrative and teaching positions in the Education Department. The work of these women had compared so favourably with that of their male counterparts that their appointments had proved a conspicuous success and a notable contribution to the cause of education.

I realize that no member regards me as a feminist in the true sense of the word, because I am definitely not, but I do have a woman's axe to grind in this matter of superannuation, though I hasten to assure the House that it is not a personal axe. I support the Bill generally, but I believe it discriminates against women members of Parliament in their contributions to the superannuation fund and in the benefits that they derive from it. The principle is wrong because it makes a distinction between men and women members of this Parliament. We are members of Parliament. We are paid the same salaries. We obtain the same insurance cover and enjoy the same terms. In the original legislation we received the same pension, and we will in this legislation. In return, of course, we accept the same responsibilities and the same obligations. We enjoy the same privileges, which is the correct situation. During the five years that the two women members have been in this Parliament they have paid exactly the same contributions as male members; so why are we to be granted the concession whereby we will pay two-thirds only of the contribution that male members pay? I am emphatic that we have not sought, nor do we want this concession. We are content to pay exactly the same contribution as male members because in every respect we are also members of the South Australian Parliament. It has been pointed out that the superannuation provisions relating to the Public Service do not provide the same benefits for women as they do for men. But, Mr. Deputy Speaker, this is a Parliamentary pension Bill, and to my way of thinking it is in no way related to the Public Service. We are a peculiar and a separate section of the community, and this Bill applies to us specifically. Why should we in any way be compared with those who receive their benefits under the Superannuation Act. I have heard the Premier say on occasions that he does not want confusion between the provisions of these two Acts.

Another point that arises from this is that as members of Parliament we do not have a permanent tenure of office as members, not like those members of the Public Service who, of course, go into the service as young men and young women and are able to take out the number of units that they want and who as they advance in the service can take out more units comparable with the salary that they receive. Ours is a very different situation, as we all know. We are appointed for three years at each election, and there is nothing permanent about our tenure of a seat in this Parliament.

To support my case I should like to give members a hypothetical instance. We know that we are getting more and more young members in this House, and I think that this is likely to be the pattern of things in the years to come. It is quite possible that we will get younger women members, and these women, of course, may have husbands in the same age group and they may have families. The woman is serving as a member in this House, and becomes eligible for a pension, having served the required number of years. Her husband may meet with a serious accident and be completely invalided as a result—he may even be eligible for an invalid pension. She, of course, supports him and the family, if they have one, quite considerably, and in this way she supplements the invalid pension or whatever other payment he might be receiving. What happens when that woman member dies? Her spouse's source of income is cut off, and he could become a charge on the State.

The point I make is that at present the benefit which a woman member receives is purely relating to the pension which she herself is eligible to receive after nine years' service in this place. Under the benefits provided in either the original Act or in this Bill

she does not become eligible for the benefits to be paid (which would be paid in the case of a male member) to her spouse in the event of her decease, and this to me is a discrimination. I do not think there is any likelihood, in the foreseeable future anyway, that there will be such an overwhelming number of women members in this House that they will become an embarrassment to the Treasury if such a hypothetical case as I have just quoted should occur. I know that a number of members in this House see eye to eye with me on this point, and I hope that the Government will have another look at the clauses which, as they are at present written into the Bill before the House, most definitely discriminate against women members of Parliament. With those few remarks, I support the Bill.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I commend the member for Burnside for her approach to this matter. There is not the slightest shadow of doubt that women members are in exactly the same category as a man who is elected to Parliament. Women members are called upon to perform the same functions for their constituents as are male members. I was pleased to hear from the honourable member that women members do not want any discrimination in their contributions to the fund.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: They do not want to be regarded as second-class citizens.

Mr. SHANNON: In fact, no-one has any right to regard them as such, and certainly their constituents do not so regard them: they regard them as being the equal of any male member of Parliament. Obviously, it is not in keeping with the status of a member of Parliament that there should be any differentiation in this matter. We are providing that these women members are not to enjoy all the benefits of superannuation, even though they can be paying into the fund for any number of years, and certainly for long past the qualifying periods that are specified. If they should die, their spouses will get nothing out of the wreck, and their contributions become a straightout profit to the fund.

I believe that every male member of Parliament is interested in making sure that his widow is cared for and that she has sufficient money not to have to worry about the weekly accounts. I believe that, more than anything else, is the guiding principle with practically every member of Parliament, and I do not see why it should not be the guiding principle in the suppositious case the member for Burnside mentioned. Such a happening may not be so unlikely as the honourable member suggested. I do not think the human race makes any distinction between the sexes as to what will happen regarding their physical condition; and it is easy for a man to fall by the wayside and not be in a sufficiently healthy state to earn a living. He may then have to depend upon his wife to look after him. That is not an uncommon occurrence, and I think that society can give many records of such things happening.

As the member for Burnside has pointed out, the women members are willing to accept the full responsibility for the payment of contributions. I think that they should do that. The members who comprised the joint committee in this matter are highly qualified in their spheres, but with all due deference to them I think that there are certain anomalies in this matter. I think the amendment regarding the qualifying period of nine years was a proper amendment to make. At the end of the ninth year, members qualify for a pension of £720. I have looked closely at the question of contributions, and I have made some calculations on a 5 per cent compound interest basis. After all, as money is paid into the fund it is invested and is interest-earning from the time it is received. I am a trustee of a similar scheme, the funds of which are provided by the employer and employee and are immediately invested. I think it is right to have regard to the compound interest. I have based my calculations on an interest rate of 5 per cent because it was simple to calculate and my mental arithmetic was not good enough to enable me to calculate on the basis of 4½ per cent or 4¼ per cent, or whatever the rate may be, so if members want to water down my figures they can do so. However, these figures give a comparative approach to the problem, and they will give members something to think about. At the end of the ninth year a member who qualifies for a £720 pension has, by contributing £200 each year, accrued a credit of £2,310 in the fund. If that is divided by the £720 he will draw each year, it shows that it will take just over three years to draw out all that he has put in. If that member remains a member for another nine years, another £2,310 accrues to his credit in the fund, which must be added to the £2,310 which has not been drawn and which, with accumulated interest, has grown to £3,620, so his credit at that stage in the fund is £5,930. By virtue of the £60 accretion in the next nine years added to his entitlement, he then draws

£1,260 a year after the eighteenth year. If that is divided into £5,930, it can be seen that it takes about five years for him to draw out the money to his credit in the fund. Members will notice that it is progressive—three years for nine years' service, and eight years for 18 years' service.

It takes 30 years to qualify for the full entitlement of £1,500 and, although my calculations may not be correct to within £10 or £20, I have estimated that the sum to a members' credit at the end of 30 years would be about £13,530. At the rate of £1,500 a year pension, it would take this member nine years to draw out the money standing to his credit at the date of his retirement after 30 years of service.

Mr. Jennings: If he served 30 years; but he would be lucky to live that long, wouldn't he?

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member anticipated me. The people likely to draw the maximum benefits under the scheme are the ones most likely to draw them for the shortest time and the most unlikely to draw the funds accumulated for their benefit over their 30 years of service. They would be considerably over the average expectation of life, which is a well-known figure. I offer the criticism to the propounders of the scheme that it appears that the £720 a year drawn after nine years' service is by far the best ratio offering. If a person is making a business of being a member of Parliament he should retire after nine years, as that is the most profitable time for him to retire. The second most profitable time is at the end of 18 years; thereafter a member is a definite loser. It takes three years from the 18th year to accumulate £60 additional superannuation. Why the promoters of the scheme decided that when members had served for 18 years they should suddenly stretch the period from one year to three years for a further £60 benefit baffles me.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: There is no rhyme or reason to it.

Mr. SHANNON: No, it baffles me. If the fund is likely to run into difficulties because it is not properly founded or it is actuarially unsound, let us know about it. Based on the assumptions I have worked out, I believe that the fund is most unlikely ever to get into financial difficulties. It may conceivably be able to afford some of the ameliorations suggested by the Leader to people who through bad luck die before some of the benefits, which now accrue to members, become available and whose widows are having a lean time. I am aware of them, and the Leader has mentioned a few. If this fund can carry that extra burden, I shall not object to my contribution being used, in part, to make good the deficiency. I am not an actuary, but if this fund is left as it stands it appears to me that the long-service people who see out the distance here and give 20 or 25 years' service to Parliament will be big contributors to the fund. I am not complaining—how can I? My own personal position is not varied one *iota* by one suggestion I could make. I already have 30 years of service behind me, so I have no axe to grind. However, for young men coming into the fund we should have a basis that is as equitable as possible. I have some reservations about whether we have done the right thing in stepping up the amount at the end of the ninth year. I think people serving only nine years are perhaps getting a better benefit from the fund than they are entitled to get. I cannot work out why it is not better than it is at the end of 18 years. If there is some valid reason and an actuary can show me that I am wrong I shall be happy to listen to him. My calculations, of course, omit the amount of the Government subsidy to the fund; I deal with members' contributions solely.

I support the Bill. I think fundamentally the principle of superannuation is sound, particularly if it is based on what is the usual custom in industry and commerce—that the individual pays his share and the employer subsidizes what the individual puts in. This is the basis of the scheme we are now discussing.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): Superannuation was a matter in which I took no interest when I first came into this House. At that time it appeared as though it would be 25 years before I could possibly draw anything and I had no dependants. It is remarkable, as I have found and no doubt other members have too, how a change in one's circumstances changes one's outlook on this matter. I am becoming sere and yellow in the service of this Parliament.

Mr. Shannon: And those annual problems have arisen too!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As the time draws nearer to my being qualified for superannuation benefits if I should be dismissed for any reason from this House, and as I have added to my dependants of one kind or another, I have become interested in this subject. I was concerned with the remarks of the member for Onkaparinga. What he said would be a good reason for my retirement at the end of

this Parliament, because by so doing I would get as much out of this scheme as I can. However, Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I shall not do that voluntarily. The member for Burnside spoke about a matter of principle when she said that we strive to attain equality between the sexes. I believe that this is not always possible to attain in the nature of things, but unless it is impossible to achieve I believe there should be equality between men and women. I have yet to be convinced that it is impossible to attain equality in this question of Parliamentary superannuation. I am open to conviction but have not been convinced, and this time I agree with the remarks made by the member for Burnside regarding the position of women members of Parliament.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I listened with much interest to the various matters suggested by honourable members, and I accede to the general request made by the Leader to refer certain matters back to the committee for further consideration. I know some of the difficulties associated with this matter. In the first place, no data can be used by the actuary as a basis for a Parliamentary superannuation scheme because no statistics that I know of can be logically applied to a superannuation scheme for members of Parliament. They do not depend on statistics relating to the length of life or things of that nature. The vagaries of politics must be considered, and I believe that in all the circumstances it is easy for a scheme to have what are apparent anomalies and possible future anomalies. I suggest that no departure be made at this stage from the committee's recommendations, but that members' suggestions be referred back to the committee for further consideration.

This scheme was drawn up on the basis that a member would provide 50 per cent and the State would provide (as it does in other superannuation schemes) the remaining 50 per cent. Since the inception of this scheme there has been throughout Australia a complete alteration in the ratio of the amounts provided by the employee and the employer. I believe that at present the ratio in Australia is officially 60 per cent to be provided by the Government and 40 per cent by the employee, but because of concessions given by Parliament from time to time, many of which have been made retrospective without involving complete retrospectivity for payments, the amount at present provided by the Government in the ordinary Public Service superannuation scheme would probably be about 75 per cent compared with 25 per cent provided by the public servant. A few years ago over 80 per cent was provided by the Government and 20 per cent by the employee. Because of the concessions that have been provided, in theory it probably works out at a 60:40 proportion. The Parliamentary scheme is calculated on the assumption that 50 per cent of the payment would come from members with the remaining 50 per cent being provided by the Government. Honourable members may be surprised to hear that, although our fund has assumed significant proportions, I, as Treasurer, have a certificate provided to me periodically informing me that the fund has to have a supplementary payment to keep it solvent.

Mr. Shannon: That is interesting. How did they work it out when there was no such thing as a basis for Parliamentary superannuation computations?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Public Actuary worked it out. I point out to honourable members it is worked out on a basis in which previous experience cannot be considered.

Mr. Shannon: That is so. I wondered what yardstick was used.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The experience of the New South Wales Parliament cannot be compared with that in South Australia or *vice versa*. Much depends on factors that cannot be considered at all. In general terms, the Parliamentary superannuation scheme in this State has provided fewer benefits to members than the benefits provided by other States. On the other hand, it has provided for rather lower contributions by members than apply in other States. The general comment made by the member for Onkaparinga is probably correct. The scheme becomes less attractive in the return to the member the longer he is in Parliament. However, I dispute his figures as they show only half the picture. If the Government's contribution is considered, it would be impossible for a member with more than 18 years' service to receive the amount of the payments he makes into the fund plus the corresponding contribution from the Government unless he does what I warn honourable members against doing, that is, remarry. His widow might be able then, if she were sufficiently young, to collect the contributions he had made. I assure members that I will refer to the joint committee the various points raised during this debate. If members have other questions that they want referred back

and they supply them in writing I shall see that they are included in the reference. The Leader of the Opposition has already submitted his questions in writing.

Mr. Shannon: Mine will be in *Hansard.*

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Any matters in *Hansard* will automatically go to the joint committee, so the members for Burnside and Onkaparinga need not commit their questions to writing. It is more desirable to refer questions to the joint committee than for us to amend this legislation. Such action might be misunderstood by the public, particularly as the amendments would not have been recommended by the tribunal appointed to examine the position. I thank members for their constructive remarks and I commend the second reading.

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

OPTICIANS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal amendments effected by this Bill are contained in clause 3 (which inserts new sections 16a and 16b into the principal Act) and clause 4. New section 16a confers minor disciplinary powers on the Board of Optical Registration. Under section 16 of the principal Act the board has power to temporarily suspend opticians or to remove their names from the register. However, it is felt that these penalties might be too severe in most cases of unprofessional conduct and the new section therefore provides that if in the opinion of the board an optician is guilty of unprofessional conduct the board may censure him, impose a fine not exceeding £50 or require an undertaking to abstain in the the future from the conduct complained of. Under new section 16b the board is required (in the case of a complaint under the new section or under the existing provisions of the principal Act) to hold a full inquiry and to act in accordance with established legal procedure before determining the complaint. Under new section 16b (2) the board may require the attendance of and examine any person on oath. Subsection (3) is a consequential provision relating to subpoenas.

Clause 4 amends section 19 of the principal Act to provide that all moneys received by the board can be expended by it on the administration of the Act and for optometrical education, training and research. At present the board can retain only up to £150 a year for the administration of the Act, the remainder being paid to the Treasury. The total amount of moneys received by the board is little more than £300 each year.

The amendment of section 23 effected by clause 5 will allow registration fees for opticians and licence fees for spectacle sellers to be prescribed from time to time instead of being fixed by the principal Act which necessitates amendments to take account of changes in money values. Clause 6 is in the nature of a drafting amendment. At present regulations can be made "deciding" the conditions under which names may be removed from the register and it is proposed to substitute "defining" for "deciding" as a more appropriate word. Clause 7 raises the penalties provided for by the principal Act by approximately 100 per cent. The penalties were fixed 30 or 40 years ago.

Later:

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the Bill. Whilst I have not had much time to consider its provisions, I realize that it is an important measure. I have not overlooked the importance of this profession and have made several inquiries that have indicated that the profession is happy with this Bill which improves the principal Act. The Board of Optical Registration will be provided with disciplinary powers over its members. It will be enabled to conduct inquiries in accordance with court procedure. At present the board can retain up to £150 a year for administrative purposes, the remainder of its revenue being paid into the Treasury. The Bill enables the board to spend additional money in its interests. If any member is accused of unprofessional conduct the board will be able to conduct an inquiry and, in the case of a minor offence, will be able to use discretionary powers and reprimand a member. The Bill was thoroughly considered in the Legislative Council where amendments were made. One provision that was questioned concerned increasing the penalties by 100 per cent. As the original penalties were fixed about 30 to 40 years ago and money values have changed considerably since then, the proposed penalties are not excessive. The Bill will benefit the profession and protect the interests of the public.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the second reading of this Bill which will have the effect of raising the standard of opticians and of their professional conduct. This is extremely important because the treatment of people's eyes is involved. Two sections of professional

men are concerned—opticians, or optometrists as we know them, and the qualified medical practitioner who specializes as an opthalmologist. Not every person can afford to go to a specialist, nor is it necessary in all cases. This Bill will result in a raising of the standard of the opticians' profession. A person who needs testing for spectacles, and who seeks a prescription for spectacles, will be able to go to a reputable professional man without the need of visiting a specialist and paying a high fee. The Bill safeguards the public and I support it.

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

BUSINESS NAMES BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 5 (clause 1)—Leave out "1962" and insert "1963".

No. 2. Page 12, lines 9 to 25 (clause 12)—Leave out paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) and insert new paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) as follows:

(*a*) a business name is deemed to be registered under this Act and the person deemed to be the resident agent for the purposes of this Act of the person or persons in relation to whom the name is deemed to be registered ceases to be authorized to accept service on behalf of such person or persons of any notices or of any process; or

(*b*) a business name is registered under this Act and the person appointed the resident agent for the purposes of this Act of the person or persons in relation to whom the name is registered ceases to be the resident agent of such person or persons,

No. 3. Page 20, line 12 (clause 25)—After "registered" insert "or any record kept".

No. 4. Page 20, line 16 (clause 25)—After "registered" insert "or the record was kept".

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): Mr. Chairman, four amendments have been made to this Bill. Amendment No. 1 brings the short title of the Bill up to date. Members will recall that the Bill was introduced and passed in this Chamber in 1962 but was revived in the Legislative Council this year. This amendment, therefore, is merely consequential. Amendment No. 2 is purely a drafting amendment. It does not alter the wording of the subclause, but only relates to the setting out of the paragraphing of the subclause. By eliminating the subparagraph designations (i) and (ii) appearing in paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*), the meaning of the subclause is clarified. Amendments Nos. 3 and 4 are related to each other. In its original form, clause 25 empowered the Registrar to dispose of only statements and notices lodged with him in respect of business names where the registration had not been in force for 12 years. These amendments will extend that power to other records kept by him in the files relating to such business names where the retention of those records for more than 12 years would be necessary.

Amendments agreed to.

SCAFFOLDING INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendment:

Page 1, line 22 (clause 3)—After "Salisbury" insert "and Elizabeth".

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): This amendment merely alters the reference to the district council district of Salisbury, which is now known as the district council district of Salisbury and Elizabeth.

Amendment agreed to.

ELDER SMITH & CO. LIMITED PROVIDENT FUNDS BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1254.)

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the Bill, which confers on employees of Elder Smith & Co. Limited the privileges which they have already paid for anyway but which have become rather embarrassing and so have to be brought into order by an Act of Parliament. This has happened because of the newest venture in free and unrestricted private enterprise: the amalgamation of Goldsbrough Mort and Elder Smith & Co. Limited. This Bill came from another place where it had been referred to a Select Committee. The Select Committee recommended the Bill, and I am a great believer, Sir, in paying great respect to the decisions of a Select Committee when I agree with those decisions. Consequently, I do not think I need say any more than that I support the Bill.

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

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1255.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I support the Bill, the principal object of which is to provide for the division of the practice of mental nursing into psychiatric nursing and mental deficiency nursing. This surely must

lead to an improvement in the training of nurses in this field and raise the status of these nurses. Nurses engaged in this field do not enjoy the glamour, if any, associated with nursing in other fields. I believe a tribute should be paid to those who pursue this vocation, as they make many sacrifices and have to be equipped in a certain way to carry out their job efficiently. The Director of Mental Health (Dr. Cramond) has drawn the attention of the Government to the inadequacy of the present training, and I think he is to be commended. Since being appointed, he has obviously made many changes and has taken whatever steps he can to improve services to the mentally ill. It is extremely important to remember that they are no different from people suffering from other illnesses and that they must be cared for in the best possible way. I believe Dr. Cramond is well-equipped to see that the purpose of this Bill is achieved, and that he will do everything possible to see that it is achieved as soon as practicable.

I am concerned about the shortage of nurses generally. From figures I have obtained, I have ascertained that on September 1 of this year country hospitals were 63 trained nurses and 183 trainee nurses short of requirements. City hospitals have a waiting list of two or three years of girls wanting to become nurses, but it does not seem possible to obtain the staff necessary for country hospitals to operate efficiently. I believe several factors are involved, one of which is that most nurses during their training are required to attend lectures in their own time. I do not think this is reasonable. This is a demanding profession and, if a girl wants to enter it, every facility should be made available to her to train in the hospital's time. It is not reasonable to expect her, after she has finished her normal day's work, to attend lectures or return to the hospital and make up the time lost.

No doubt the training of nurses has advanced over the years. Possibly no comparison could be made between the training required 20 years ago and that required now. Although nurses do not specialize in any field, they must have good general knowledge of most of the things now applied in medicine. These are not easy to assimilate and as a result, apart from attending lectures in their own time, they must spend much of their time on individual study. When they graduate after three or four years of solid and concentrated training, the remuneration they receive is not all it could be; in fact, in some large hospitals the typist in the office receives more than a trained nursing sister. Although the typist would earn her remuneration, it is only reasonable to expect that a trained sister, who has undergone strict training and has been subjected to much regimentation during her training to prove her worth in this field, will be paid accordingly. I am pleased that the need has been noticed and that steps have been taken to create the division in the training of mental nurses, and I am sure this division will be successful.

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

SECOND-HAND DEALERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 24. Page 1256.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading. Apparently under the principal Act there is no reference to companies and thus there is inadequate machinery for local courts to supervise and license all classes of second-hand dealers. Certain minor amendments were made to section 6 of the principal Act in 1958, dealing with the submission of character references by applicants for second-hand dealers' licences. It was found in practice that in some cases it was extremely difficult for applicants to comply with the stringent conditions of the Act which tended to become unworkable. Except for the substantial increases in penalties for infringement of the Act as provided by clause 12, I believe that this Bill is similar to the earlier amendments in that they may be classed as machinery amendments aimed at making the implementation of the Act easier for the local courts.

The principal Act envisages an individual person operating as a second-hand dealer whereas today many companies are operating in this field. The used car organizations would come within this category, and they should be subject to supervision in accordance with the provisions of this Act. Even though the bulk of the people who trade in second-hand goods are reputable and responsible people within our community, this industry seems to attract a number of persons who are prepared to stoop to sharp practices. In other fields of commerce and trade, it has been members' sad experience in recent years that some companies also are not exempt from stooping to doubtful practices. Therefore, there should be no doubt that a business trading in second-hand goods whether it is a private person, a partnership, or a company, will be subject to control of

the present Act. This is provided for in section 6 of the principal Act, together with the enactment by this Bill of two new sections 6 (*a*) and 6 (*b*).

Clause 6 is a consequential amendment setting out the terms and conditions under which the local court may or may not grant a licence to a person or a company. Regarding a company licence, a court must satisfy itself that the manager or person substantially in control of the company is a fit and proper person to carry on the business of a second-hand dealer. Clause 7 lays down the procedure to be adopted in the event of the manager of the company carrying on the business of a second-hand dealer being changed. It is necessary for the company to notify the clerk of the court and the Commissioner of Police within 14 days and to nominate the name of another person to be the new manager. The penalty for non-compliance with this clause is £50. Clause 8 is another consequential amendment dealing with the revocation of licences of partnerships and companies for infringement of the Act.

In accordance with the provisions of clause 9, a partnership is only obliged to pay a licence fee as though it were granted to an individual person and is not obliged to pay a fee for each partner. For a company, only the manager or a similar person nominated pays the fee: it is a reasonable approach that under a partnership only one fee should be payable. Clause 10 sets out how the names of second-hand dealers, whether they are private persons, partnerships or companies, are to be shown on their premises, and clause 11 empowers the Governor to make regulations relating to partnerships and companies, and thus these are further consequential amendments. Clause 12 relates to various penalties for infringement of the Act that have been substantially increased, and I understand that the majority of these were fixed in 1919. To make allowance for depreciated money values, perhaps some increases in the monetary penalties are in order. However, I am completely at a loss to understand how lengths of prison terms have become less onerous since 1919, and I am concerned particularly about the amendments proposed to sections 32 and 33 where imprisonment penalties have been increased from three months to six months in both instances. This cannot be on account of changed values, and I should appreciate some explanation from the Government as to why it has been found necessary to double these imprisonment penalties. If a person is convicted and a penalty imposed, whether for the first or subsequent offence, will we improve the position by increasing the term of imprisonment? I maintain that we will not, because although the fine is increased there is no reason why the imprisonment period should be increased from three to six months. In many cases before the courts a fine is imposed, and part of the penalty is a term of imprisonment. How can we rehabilitate a person in gaol? I understand that if a person has three or more months' sentence to serve he has to go to Yatala Labour Prison and not to the Adelaide Gaol. If a person is fined and given a gaol sentence, how can he find the money to pay the fine when he comes out of gaol: he has to find a job before he is able to pay it. Why fine him and impose imprisonment upon him as well? Another difficulty arises for him after serving six months imprisonment, because he finds it almost impossible to secure employment once he has been imprisoned, as he is looked upon with suspicion whether it is deserved or not. After all, he has paid his debt to society and should not have to pay it again. I cannot understand the suggested increase in the gaol term. I hope that members will reconsider the term of imprisonment.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 13 passed.

Schedule.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I am concerned that it is intended to double the monetary and imprisonment penalties. I have no objection to increasing the monetary penalty, but I cannot see why the term of imprisonment should be increased from three to six months. Has the Minister an explanation?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE (Minister of Lands): These penalties were devised in 1919 when a second-hand dealer was usually a man who operated as an individual and whose business undertakings were not extensive. Today a second-hand dealer can be a huge company handling hundreds of thousands of pounds worth of equipment.

Mr. Riches: Small second-hand dealers still operate.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes. It is obvious from an examination of section 32 of the Act that the offence for which the increased penalties are provided is regarded as serious. The value of the goods involved could be considerable, and I believe that the proposal to increase the imprisonment penalty from three

months to six months is warranted. Section 33 is also amended. This section refers to a person who sells goods to a second-hand dealer. The goods could comprise a motor car or other articles of value, not merely the few pieces of brass junk visualized in 1919. One of the reasons why offences are committed today is that penalties are not sufficient to deter potential offenders. The Government has no fixed opinion on these penalties and if the Leader, the Opposition, and the Committee believe that the increased penalties are unduly severe the Government will not press for them. However, I stress that there is an urgency today for penalties to be increased to conform to the value of goods that are now handled by second-hand dealers.

Mr. Riches: Do you agree that the monetary penalty should be increased?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: It is increased, but that penalty is not under discussion.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I move:

To strike out "and 'three months' ".

I admit that false statements have been made, particularly regarding cars that have been stolen, but I think that the industry, with the assistance it has received from the police, has stamped out the most serious offences. We have provided penalties for dishonest dealings. Regarding the question of penalties generally, there seems to be a tendency for magistrates to "lay the wood on" for traffic offences and to impose maximum penalties. I do not quarrel with the monetary penalty prescribed in the Bill, but I seek the retention of the three months' maximum imprisonment provided in the original Act.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Although the Government will not seek a division on this amendment, I wish to emphasize its seriousness. It is 40 years since the present penalty was prescribed, and the circumstances are of much greater importance today. It is not our job to prescribe punitive penalties just for the sake of doing so, but the courts are constantly being criticized because of the flagrancy with which some of these offences are committed, and it has been considered that the penalties are not sufficiently heavy. Although the maximum of three months' imprisonment has stood for 40 years, the suggestion now is that we do not increase the penalty, although there are greater opportunities for committing offences and goods are more valuable. The penalty actually imposed may be only one month or one week.

Mr. Millhouse: On the other hand, if Parliament increases the maximum penalty the courts assume that we regard the offence as being more serious.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I think a penalty of six months' imprisonment is justified in some of these instances. However, the matter is in the hands of the Committee; the Government will not oppose the Leader's amendment.

Amendment carried.

Mr. FRANK WALSH moved:

To strike out "and 'six months' respectively".

Amendment carried.

Mr. FRANK WALSH moved:

To strike out "Section 33 (4)—Strike out 'three months' and insert 'six months' ".

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (POLES AND RATES).

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 4 (clause 4)—After "other" insert "similar."

No. 2. Page 2, line 13 (clause 4)—After "other" insert "similar."

No. 3. Page 2, line 29 (clause 5)—After "may" insert "after submitting plans to and consulting with the council."

No. 4. Page 2, line 34 (clause 5)—After "opinion" insert "a sufficient reason exists for the removal of."

No. 5. Page 2, lines 35 and 36 (clause 5)—After "wire" leave out "impedes or obstructs vehicular traffic."

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works): The Parliamentary Draftsman reports that these amendments are not material and do not alter the law. He says:

These amendments, in my opinion, make no difference in the substance of the provision. This is the view also of the trust's solicitor. However, some members of the Legislative Council preferred to see it made quite clear that this was the intention, and neither I nor the trust's solicitors had any hesitation in agreeing to the amendments because they do no more than remove a possible doubt.

In the circumstances, the Government asks that these amendments be accepted.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 3.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The only difference that this amendment can make is that it will require the trust, before replacing a pole, etc., that it has removed, to forward a plan to, and consult with, the council. Another

place carried this amendment by a majority and, as it is not an important alteration (or really any alteration) of the clause as drafted, except that it clarifies and emphasizes a point, the Government does not object to it; I therefore ask the Committee to agree to it.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 4 and 5.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: These amendments are similar in their purpose. The Parliamentary Draftsman reports:

The clause as drafted provides, in effect, that the trust need not remove a pole at the council's request unless the Commissioner of Highways certifies that the pole impedes or obstructs traffic. The amendments provide that the trust need not remove poles, etc., unless the Commissioner certifies that the removal is reasonable.

In the Government's view, the alteration is not of material substance; it is a question of the opinion of the Highways Commissioner about whether or not a pole impedes or obstructs (as the clause is drafted) or whether he considers that the removal is reasonable. It seems to me that the two wordings, although they have slightly different emphases, amount to much the same thing, inasmuch as the Highways Commissioner is the authority in each case, and I doubt whether he would certify that the removal of a pole was reasonable unless it did in fact impede or obstruct traffic. There seems no reason for opposing the amendments, and I ask the Committee to accept them.

Amendments agreed to.

REAL PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 18 (clause 4)—After the word "specifications" insert:

"which are in existence at the date of the mortgage or encumbrance"

No. 2. Page 2, line 27 (clause 4)—After the words "they are" insert:

"or will be"

No. 3. Page 2, line 30 (clause 4)—After the word "available" add the following words:

"or will be so available within twenty-eight days of the date of execution of such instrument"

No. 4. Page 3, line 15 (clause 5)—Leave out "such time as the Registrar-General allows" and insert:

"two months after the making of a requisition under subsection (3a) of this section:

(*a*) the Registrar-General shall give notice in writing of his intention to reject the first-mentioned instrument and any other instrument or instruments lodged subsequently thereto and dependent thereon to the person or persons lodging and to each of the parties to such instrument or instruments; and"

No. 5. Page 3, line 16 (clause 5)—Leave out "(*a*)" and insert:

"(*b*) if any such requirement is not complied with within one month after the giving of the notice under paragraph (*a*) of this subsection".

No. 6. Page 3, line 17 (clause 5)—After "and" insert "any other instrument or instruments lodged subsequently thereto and dependent thereon and"

No. 7. Page 3, line 20 (clause 5)—Leave out "(*b*)" and insert "(*c*)".

No. 8. Page 3, line 21 (clause 5)—After "forfeited" add the following proviso:

"Provided that the rejection of any instrument in pursuance of the provisions of this subsection shall not prevent the relodgement of that instrument for registration after compliance with the requisition referred to in subsection (3a) of this section.

Any instrument rejected or returned in pursuance of this subsection shall, if the party or parties deriving an estate or interest thereunder lodges a caveat to protect such estate or interest before the expiration of the period mentioned in paragraph (*b*) of this section retain the priority to registration which it would have had if it had not been rejected or returned."

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education): It would be most convenient to explain amendments Nos. 1 to 5 together, as they are of a machinery nature, designed to enable registration of a mortgage or encumbrance that refers to another collateral document where that other document will be made available in some other public registry. In its original form the Bill provided that the collateral document had to be filed in the other registry before the mortgage or encumbrance could be registered. A period is allowed of 28 days in which to file a debenture or register a bill of sale. The amendment will enable the mortgage to be lodged if it contains a reference to the fact that the collateral document will be filed within that period, if it has not already been so filed.

The remaining amendments (6 to 8) are designed to protect persons lodging documents which are rejected by the Registrar-General by requiring him to give, in effect, three months' notice before rejection and providing that, if the party affected lodges a caveat to protect his interest, his priority will not be affected if he lodged the documents again. Otherwise, an intervening party might secure an advantage.

The CHAIRMAN: Before I put the motion, I point out to the Committee that I intend to make certain alterations to the Legislative Council's amendments. These are drafting errors that I shall treat as clerical errors. Where "subsection" appears I intend to insert "para", and where "para" appears I intend to insert "subpara".

Amendments agreed to.

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.33 *to* 8 *p.m.*]

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 43, line 28 (clause 138)—Leave out "section" and insert "sections".

No. 2. Page 43, line 28 (clause 138)—After "324" insert "and 325".

No. 3. Page 43, line 28 (clause 138)—Leave out "is" and insert "are".

No. 4. Page 43, line 30 (clause 138)—After "hoist" insert "in each case".

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I ask members to agree to these amendments. They are of a drafting nature. They relate to clause 138 of the Bill, which removed the word "lift" from section 324 of the Code and inserted a reference to cranes and hoists to bring the Code into line with the Lifts Act, 1960. The similar requisite amendment to section 325 was omitted. The amendments made in the other place correct this anomaly. Members will see that there is no difference in the Bill, except that a correction of a drafting mistake has been made in another place.

Amendments agreed to.

BOOK PURCHASERS PROTECTION BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 17 (clause 4)—After "unless" insert new paragraph (*a*) as follows:

"(*a*) such contract is in writing and sets out all the terms of the contract including the total price payable; and"

No. 2. Page 1, line 18 (clause 4)—Leave out "(*a*)" and insert "(*b*)".

No. 3. Page 1, line 20 (clause 4)—Leave out "(*b*)" and insert "(*c*)".

No. 4. Page 2, line 5 (clause 4)—Leave out "(*c*)" and insert "(*d*)".

No. 5. Page 2, line 10 (clause 4)—Leave out "(*d*)" and insert "(*e*)".

No. 6. Page 2, line 16 (clause 5)—After "otherwise" insert "or deliver to the purchaser any book or books the subject matter of the contract".

No. 7. Page 2—After clause 5 insert new clause 5a as follows:

5a. A vendor or his agent shall not, during the period hereinbefore allowed by this Act for confirmation of the contract by a purchaser, solicit or otherwise attempt to obtain from such purchaser any notification under paragraph (*e*) of section 4 of this Act.

Penalty: Not exceeding one hundred pounds.

No. 8. Page 2, lines 20 to 23—Leave out clause 6.

No. 9. Page 2—Insert new clause 6 as follows:

6. This Act shall not apply to any contract when the purchaser is a person whose trade or business is that of buying and selling books.

No. 10. Page 2—After new clause 6 insert new clause 7 as follows:

7. Proceedings for offences against this Act shall be heard and determined summarily.

Consideration in Committee.

Amendments Nos. 1 *to* 5.

Mr. HALL: I ask the Committee to accept the amendments. Four main points are involved. Do you wish me to deal with each amendment separately, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member may explain each amendment separately if he wishes to.

Mr. HALL: Very well, Mr. Chairman. Amendment No. 1 inserts a new paragraph (*a*) after "unless" in clause 4. The paragraph to be inserted reads:

such contract is in writing and sets out all the terms of the contract including the total price payable; and.

With those words included the relevant part of clause 4 would read:

Every such contract shall be unenforceable against the purchaser unless:

(*a*) such contract is in writing and sets out all the terms of the contract including the total price payable;

Then follow the other re-numbered paragraphs. Amendments 2 to 5 are consequential.

Mr. SHANNON: I cannot follow this. Is it relevant whether the contract itself is in written form, typed form or printed form? The important thing is that the contract is signed by the purchaser. I believe that "writing" covers handwriting, typewriting and printing, and I cannot see much virtue in the amendment. It seems to me that somebody in another place has sought to improve upon something but, in my opinion, he has not done so. I think the words that have been inserted do not mean a thing. What is a contract? I think a contract is made when one party agrees to pay another party for something; a contract cannot be drawn unless it includes terms of payment. I

do not think the Committee is doing any good to itself by approving these amendments, as I think the Bill as it left the House of Assembly was effective and would have achieved the goal of its mover.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 6.

Mr. HALL: This is rather a significant addition, as it will prevent a salesman from going to the residence or place of employment of a person and trying to consolidate a sale by leaving books. It will also obviate something to which I drew attention when I explained the Bill, when I said that a salesman was known to leave books at a house on the condition that they would be taken back if the householder did not require them. However, when he returned he maintained that the books were damaged and insisted that they be paid for. This amendment will obviate this sort of thing and remove any inducement or threats to an intending or interested purchaser. I believe it strengthens the Bill, and I ask that it be accepted.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 7.

Mr. HALL: This amendment simply means that where a salesman calls and induces a householder to sign a contract to purchase books that is dependent on the confirmation of that contract by the householder after the stipulated waiting time (or cooling-off time, as it has been termed) the salesman may not return during the cooling-off period to induce the purchaser or intending purchaser to send in his confirmation. It therefore leaves the purchaser an unhindered time to consider whether or not to confirm the contract. This greatly strengthens the Bill, and I ask that it be accepted.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 8 *and* 9.

Mr. HALL: The members in another place gave clause 6 some thought and apparently considered it to be clumsy and inadequate, so they moved that it be deleted and that in its place a new clause 6 be inserted. I ask that these amendments be agreed to, as the new clause simplifies what we are trying to achieve in the original Bill.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 10.

Mr. HALL: This amendment is to insert a new clause 7 to deal with an omission made in the original Bill. I am no expert in the conduct of our courts, but I believe that unless this provision is inserted in the legislation the higher courts have to deal with offences under it.

Amendment agreed to.

MAINTENANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, line 12 (clause 6)—Leave out "Minister" and insert "board".

No. 2. Page 2, line 12 (clause 6)—Leave out "his" and insert "its".

No. 3. Page 2, line 15 (clause 6)—Leave out "him" and insert "it".

No. 4. Page 2, line 15 (clause 6)—After "except" insert "upon the written authority of that person or".

No. 5. Page 2, line 17 (clause 6)—Leave out "Minister" and insert "board".

No. 6. Page 4, line 13 (clause 8)—Leave out "Minister" and insert "board".

Consideration in Committee.

Amendments Nos. 1 *to* 3.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to accept these amendments as they are only consequential.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendment No. 4.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I oppose this amendment, because I believe that members of another place have not given serious consideration to the original clause. However, I am afraid that if it is not included the benefits that are apparent in the remainder of the Bill will not be available, so I am prepared to accept it reluctantly. I am concerned about women desiring maintenance who with this amendment would sign anything in order to obtain the assistance. Members of Parliament with legal experience would agree that that would be possible under certain circumstances. These people, in an anxiety state, would be prepared to sign any form. Because of the provisions which were agreed to here and which would benefit many people, I am prepared to accept the amendment under protest.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It is with much sorrow that I support the Leader's sorrowful views on this amendment by the Legislative Council. The purpose of the new section as it left here was to see to it that moneys that were collected by the board as maintenance for deserted wives should not be used to repay public relief to the board, except upon the order of a court of summary jurisdiction, which should be satisfied that the repayments could be made without hardship. First, there would be no administrative decision simply taking the moneys back from other moneys the board had in its power, and secondly, the court of summary jurisdiction could protect

these women and see to it that the deduction was not made unless it could be made without hardship to the person. Many cases were cited where money had been deducted by the board from moneys in its hands received for maintenance where in fact the woman concerned could not afford the repayment to the board out of maintenance moneys. Because of the Legislative Council's amendment the board will be able to say to any of these women, "Give us a written authority to deduct this money, will you?" If the person signs, the matter does not have to go to a court of summary jurisdiction to see whether or not it can be repaid without hardship. In view of the fact that the Leader has agreed that members should accept the amendment for the purpose of saving the rest of the Bill, which has much merit in it, I appeal to the Minister to ensure that administrative action is not taken to use this amendment from the Legislative Council to do the things that members here sought that the board should not do in relation to these women.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I confess that I am not sure what will be the precise effect of the Legislative Council's amendment. Members opposite have suggested that it could be used in such a manner that it could cause hardship to a person who had been granted relief. They suggest that a Welfare Department officer could say, "We will give you relief, but we want you to sign this order." Of course, it could be used also to give temporary relief to persons who would not otherwise get it. The department tries to meet the various contingencies that arise. All manner of cases are involved in this question of public relief. If it were obvious that a court order could be obtained, then I believe this amendment would be properly applied. If the department had to go to the court every time to get an order it would render too severe the administration of the Act. I appreciate the viewpoints expressed by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Norwood. I presume they are speaking on behalf of the Opposition. I will confer with the Chief Secretary and inform him that it is the view of this Committee that this amendment should not be used in a manner that could be regarded as unfair to an applicant for relief. I will suggest that it is to be used only in cases where the court would in ordinary circumstances grant an order if a court order were sought. To make the position clear I will see that the *Hansard* report of this debate is brought to the Chief Secretary's notice and also to the notice of the Chairman of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board. It will then be realized that this amendment is not to be used as a big stick, but only in those cases where relief is being granted and where the department knows that the money advanced as relief can be amply repaid without hardship.

Mr. Jennings: They play the game pretty tough at the Welfare Department at times!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The school is pretty tough. I am familiar with many cases that come before the department. In fact, I have in my bag reports from the Welfare Department regarding cases brought to my notice by members. Those members have seen the reports. They will agree that the department has done the fair thing. Frequently I get letters of appreciation from people who have been assisted. I point out that the assistance given by the department is not of a stereotyped nature, as are Commonwealth pensions, where everything has to be proved before a payment is made. If a person comes to the Welfare Department and is in need, that need is met before any other action is taken.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I should be failing in my duty if I did not express my appreciation of the Premier's offer. I am sure that the Chief Secretary will agree in principle that the amendment should not be wrongly used. The Premier would not want to deprive people of relief or to insist on repayment of relief when such repayment would create hardship.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It is unfortunate that people's ideas of what constitutes hardship differ. It has not been unusual for members to discover a tough attitude on matters of public relief and relief repayments within the Welfare Department. Let me instance a case. In my district is an invalid pensioner who is totally incapable of working. He has a wife and three children aged 13, 11 and 10 years; the eldest child being at high school. The family receives £9 7s. 6d. a week from the invalid pension and wife's allowance, plus £1 5s. a week from child endowment, making a total income of £10 12s. 6d. a week. He has a house that has been left to him in trust. It is part of an estate and he has the right to live in it. It is not palatial and is badly in need of repair. He pays £26 a year for rates. He does not receive any State public relief because the Welfare Department considers that he has too much money, as well as a house in which to live. The department claims

that he has an interest in an estate, which is in the hands of the Public Trustee, from which he will get certain moneys from time to time. The estate consists of houses that are extremely run down. The Public Trustee, in his discretion as trustee, used all of the income from the estate this year for necessary repairs to the houses. So, this man received nothing from the estate this year. Despite that, the department has taken the attitude that because he has the right to some money at some time he should not get anything from the department. When I pointed out to the department that this family could not feasibly exist on this money and keep the children in any sort of reasonable state, I was told by an officer of the department that this man was better off than a man on £15 a week with eight children, and that that was the standard.

That seems to be altogether too harsh. These people are not trying to put something over the department: they are genuine people. I have investigated this case personally. If that is the standard of hardship which will be assessed in administrative decisions, then members of this Parliament ought to be worried. I hope that that matter also will be brought to the attention of the board. We have to be careful for these poorer people. I appreciate the Premier's point that on occasions some people try to get something out of the department that they have no right to get, but not all people are in that category by any means. I hope the Premier will bring this matter also to the attention of the board so that it might be apprised of the fact that this Parliament is concerned to see that the standard of hardship is not too strictly set.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 5 *and* 6.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I ask the Committee to accept these amendments, which are consequential.

Amendments agreed to.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (BENEFITS).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 8.54 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 21, at 2 p.m.