HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 3, 1965.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

HOUSING IMPROVEMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

QUESTIONS

WAIKERIE-TRURO ROAD.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Roads, a question regarding the Waikerie-Truro Road. Has he now a reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that roadworks in hand on the Waikerie to Blanchetown section are being carried out by the District Council of Waikerie. Diversion of traffic onto the new work was desirable for the reasons that the old bitumen had deteriorated rapidly since maintenance expenditure was reduced in anticipation of its abandonment in the near future, and the District Council of Waikerie had insufficient rollers and watering equipment to effect compaction without the use of traffic flow. The section mentioned by the honourable member has now been compacted sufficiently by traffic and further watering to the stage where little dust nuisance is being experienced. It has only recently been completed and opened to traffic for the long weekend and was not fully compacted at the time. Arrangements are in hand to investigate the need for calcium chloride as a dust palliative and to continue watering over the weekends in order to minimize the dust hazard on this section and that between Blanchetown and Half-way House. Adequate warning signs will be maintained at both ends of the construction works to warn traffic against the hazards of travelling over new work at high speeds.

RESEARCH GRANTS.

Mr. HUDSON: On Wednesday, October 20, I asked the Minister of Education a question relating to the research grants for staff members of the University of Adelaide. In his reply the Minister said:

Before this matter had been properly considered by the State Cabinet the details of the allocation to individual projects were handed out by Canberra to a South Australian daily newspaper and were published in the *Advertiser* of either yesterday or the day before. The Prime Minister had not been advised whether we could meet the extra commitment from this State, a commitment that would mean another £60,000 on top of the £90,000 that we had budgeted for.

Can the Minister say whether this additional £60,000 will be provided?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Government has considered this matter, and I have discussed it with the Vice-Chancellor of the university. The university has placed a high priority on the research grants which have been made available, and the Government has decided, in view of that, to make the £60,000 extra available for the research grants above the sum the State budgeted for. At the same time, however, the Government has informed the university that, in regard to the university's recurrent expenditure for 1966, the Government may not be able to match the full Commonwealth grants that are made available during that year. That recurrent expenditure would be about £4,750,000. The manner in which the research grants were allocated by the Commonwealth Government (on a totally different formula from that used in regard to the first £3,000,000 of the total of £5,000,000) has seriously embarrassed the Government, which budgeted for 11 per cent, the proportion expected from the formula applicable to the first £3,000,000. Nevertheless, in view of the representations by the university, the Government is providing the £60,000, which will mean a total of £150,000 from the State within the second allocation of £2,000,000.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not sure what the Minister's decision means. Is the additional £60,000 being provided to be subtracted from the amount already provided for the university or will it be an additional amount if finances permit this later?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: To make it clear, let me point out that £5,000,000 for research grants was divided by the Commonwealth Government into two parts. The State budgeted for 11 per cent of the first £3,000,000 allocated. From memory, the allocation for South Australia from that sum was £373,000 in all. Out of the second £2,000,000 we were informed by the Prime Minister that the allocation would probably be £300,000, of which the State had to find half. Instead of that being 11 per cent of the total allocation for the universities, that sum would represent over 16 per cent. The State had budgeted for 11 per

cent (which represented £90,000) in accordance with the understood formula. The State has now agreed to find the additional £60,000, making a total of 16 per cent of the allocation of the £2,000,000. The university has been informed that the Government may have to consider the university's recurrent expenditure budget for 1966, which will probably be about £4,750,000, and the Government may not be able to match entirely the Commonwealth grant for that particular year's recurrent expenditure as a consequence of providing the £60,000.

CURCULIO BEETLE.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Last weekend I was informed that the Curculio beetle had been attacking vines in the Barossa Valley and doing considerable damage. Has the Minister of Agriculture a report about this beetle? Is there any effective way of dealing with its depredations?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member was good enough to inform me that he was going to ask this question. No reports have been received at head office regarding Curculio beetle damage in the Barossa Valley this season, but reports would normally go to the district adviser at Nuriootpa. Curculio beetle eats the leaf edges of grape vines, causing typical saw-tooth appearance, and occasionally it eats the buds. The pest occurs sporadically in South Australian vineyards, and sometimes causes serious damage in small localized areas. It can be easily controlled by spraying with dieldrin at 0.05 per cent aimed at the vine butts.

PORT PIRIE WHARVES.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question about lighting facilities on the Port Pirie wharves?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have received the following report from the General Manager of the South Australian Harbors Board, resulting from the recent inspection by the board's Ports and Traffic Manager and the Railways Assistant Superintendent at Peterborough:

The Ports and Traffic Manager, accompanied by the Harbourmaster, Port Pirie, and Mr. Black (Assistant Superintendent, South Australian Railways, Peterborough), carried out an inspection of the entire wharf and stacking areas at Port Pirie during the hours of darkness on Friday, October 22, 1965, for the purpose of ascertaining the required floodlighting, etc., for railway shunting on the wharves, particularly in the concentrates stockpile area. Conditions for such inspection were ideal: the stockpile area was filled to capacity, and it was a moonless night. Particulars of the existing floodlighting arrangements were noted and it was agreed that some additional lights were required, and certain modifications to the existing lights necessary. A list of these will be incorporated in Mr. Black's report to the S.A.R. Traffic Manager. The extra lights and modifications will be implemented immediately written confirmation is received from this officer.

BEEF ROADS.

Mr. CASEY: Some months ago I stated in the House that beef cattle roads in the Far North would be inspected by a member of the Northern Division of the Department of National Development. From August 7 to 9 this year Mr. Vaughan Davies (Assistant Director of the Northern Division of the department), accompanied by officers of the Pastoral Board, inspected the beef cattle roads in the Far North, particularly the Birdsville Track which, as the Minister knows, is not only our only link with South-Western Queensland but a road vital to South Australia's beef cattle industry. Has the Minister of Works received a report from the Department of National Development concerning Mr. Davies's visit? If he has not, will he obtain from the department a report on the advisability of constructing better roads in that part of the State?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the honourable member kindly intimated that he would ask this question today, I have obtained a report to the effect that a joint inspection of beef roads in the northern areas has been made by representatives of the Commonwealth Department of National Development, the South Australian Engineering and Water Supply Department, and the Pastoral Board. A report on that inspection has been submitted to the Commonwealth Government, and is now being considered by a Commonwealth interdepartmental committee. The report covers all northern roads, including those in South Australia. The committee hopes to complete its examination of the report and to submit recommendations to the Commonwealth Government towards the end of this year.

CLEANERS.

Mr. LAWN: About two or three years ago I asked the then Minister of Works questions about the cleaning of Parliament House. I pointed out that workmen had to climb out on to window ledges around the building and hang on to the windows with one hand whilst cleaning with the other. I pointed out the danger to the workmen and the possibility of a serious

accident occurring if they fell. I pointed out also that some of the shutters on the western side had themselves fallen and broken and that at times the cleaners leaned against those shutters. Since then, whenever I have had some spare time I have gone around the city and taken photographs of other buildings on which the same methods of cleaning windows are used today as were used here two or three years ago. I take this opportunity of thanking the previous Minister for having that position rectified. We do now have safety eyelets for this building, as I requested. However, unfortunately some of the buildings in the city still have the outdated method of cleaning windows. In order to take these photographs I have had to be present when the windows were being cleaned. With your permission, Mr. Speaker, and that of the House, I seek leave to have these photographs placed on the board so that members may see them at their leisure. The photographs disclose that at Foys building the men go out on the window ledges to clean the windows and, although this building is being repaired extensively, I understand that no provision is being made for the inclusion of safety eyelets for the cleaning of windows. Photographs of the Savings Bank building in King William Street show pedestrians walking below, and as the same method of cleaning windows is used at that building there is the additional danger that should a cleaner fall people below could also be killed.

The Savings Bank building in Hindley Street is in a similar situation. At that building there is what is called a bar knee-high across the window so that workmen on the inside cleaning the windows could overbalance if they happened to hit that bar with their knee with sufficient force, for this would throw them out and they would not be able to save themselves. The Advertiser building is in an even worse situation. The cleaners of that building clean similarly to the way I have described. They go out on the window ledges, and on the northern side of the building there are aluminium sun vizors and the cleaners stand on a chair on the top of those sun vizors to clean the windows. Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague whether any legislation covers this position? If none does, will the Government seriously consider introducing legislation to make the provision of safety belts, or some other safety provision, compulsory in order to protect the workmen who are called upon to clean these windows?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am somewhat concerned about the explanation given by the honourable member. I think it is desirable that some safety measure should be adopted, and I will certainly take the matter up with my colleague, the Minister of Labour and Industry, to see whether something effective cannot be done.

The SPEAKER: Following precedent, permission has been given for the display in this Chamber of material on subjects affecting the business of Parliament. This in my judgment may be a new departure. However, the matter is in the hands of the House. Does the House grant leave for the honourable member to display the photographs?

Leave granted.

HUGHES ESTATE.

Mr. BROOMHILL: The Housing Trust project of Hughes Estate at Henley Beach has commenced, and almost 100 houses are nearing completion. I understand that the remaining 300 houses to be built in this area cannot be commenced until services are available. However, because of the interest shown by residents of the area, and because the provision of schools depends on the future of this project, will the Premier, as Minister of Housing, be good enough to obtain a report from the trust on the possible future development of Hughes Estate?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

AGINCOURT BORE SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Minister of Education will recall that I have asked questions concerning the Agincourt Bore school and the problem regarding secondary schoolchildren now attending Alawoona school. The Minister promised to see what could be done to solve the immediate problem. Has he had an opportunity to discuss this question with officers of the department, and has he a reply? Can he also indicate when the building of this school is likely to commence?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Immediately after the deputation called on me regarding the Agincourt Bore school, and after my visit to Paruna, officers were detailed to investigate the transport problems associated with the opening of the Paruna school and any incidental transport problems of the whole area. I have not yet a report to hand regarding the Agincourt Bore school, so nothing specific can be given at the moment. The Public Buildings Department has been asked to proceed with the

drawings as quickly as possible, and the building of the school will proceed with all possible dispatch.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: JUDGES' RULES.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Following an answer I gave to a question on notice by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday, I received this morning from His Honour Mr. Justice Travers a courteous letter in which he stated, referring to my answer to the Leader's question:

As I read it, it contained a suggestion that I was favouring the introduction here of the Judges' Rules.

I did not say that in my answer to the Leader yesterday, and I certainly did not intend to imply it. If I did convey that impression to His Honour or to anyone else I hasten to correct that impression immediately. The speech of His Honour (Mr. Travers, M.P., as he then was) to which I referred is reported in Volume II of the 1955 *Hansard*. In that speech His Honour made it clear that whatever strictures he passed about the administration by some courts of the laws of confessional evidence he did not think that the introduction of the Judges' Rules was the way to cure that situation. He said at that time that he opposed the introduction of the Judges' Rules as part of the law of this State, and I have no reason at all to think that His Honour has in any way changed the view that he then expressed to the House. I wanted to make that clear to the House at the earliest possible opportunity.

ABORIGINAL REGULATION.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That the regulation under the Aboriginal Affairs Act, 1962, in respect of access by departmental officers to Aborigines on pastoral leases, made on October 7, 1965, and laid on the table of this House on October 12, 1965, be disallowed.

The regulation that is the subject of this motion was made under the Aboriginal Affairs Act, 1962. It reads:

Officers of the department shall have access at any time to any Aboriginal or any person of Aboriginal blood hereinafter described as such person who is or is living, or is employed upon the land comprised in any pastoral lease for the purposes of inspection, interview or inquiry in regard to matters which may affect the welfare of such person, and for such purposes may at all reasonable times enter such land and any house or other building thereon where such person is or is living or is employed. Any person who obstructs or hinders any officer of the department in exercise or execution of any power or duty under these regulations shall be guilty of an offence under these regulations and shall be liable on conviction to a penalty not exceeding for one offence £100 or imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months.

The Minister of Aboriginal Affairs is to give the necessary directions accordingly. This regulation is somewhat similar to the provisions of the Act, so that members will appreciate that we have similar legislation on the Statute Book. The regulation we are discussing alters the Act in several respects. First, the Act provides that this inspection shall take place where the person is employed, but the regulation states that it shall take place where the person is employed or living. Secondly, the regulation applies only to pastoral properties, whereas the Act applies generally. Thirdly, the Act states that the inspection shall apply to any Aboriginal, but the regulation provides that it applies to any Aboriginal or any person of Aboriginal blood. In these three ways the regulation is an extension of the principal Act.

The definition of "Aboriginal" in the Act shows the considerable difference between the varieties of person that are involved under the Act and those involved under the regulation. Section 4 of the Act defines both an "Aboriginal" and a person of Aboriginal blood. The regulation expands the power of the inspector to visit, from a place of employment to a place of living; from Aboriginal, to any person who may have Aboriginal blood. If the Minister considers the implication of this regulation, whatever its intention, he must agree that it goes too far. If the regulation were put into effect, it would immediately cause a serious reaction. I illustrate this statement by referring to the simple case of a reputable person marrying a woman remotely descended from an Aboriginal of this country. Is it desired, is it intended, or is it in the public interest that an officer of the department, at any reasonable time, can inspect her and her place of living? I am sure the Minister would agree that this is neither desirable nor necessary. It probably deviates from the policy that the Minister has enunciated many times: that people of Aboriginal blood should, in every way, have the same rights and privileges as those of other citizens. This regulation goes much further than the principal Act,

which refers only to a pure-blood Aboriginal. The principal Act refers to employment: the regulation refers to where any Aboriginal is living.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: On a pastoral lease.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, I accept that. However, that aspect causes me concern. The regulation-making power in the principal Act states:

The Governor may on the recommendation of the board make regulations . . . authorizing entry to an Aboriginal institution by specified persons or classes of persons for specified objects, and the conditions under which such persons may enter or remain in or upon an Aboriginal institution and providing for the revocation of such authority in any cases:

Again, the scope of the Act is being widened, because the regulation-making power here relates to entry into an Aboriginal institution.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: But not by inspectors! Surely, that regulation-making power refers to people going into Aboriginal institutions to inspect them.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This applies to pastoral properties which, of course, are not Aboriginal institutions, except those that have been declared for that purpose, about which there is no problem. Frequently, pastoralists in this country have been subjected to unfair criticism in respect of Aboriginal people. I acknowledge (and I know my colleague the former Minister of Aboriginal Affairs acknowledges) their assistance in the care, maintenance and livelihood of Aboriginal people. Indeed, if pastoralists in certain areas of the State took the view that this regulation would be burdensome on them, and consequently did not desire to have Aboriginal people living on their properties, the Government would immediately be embarrassed. After all, these pastoralists provide the main source of livelihood for many Aborigines, as well as a place for them to live. To have a regulation to single out and to make an invidious distinction in respect of pastoral properties cannot be justified, and it is not borne out by my own experience, or by that of my colleague the former Minister, because I have often heard him acknowledge the material support that we have received from pastoralists in this State in respect of welfare work being undertaken in this regard.

I know that pastoralists have sometimes even acted on behalf of the board in distributing relief and rations to Aboriginal people. I am not objecting to the motive that may be behind the regulation: anything that can be done to support and assist the Aboriginal people, or people of Aboriginal blood, has my sympathy and support. However, when we say that a person of Aboriginal blood, living anywhere in a pastoral area, can be subjected to inspection by officers without there being a specified reason (without a search warrant, or a reason to suspect that a breach of the law or anything undesirable has happened), the regulation is obviously an infringement of the rights of the Aboriginal citizen. Unless something exists in this regulation that I have not been able to find, I believe it is *ultra vires* the Act. Indeed, I can find nothing in the Act that would enable the section which provides the power for inspection (and which sets out the penalty for obstructing an inspection) to be altered. A section specifies the powers of inspection, but the regulation completely alters those powers not only with regard to their scope, thereby creating an invidious distinction, but also as they affect a class of person who, in my opinion, should not be brought into the scope of the regulation.

Finally, I believe that the regulation perpetuates an invidious distinction which I know the Minister and everyone else desires to see abolished. We desire to see Aborigines live an ordinary life as citizens of this State. The regulation should be disallowed, and the Minister should have another look at this matter and, if necessary, consider altering section 26, which provides that every person shall allow any member of the board to inspect a place of employment of an Aboriginal. The alteration should be applied by the Act and not effected by a regulation. I understand that the Subordinate Legislation Committee passed this regulation as being desirable, but I repeat that it should be disallowed because it goes too far. It is a serious invasion on the civil liberty of our citizens, many of whom may have only a small proportion of Aboriginal blood, and may be only remotely descended from Aboriginal people. If the Minister will examine these objections I think he will find them valid. If it is necessary to amend the legislation, he may choose to amend section 26 of the Act, so that Parliament may be provided with the relevant reasons, and so that it may debate them and ensure that they are desirable before they become a feature of the law of this State.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): As this matter was before the Subordinate Legislation Committee, I believe that I, as Chairman of that committee, should comment on it. The committee considered this regulation at length before deciding that no action should be taken.

Although I agree with the Leader that many pastoralists have helped the department, I understand that the various officers have experienced difficulty on certain properties. Therefore, it is necessary to have the regulation implemented to give officers of the board power to investigate cases on certain properties. The Leader exaggerates greatly when he says that the legislation places too much power in the hands of officers. The purpose of the regulation is to help the department improve the living standards and conditions of natives, and only in this way can that be done. The Leader said that this was taking away civil liberties from normal citizens, but I am assured that it is not the purpose of the regulation simply to give power to officers to go onto pastoral properties to conduct inspections: the regulation seeks to improve the living conditions of the natives, and that can be done only by the regulation. This is the only way in which officers can overcome hindrances placed on them. These officers are conscientious and responsible and if anyone objects to their entering properties it is obvious that such a person has something to hide. Therefore, I oppose the motion.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I was interested to hear the comments of the Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee . Undoubtedly the committee considered the regulation carefully before making a decision. However, I believe the Leader's objections have substance. I agree with what the Leader said about the widening of the scope of section 26 of the Act, and about the doubtful validity of the regulation from the point of view of the regulation-making powers of the Act. It may be held that the regulation is valid because section 40 provides:

> The Governor may, on the recommendation of the board, make regulations, not inconsistent with this Act, prescribing all matters and things which by this Act are contemplated, required, or permitted to be prescribed, or which may be necessary or convenient.

I presume the Minister is relying on this section to support the validity of the regulation. However, it is rather surprising that, in the specified list of matters about which regulations may be made, no specific provision is made for a regulation of this type. I should have thought that the powers to make regulations would be more specific if it were contemplated when the Act was passed that a regulation such as this would be required.

I do not know why this regulation is required. I agree with the Leader that this brings within the ambit of investigation by officers of the board people who have only a little Aboriginal blood. It is the purpose of our legislation and administration to remove, as far as it is humanly possible, any distinction between citizens of the State in respect to blood relationship or inheritance. It is unfortunate that a person living on a station property, who may be completely educated and sophisticated, should be subject to such an investigation, which the regulation will obviously empower officers of the board to carry out. I hasten to add that I believe the officers of the board are thoroughly commendable, reputable and thoughtful. As most of them were officers of the board during my time in office, I think that I know them all personally. I also know most of the pastoralists in the North-West of the State, because I have visited many properties there. Never once have I met with any suggestion of reluctance or resistance to discuss with me matters relating to Aborigines on these holdings.

The Minister and the member for Port Pirie have both suggested that there were certain properties where resistance has been encountered. I should like to know who these people are. I should also like to know what are the grounds on which this inquiry is alleged to be justified. Is it on the ground of instability of requirement, or has it to do with living conditions? Is it alleged that there may be improper conduct between lessees of pastoral properties and Aborigines? I point out that the law relating to cohabitation has been abolished by this House. It is no longer an offence for a person to associate himself or herself with a person of Aboriginal blood. I have no quarrel with that provision and I did not oppose it when it was made law. It was considered to be a major alteration to the law, and many people opposed it, as the Minister well knows. However, whether we agreed with it or not it is the law. Therefore, it is no longer an offence to be associated with and to have Aboriginal people in a white man's home or *vice versa*. So, Sir, what are the grounds for this inquiry? Does the Minister desire to involve himself in questions of relationship between people which are not illegal? Does he want to examine the premises in which these people live? It is a fact that there are many Aboriginal people who live on pastoral properties by consent of and with the approval of the owner, and they live in conditions of their own making: they are

not employed by him, except possibly on occasions, and only then—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They are entitled to be there by law.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Exactly, and they are entitled to hunt over the property and live off the property.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The Aborigines are entitled to be there by law, but it is not lawful at the moment for the patrol officers to require to see them.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I think I have been on nearly all the properties where Aborigines congregate. There are traditional meeting places through the north, and they are all on pastoral properties where the Aboriginal people are accustomed to meet on regular occasions for corroborees, ceremonials, and initiations. I have visited these camps on occasions, and I know where most of them are. Some of the main ceremonial grounds are in the North-West Reserve, but a few are not: they are on pastoral properties. In addition, there are other groups of Aborigines living on stations where possibly one or two of the men may be employed and their families live there with them by arrangement and with the consent and approval of the owner. I wonder which are the properties where difficulties have arisen. I should like the Minister, if he would be good enough, to tell me in confidence, because if he would tell me it would possibly remove some of my objections to this regulation.

I would think that this matter could be overcome by the regulation only being effective in cases where an officer of the board complains to the Minister that he has been refused entry. Let us restrict it a bit. Let us not have an all-expansive sort of regulation, where everybody is suspect. Why does the Minister not reframe his regulation to provide that, where an officer of the department complains to the Minister that he has been refused a valid entry, specific action can be taken in those specific cases? I think the Leader's objection would be largely removed in that case, provided there was some narrowing of the effect of the regulation. I think it ought to be so narrowed. Whether or not the Minister will see it in that light, I do not know, but I think it would improve the regulation substantially. As it stands, I think it has been drafted from the point of view of overcoming a problem, and, as is easy when making regulations, the side effects of the regulation have not been fully considered. If I may say so, this is a weakness in a departmental approach to a problem: a department invariably sees the problem and prescribes a solution without taking into proper account the side effects and other matters which may be dragged in as a result of the regulation's achieving its purpose.

This is where the Minister's responsibility comes into a matter such as this. He should take a good look at the regulations recommended by his department to see just how they affect the public generally. This is his function as a go-between between the department and the public at large. I believe that the Minister, having heard this discussion, may be inclined to have another look at the matter. As the regulation stands, I support the motion for its disallowance.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I oppose the motion. When members analyse the regulation (as the Subordinate Legislation Committee did) they will find that it is sound and logical. It is a matter of common sense to give right of entry to an officer who has a duty to perform.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: What duty is he performing?

Mr. HURST: Patrol officers should not be employed unless they can go around and see what is going on. Certain responsibilities are attached to their duties, and there are certain undertakings that property owners have to carry out. I say that it is the Government's responsibility to see from time to time that those undertakings are being effectively carried out and also to see whether any improvements can be made to the system. It is only right and proper that if a patrol officer is appointed he should not be handicapped in carrying out his duties. It is his duty to report to the head of the department and in turn to the Minister, and as a result it could be that further improvements could be made to better the lot of the Aborigines.

As the member for Port Pirie said, this matter was considered by the Subordinate Legislation Committee, and the committee could see nothing wrong with it. I suggest that in future, when something of this nature arises and honourable members have any matters to submit, they should tender their evidence to the committee, because the committee would welcome it. The committee comprises representatives of both Houses, and once it has arrived at a decision I think it is wrong for certain members to take the attitude that they have taken. Members were invited to appear before the committee to give evidence on this matter, and I suggest that it shows a lack of confidence in their own Party members on that committee when members opposite are

not prepared to come before it. I consider it is the responsibility of a Government department (and so, too, would this House consider it) to have its officers check from time to time on these matters affecting Aborigines.

Only the other week the Leader of the Opposition, after a crisis in his own district regarding a local Government authority, saw fit to take steps to ensure that auditors wer appointed by the Government to audit the books of those authorities. Why continually wait until the horse has left the stable before closing the door? Everyone knows that there are times when a property owner may be absent when a patrol officer arrives. Is the Government going to be responsible for sending a man hundreds of miles to investigate matters only to find that a subordinate officer left in charge there knows nothing about them? It could be that that person is new on the job and because he does not know these things he refuses right of entry, thus causing the State heavy expenditure. I maintain that the regulation is a good one. It is a sound administrative measure and something that Parliament should endorse, because it will ensure that the patrol officers are able, without their being harassed, to carry out the duties for which they have been appointed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Minister of Aboriginal Affairs): I oppose the motion. I fear I must disappoint the Leader and the member for Flinders over their suggestion that I should look at this regulation again. I think that it is a proper regulation, that it is desirable, and that its provision is urgent. May I outline at the outset the reason for bringing in this regulation? On the pastoral leases in the northern part of the State there is a considerable Aboriginal population. It is not confined to Aborigines as defined under the Act, but includes, as the member for Flinders knows, many people of Aboriginal blood. They are not all full-bloods living on pastoral leases, because there are some with less than full blood living there, and living in semi-tribal conditions.

This is the area where probably the greatest problem occurs at present amongst Aboriginal people in South Australia, because these are the people who are the least privileged in the State. This is the area where there is the greatest incidence of disease amongst Aborigines; it is the area where the children are given no education for the most part. We have some proposals under way, but I am explaining the situation that faces us. Under the honourable member's administration of this department, we appointed several welfare officers. The patrol officer going through the area of pastoral leases in the North was Miss Forbes, who is known to the member for Flinders, and who is one of the finest patrol officers and employees in the department. It is her duty to see that conditions in the Aboriginal camps on pastoral leases are tolerable, that the health of the children is considered, and that there is a balanced diet provided, as this is vitally necessary.

These people were originally nomadic people living in conditions under which the tribe continually moved but by their natural hunting and grubbing for food they obtained a balanced diet. However, all this has changed because now they have become basically settled people, and camp for long periods in the one spot close to station properties. Having become settled, they have not as yet acquired the changes in habits necessary for hygiene in these circumstances, habits they did not need for hygiene when they were nomadic.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: How does this touch the question?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am explaining the problems with which we are faced. When these people are camped on the properties they have problems of hygiene and feeding, because the ration system administered through the pastoralists is not satisfactory to provide a balanced diet.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Do you mean to say that they have been refused entry to Granite Downs and Everard Park?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member would let me explain the position I shall be able to deal with the questions he is asking.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I know the position, you don't have to explain.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member may, but there may be others in the House who do not. It was evident that the Leader did not. We have problems of water supply for these camps. The Leader has been complaining about the incidence of glaucoma and eye diseases, but hygiene and balanced feeding to counteract malnutrition need to be provided and through the patrol officers we have provided a balanced diet and excellent hygiene in the camps, as well as supervision to see that these people are getting adequate water. I received a report two days ago that a pastoral lease with many people camped—

Mr. Bockelberg: Who is going to cook a balanced diet for them? Will it be the station owner's wife?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, because a balanced diet can be supplied from the department's stores. Patrol officers supply stores to

the depots that have been established on pastoral properties in some cases, and through the regular patrol they see that a balanced diet is kept up for the children. The report I received a couple of days ago stated that there were many Aborigines with many children in the camp, and that they were getting only four buckets of water a day. The question arose whether they should move to a place where they could get surface water, because most station property owners would not let them camp near a bore and use it, and under the terms of the pastoral lease they were not obliged to do that. The Aborigines are entitled to surface water. The question was whether they should move away to an area with surface water, whether the patrols could be altered, and whether the officer could get supplementary stores to them, and so on. This has to be dealt with by patrol officers on the stations.

It is true that so far there has not been an outright refusal by anyone on a pastoral lease, but there have been many hints and inquiries to the effect that we are not entitled to be there. Many things have been said to police officers (which have been reported to us) and to departmental officers, and many things have been said to me. These people have said that the Aborigines are entitled to be here under the terms of the lease, but they have asked how far they were obliged to submit in law and what their legal position was regarding patrol officers and departmental officers coming through. Objection has been raised to patrol officers on a pastoral property. The Director, the Acting Director, and the board want to make certain that we shall be able to continue the patrol by patrol officers, because they are absolutely vital to the continuance of the board's policy. That is why we should pay increasing attention to these people on pastoral leases who are the most under-privileged people anywhere in this State. It is with the problems of these people that the department must be increasingly concerned.

We have appointed a new patrol officer in the North, and will have to appoint a further welfare officer for this area, and submissions have been made about the possibility of establishing a depot and education services in this area so that we may step up the services to the Aborigines. That will take time to develop, but we do not want suggestions that our patrol officers are not able to keep up the kind of activity which has been established in this area, and which is essential to keep the health of the Aborigines at a minimum standard. As the Leader knows, in some cases that is a pretty poor standard but is the best we can do at present. That is why we wanted this regulation.

The Leader has suggested three basic objections. First, he says the regulation goes too far because it now includes other than employment. We have powers now in relation to employment, but it is not the employed Aborigines with whom we are concerned on pastoral leases. On some leases there are a few camping about, and they are used by the pastoralists as a pool for employment. There may be a camp of 100 or more, from which about five will obtain employment.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That rarely happens in that area.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It often happens at Granite Downs. The honourable member may not be aware, but much ceremonial material is being transferred now from Yalata to Granite Downs, and there is now a considerable increase in the population of the Granite Downs and Everard Park areas which is causing increasing concern to the department. The honourable member will know what a problem it is to provide services for the people in that area. Although five people may be employed on the station, the conditions of the other people are what we are concerned about. We do not wish to intrude on their privacy, but we desire to provide supplementary feeding and vitamins in some cases, and to see that children are catered for. That cannot be achieved by means of an inspection for employment provision, and that is why we had to bring in this regulation to deal with the general living conditions of these people. In providing that people of Aboriginal blood also may be inspected, we are providing for the situation in respect of pastoral leases where people of Aboriginal blood (as well as full-blood Aborigines) are living in the camps.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Granite Downs is not having any trouble.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No refusal has ever been given in relation to Granite Downs. I do not wish to discuss individual cases openly, but I am willing to mention to the honourable member the situation that has given rise to this recommendation by the board. I do not imagine that any prosecution will ever have to take place under this regulation, but the board and, indeed, the Director believe that it should be clear that patrol officers should have legal authority to do what they are now doing, so that they can continue their activities. It is not intended to go beyond

those activities, or to investigate the private activities of people who are living according to the standards of the general community, although we have wide powers to do that in relation to certain people, under the provisions of the Aboriginal Affairs Act. The Leader has nothing to fear; if anybody attempted to make an investigation of the type he hypothesized, he would be on the mat immediately

If a pastoralist were to say, "I am sorry, you cannot come in," he is within his legal rights. The only existing authority at present is that the Aboriginal people, under the terms of the pastoral lease, are entitled to be on the property, and to use such water as is on the property, but not to use improvements on the property. We have no authority under the pastoral leases in respect of patrol officers' activities. This is an urgent problem, and we desire to do everything we can to ensure that these under-privileged people receive every assistance we are able to give them.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I claim to have some knowledge of pastoral leases and, evidently, the Minister does not understand the way Aborigines are treated by property owners. The Minister has much power under the Act to make investigations, and he has not explained why he is seeking this additional power. I have never heard of a patrol officer's being refused the right to conduct an investigation. Nor do I think that any property owner would attempt to interfere in that regard. If a patrol officer has ever found himself in trouble, I should say that he has done something on a pastoral property that he should not have done.

Mr. McKee: What, for instance?

Mr. HEASLIP: I would not know; he could do a number of things, such as leave a gate open as he went over the property, turn on a windmill and not shut it off, or interfere with lambing ewes. If the honourable member lived on a property he would know 101 things an officer could do to interfere with the property and create expense for the owner. Any patrol officer investigating natives' affairs and endeavouring to help them will not be refused entry. The Minister has not referred to one case where an officer has been refused that right. I see no reason for this additional power, for I believe it interferes too much with the individual. The Minister mentioned diseases among natives and, of coursse, that problem exists. No pastoralist would object to a person's attempting to alleviate that position. The Minister also mentions the need for hygiene, but many natives are living on thousands of acres in almost the same way today as they have ever lived.

Hygiene in these areas does not really come into the picture. Of course, it is an important factor in a built-up community, such as the one at Port Augusta, but in many other areas it is no more important to the natives today than it has been in the past. The Minister mentioned the need for water, but if we take water, food and everything else to the native, instead of letting him obtain such commodities for himself, what kind of individual will the native become? Surely, the natives should be taught to look after themselves. They are not spoon-fed in this manner at Musgrave Park or Ernabella Station. At Ernabella Station the natives are being taught something worthwhile, and have to earn their keep. We must realize that if these people, who have now been given full civilian rights, are to take their place in the community they must look after themselves. I am sure the regulation is unnecessary because the Minister has not given one instance where a pastoralist has refused an officer the right to examine the conditions of natives in the area.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I am pleased to know that the native population of the North is being looked after in a way that will promote their health and wellbeing. In the past they have been deprived of their natural environment through subdivision of the country, and have been unable to maintain their perpetual tribal activities. They have come together in bunches after which have occurred the objectionable features that take place when people who are not trained for it are placed in a situation such as this. I appreciate the difficulties of people on stations. I have no doubt that Aborigines will be looked after and that they will not be permitted to become a squatting community of mendicants.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We are looking after that aspect.

Mr. QUIRKE: That is good. However, I know that one of the main problems with the native population is that they squat in one place once they are adequately maintained. Then the problem of hygiene arises, and it does not matter if they are in an area of thousands of square miles: it is in the square mile that they inhabit where the trouble occurs. My objection to the regulation is that it brands people as being unco-operative. Although the regulation has some reason behind it, I think it is using the back end of an axe to achieve something in this way. I do not think all the

people in the area deserve this sort of treatment. Of course, there might be a case occasionally where a man is hurt beyond caring by having not far from his place many of these people who will not move and who are unmindful of the fact that he has to tolerate them there.

Seeing that we have deprived Aborigines of their way of life it is our responsibility to see that they are looked after, but we do not want to throw too much of that responsibility on to one or two individuals, because the population on stations is not large. I appreciate some of the difficulties that could occur but this is using a bludgeon and it will reflect on certain people. The reason for the regulation is that it is probably necessary to do this because people are unco-operative and must have the heavy hand of the law placed on them to ensure their co-operation, but this will produce co-operation against their will. Would it not be possible to do something like this under the tenure of the pastoral lease instead of doing it by a regulation from somewhere else which has a direct relation to the people?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We examined that and it is not possible. Each pastoral lease would have to be changed.

Mr. QUIRKE: There could be a difficulty there but I still think that would be by far the best way to do it. A regulation will brand these people as totally unco-operative, branding even those who are willing and co-operative: they will not be hawks among the crows —they will all be crows. I am not at all unsympathetic to the idea of looking after the welfare of these people whom we have deprived of their natural heritage and reduced from a condition of native dignity (and they are dignified in their own environment) to the rather scandalous condition under which they are forced to live. However, I have grave doubts whether we should paint everybody the same colour just because there have been one or two who have not complied with the order.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I thank honourable members for the attention they have given to this motion. I wish to reply to two matters that have been raised. It was stated that the Subordinate Legislation Committee would have been pleased to hear representations from Opposition members about the regulation. However, that procedure would be irregular. The committee is appointed by the Parliament and its duty is to make a decision about a regulation. I do not believe the committee knew what was involved in the regulation when it took no action. I discussed the regulation with a member of the committee, who is a member of my Party in another place, and he certainly did not understand the implications behind it. I do not believe the Minister has answered the case I put forward. He has dealt with the case of Aborigines in pastoral areas who are under-privileged, wander around and are examined by officers. Under those circumstances how could he justify entry into a house, which is totally different from entry on to a pastoral property. Entry into a house carries this regulation much further than is necessary.

The Minister admits that pastoralists have not been unco-operative, and he could not produce one case where there had been a suggestion of refusing entry. This regulation provides that in future an officer of the department will be able to say to a person that his wife is of Aboriginal blood and that the officer will enter his house and make an examination. The Minister cannot justify that. Members on this side are just as insistent as was the Minister that provision should be made for education and medical assistance in the North-West. Therefore, this is not a question of our wishing to impair the welfare of Aborigines. We believe this regulation separates them from the community in a way that is undesirable. If the regulation merely stated that the Minister might give an approval to an officer to go on to a pastoral property where he had reason to suspect that the conditions of the Aborigines were not being properly attended to, it would be a totally different matter. However, it gives wide power to any police officer or any officer of the department. I hope the House will disallow the regulation.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Noes (20).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

SIMULTANEOUS DEATH BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 6. Page 1973.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): The honourable member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) yesterday put on the file some amendments to this Bill. I realize that I must not discuss those amendments, but I think I can say that if they were to be considered they would change the complexion of the Bill before the House. It has not been possible for me in the interim to get a report from Their Honours the judges, and as this is a complicated measure, affecting significantly questions of the law of inheritance, it is preferable to have a considered report from the Master and the judges before we proceed with the debate. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to continue my remarks. By arrangement with the honourable member, the Bill can be dealt with later this session.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

BOLIVAR IRRIGATION.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall:

That a Select Committee of the House be appointed to inquire into and report upon the desirability of using effluent from the Bolivar sewage treatment works for agricultural irrigation purposes.

(Continued from October 27. Page 2408.)

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I sincerely appreciate the motive of the mover of the motion and previous speakers on it. Although I know that they have acted with the very best intentions, I ask the House to reject the motion. A departmental committee has considered the use of effluent from the Bolivar treatment works and its report is almost finalized, so that there is no need to appoint a further committee. I assure the House that when the report is available I shall table it, as I appreciate the serious problems of the people in the area. The powers of this departmental committee are wide, and it would be improper and incorrect for me to quote from its report. An interim report handed to me a short time ago indicated that this area had been examined extensively with respect to the disposal of effluent. I have also read a report from Mr. R. G. Shepherd (Senior Geologist of the Mines Department) who makes some rather alarming statements about the use of this effluent. Those statements suggest that there may be a danger in using it in the market-gardening areas. The mover of the motion acted in the best interest of his district and of market gardeners in South Australia, particularly of those in the Two Wells area. However, I ask the House to reject the idea of appointing a Select Committee until the departmental committee's report has been considered by Parliament.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): Although I appreciate the Minister's reply, I consider that a Select Committee should be appointed. A departmental committee was appointed by the previous Minister to consider this question, and its report still has to be considered. I know that the Minister will study it and take the appropriate action. This problem is so serious that Parliament should appoint a Select Committee to study the departmental report, because from that report other questions will arise. It is unlikely that the report will provide all the answers that we, as members, need to know. I should like a Select Committee appointed to consider the report, and to have the same powers as a Royal Commission. It should be able to call witnesses, so that the report can be elaborated on by further questions where necessary. This is not a matter that should be postponed. We cannot be assured that this district will not be in serious trouble at the end of the coming summer. I hope the departmental report will refer to this problem, but the information will need further study, and additional evidence should be tendered to try to establish what should be done. Whatever is contained in the report, the Government should take action and a Select Committee should be appointed to consider all aspects of this problem. I ask the House to approve the appointment of a Select Committee because of the seriousness of the problem in the Two Wells and Virginia area.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Noes (20).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens (teller), Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

SEAT BELTS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should advise His Excellency the Governor to make the proclamation pursuant to section 162a (3) of the Road Traffic Act specifying the date after which seat belts must be fitted in certain motor vehicles.

(Continued from October 27 Page 2421.)

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): When this matter was recently raised in the House by way of question I stated that it was being considered by Cabinet. Whilst Cabinet has made no decision as yet, the matter is still receiving the Government's attention.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I am sorry that I have not received a little more from the Government side than a couple of sentences by the Premier, which I must say I consider entirely unsatisfactory. I have raised this matter by question several times, and each time the Premier has told me that the matter was before Cabinet. He says that again today, even though this motion has been on the Notice Paper for some weeks, and Cabinet has had ample time to consider the matter. In my respectful view, Mr. Speaker, Cabinet should have considered the matter by now, because I regard this as a matter of urgency. I utter as strong a complaint as I can to the Premier and to the other members of Cabinet present at their putting off a decision on this matter, because that is in fact what they must be doing.

There can be no other explanation but that they are procrastinating and trying to fob off a decision. I moved the motion because of that very procrastination, and because I could not obtain any answer from the Government on what is a matter, I believe, of great urgency, as well of great importance. We already know what three of the members of the present Cabinet (three out of five in this House) think about the matter, because we know what they said when it was debated in 1963. We also know that the other two Ministers in this House, who did not speak in the previous debate, voted in favour not only of the installation of seat belts but also of the compulsory wearing of them.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member will not develop that in reply, will he?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I certainly will not; there is nothing to develop other than to say that that is the fact of the matter. It is ironical that the present Minister of Agriculture raised the very point of procrastination, and said that he hoped there would not be any procrastination in regard to this measure. He said:

I support the Bill and hope that it will be carried. If the member for Mitcham agrees with the Premier's suggestion that it should come into operation by proclamation rather than at a specified time—

and that is what happened as a result of a conference—

I hope he will obtain an assurance from the Premier that its operation will not be unduly delayed.

Mr. Freebairn: He is usually very consistent, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is what he said on October 9, 1963. The present Minister of Works also supported the Bill, and said:

I support the Bill, which provides for the wearing of safety belts by passengers in the front seats of motor cars.

The Premier himself said (as I mentioned when moving the motion):

The closing remarks on the second reading by the member for Mitcham have clearly indicated that this Bill is a first step only towards what I wish to achieve.

Then, all members of the Labor Party, including the five members on the front bench, voted in favour of the Leader's amendment, which went beyond the Bill, and beyond the Act as it was passed by both Houses. Therefore, we know what those honourable gentlemen thought two years ago. I cannot understand why a delay should now occur in considering this matter.

I emphasize the importance and desirability of introducing this reform. Honourable members who have spoken to this debate have referred to two factors: the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) referred to an article in the *Medical Journal of Australia*, October 23, and the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) referred to the investigation being carried out in the State of Wisconsin. With regard to the article in the *Medical Journal* written by Dr. Bernard O'Brien, who has carried out a detailed investigation, especially on the question of facial disfigurement, the doctor said, in summing up:

The most striking feature of these series—

that was a series of investigations of individual cases of injury—

was the complete absence of any person wearing a safety belt. It is a reasonable assumption that the vast majority of these people would not have been injured or would have sustained injuries of less severity, if safety belts had been worn, because the forward projection would have been restricted. From time

to time, some people (including occasionally doctors) claim that safety belts may be harmful and capable of causing injury. However, documented cases of this nature are so rare as to be of little consequence. They pale into insignificance in comparison with the vast numbers of cases of injuries caused by the absence of safety belts. The responsibility for the installation of safety belts rests with Governments, automobile manufacturers and, above all, individuals. There is need for urgent legislation for the compulsory fitting of safety belts (not just anchor points) in all registered vehicles. Special provision and protection of small children under the age of six years are required. The use of safety belts is rigorously observed in aircraft, so why not in motor cars? It is difficult to understand why the appropriate authorities do not act in a matter in which so much preventable mortality and injury are involved.

I ask members of Cabinet who are on the front bench to take note of that. I echo it to the full. The article continues:

Surely the compulsory fitting of the greatest single safety device in a motor car is worthwhile. In certain forms of public transport (such as taxicabs), the public has the right to expect a safe car as well as a safe driver. Car manufacturers have a heavy responsibility to make their products as safe as possible. Copp (1964) considered that, aside from engineering improvements brought about every year, there were six specific safety features which could reduce injury. They were as follows:—The deep-dish steering wheel, improved front seat retention, improved door latches, safety belts—

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member will realize that he cannot add too much new material.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is not new material, Sir: it follows that introduced by the member for Light, who referred to this article.

Mr. Lawn: You do not have to justify the safety of the belts. They break your legs, anyway.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the honourable member had been listening he would have realized that two or three sentences ago I was dealing with the urgency of their introduction.

Mr. Lawn: They break your legs.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is a silly remark and I hope it is not typical of the thinking on the other side of the House, although, if the procrastination from Cabinet is any indication, it may be.

Mr. Lawn: That is all we have had from you all this session.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If the member for Adelaide cannot make a better contribution to the debate than that then we are in a pretty bad state.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: May I finish the last sentence of the article from which I was quoting, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER: I am merely asking the honourable member not to introduce additional matter in reply.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The article continues:

interior padding and, lastly, non-obstructive interiors.

In dealing with the point raised by the member for Burnside about the investigation in the State of Wisconsin, I should like to point out that Wisconsin introduced the provision for compulsory intallation of belts in motor cars registered after the beginning of 1962. This provision differs slightly from that in our Act in that it is permissible in Wisconsin to take the belts out after purchase of the vehicle if that is desired. The honourable member, however, quoted from a statement that showed that in 86.1 per cent of cases the belts were retained. The figures contained in the report show that where there is compulsory installation of the belts they are worn in 31 per cent of motor cars but, in comparison, where there is voluntary installation of belts, they are worn in only 14 per cent of motor cars, which means that compulsory installation increases the wearing of belts by 17 per cent. It more than doubles it. There is no reason to expect that the experience in South Australia will be any different from that in other States and in the United States of America. I hope that what I will say now will not fall on the deaf ears of members of the Cabinet, who make this decision (if Caucus allows them).

Mr. Lawn: The ex-Premier is amused by the honourable member's last remark.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is pretty true, isn't it?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I should not be side-tracked in this way.

Mr. Freebairn: The member for Chaffey said that your remark was correct.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have asked the honourable member for Mitcham to confine his reply. Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to quote from the November report issued by the Australian Road Safety Council, which contains an article headed "Compulsory Seat Belts in Britain". That article states:

The day when seat belts become compulsory in all Britain's cars has come closer, says a London report. The Transport Minister, Mr. T. Fraser (a Socialist), proposes to make the fitting of approved seat belt anchorage

points compulsory in all new cars and vans from the start of 1967.

Mr. Hurst: Who quoted that in the debate?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am replying now to the Premier's speech in which he said that Cabinet had not yet come to a conclusion. I am urging Cabinet to come to a conclusion as quickly as possible and that is my reason for quoting this. It continues:

His intention is eventually to make seat belts as much a part of a car's basic safety equipment as brakes.

The article then explains that anchorages will be made compulsory. I mention this to show that they are behind this State.

Mr. Hurst: How does that line up with human rights?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Apparently the member for Semaphore does not take the matter seriously. It ill behoves him to interject in that way. Of course, he was not a member of this House when all members of his Party supported the provision for the installation of seat belts. The article continues:

A recent survey claimed that properly fitted belts would prevent 73 per cent of the fatal injuries received in collisions, as well as 67 per cent of serious injuries and 33 per cent of slight injuries. At present only about 12 per cent of people buying cars bother to get belts fitted, and there seems no reason to believe any drastic increase in this figure will come after legislation makes anchorage points compulsory. The Royal Society for the Prevention of Accidents and the Automobile Association both favour compulsory seat belts and say they would welcome any action in this direction.

That is the position in Great Britain. I hope that South Australia will be in the lead in this matter and will not merely wait for other parts of the world to take the lead. We have here an Attorney-General who has introduced a number of matters of law reform and given the same reason as that for introducing them: that we should be pioneers, that we should take the lead in these matters. I do not agree with all the things that he has introduced, but I agree with him that it is a good thing for this State to show that it is progressive and that it can give a lead to other parts of the world in these things. Here in this matter we do have an opportunity to give a lead in Australia and, in fact, in British countries. Sir, this is the opportunity that the Government is hesitating to take. For some reason or another the Government does not want to come to a conclusion on this. I do not know whether the members of the Government Party are not impressed by the road toll in this State or whether they do not care about it. When they delay doing something which we know will reduce the road toll and which they themselves supported two years ago, one wonders what the reason is for the delay. Sir, these things shake one's confidence in the way in which the Government is tackling its problems.

Mr. Hurst: Why didn't the previous Government do something?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I wish I knew that.

Mr. Hurst: Did you move a motion?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I did not, but I asked questions in the same way as I have asked questions of this Government.

Mr. Curren: Didn't the previous Government say, "No, little boy, we can't do it"?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Chaffey would do well to compare the courtesy extended to me by the former Premier when he said "No" with the treatment I had from the present Premier when he said "No". The answer was the same, but at least it was decently given. I am not excusing the previous Government; I believe that the proclamation should have been made. What I am saying is that even though it were not done then, well, there is more reason for doing it now, and I think it is absolutely wrong of the present Government simply to say, when this motion is moved, that the matter is still being considered. As I have said, this is an urgent matter. It is something which the Government should face and about which it should come to a conclusion. When the Premier spoke today he did not even say when the matter would be concluded and a decision reached, and may be it will be never. He was just fobbing me off. I hope the House will support the motion as a protest (if for no other reason) at the procrastination of the Government.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Noes (21).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Heaslip, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (AUDIT).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 20. Page 2272.)

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, in introducing this Bill, undoubtedly had in his mind the circumstances surrounding the financial affairs of the District Council of East Torrens, and there is no doubt, of course, that the position regarding auditors for local government bodies is far from satisfactory. That was not only apparent in that case but I am sure there are other cases in which similar situations existed.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I know of at least six others.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have no doubt this is a matter requiring attention, and the Government is conscious of this. At present this matter is being investigated by the Local Government Act Revision Committee, and regulations will shortly be introduced to deal with it. The Leader, when explaining the Bill, pointed out that it provided two things: first, that a council should not appoint its auditor until the auditor had been approved by the Auditor-General and, secondly, that auditors' fees should be approved by the Auditor-General. Regarding the first point, it would not make much difference to the existing situation, because the council auditor is required to possess the Local Government Auditors' Certificate issued by the Local Government Auditors' Examination Committee of which the Auditor-General is chairman. Therefore, to some extent, the approval of the Auditor-General is obtained now. The fact that an auditor possesses a certificate is authority for him to act as auditor.

It is difficult to see how the Auditor-General could give any more approval than he does in the existing circumstances. The second point about auditors' fees is an important one, and there is no doubt that, in theory, an auditor is bound by his professional ethics to carry out a proper audit no matter what the fee. It means that councils choose the auditor whose fee is the lowest, and there is a temptation not to do an adequate job where the fee is far too low. It is a human reaction to a set of circumstances that is undesirable, and no doubt the fee should be determined on a basis that is satisfactory and that gives a reasonable assurance that the audit is carried out in a proper manner. The Government is conscious of these things, and considers that the Bill introduced by the Leader is, to this extent, premature, in that the Local Government Act Revision Committee has not yet brought down its recommendations to the fullest extent, and in any case the recommendations being made will go further than the Leader has suggested in his Bill. The Government considers that the position needs tightening up more than is suggested in the Bill. I ask the Leader to consider this aspect, and suggest to Opposition members that this Bill is not pressed, as the matter is fully in hand. The Government considers it should take the matter further and that proposals should be more stringent than those in the Bill, as the Bill does not go far enough. The whole question needs tightening up to provide a situation satisfactory to everyone and to councils in particular. I ask the House not to support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICITY.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford:

(For wording of motion, see page 717.)

(Continued from October 20. Page 2273.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): When addressing myself to this motion on October 20, I made a few introductory remarks and dealt with the relationship between the Leigh Creek coalfield and the Sir Thomas Playford power station at Port Augusta, and said that the relationship was a well balanced one and that the estimated resources at Leigh Creek had been designed to provide for the requirements at Port Augusta during the economic life of that plant. In speaking on the Leader's motion, the Premier said that, because of increasing efficiency of the more modern power plants and the growing demand in South Australia for electrical energy, the proposed station at Torrens Island would be more efficient because of its modern facilities, its high temperature and boiler pressures, and larger size, so that it would out-date the station at Port Augusta, which would be relegated to a secondary role in power generation. This is generally true in the history of power stations.

Some years ago it was suggested that the advent of atomic energy would render obsolete within a few years all the conventional thermal stations, and there was a spate of activity and research into this matter. At that time it was suggested that the next power station in South Australia would probably use atomic energy

for two reasons. First, the limited coal supplies in this State and, secondly, the ready availability of good uranium ore in the uranium ore field. At that time the manufacturers of conventional thermal stations made them efficient and developed new techniques which could employ a much higher temperature and pressure in the boiler system, and they were able to develop larger units.

As a result of this, the researches into conventional stations went ahead and produced results more rapidly than stations using atomic energy. I remember when a large manufacturer of electrical generating equipment and members of his company were in Adelaide that, at a discussion across the road, the chief engineer for the undertaking admitted to the engineers and Parliamentarians present that their researches into the use of atomic energy for power generation had fallen behind, and that the conventional generation had so improved its techniques that costs per unit of generating power had been reduced much faster than the costs of atomic energy had been. He said that no doubt the tide would turn and atomic energy would stage a breakthrough.

However, this motion does not intend that we should consider seriously atomic energy, but it proposes that we should seriously consider any alternative fuel, with particular emphasis on the use of natural gas. I do not believe that, merely because the resources at Leigh Creek are still substantial and because the Electricity Trust has been able to make a favourable forward contract for the supply of oil fuel, we should be complacent about the future situation in respect of fuel supplies in South Australia. I believe it is that fact to which the mover of the motion seeks to draw the attention of the House (and, indeed, the attention of the public generally) to shock us, if necessary, out of any complacency that may be creeping in, in regard to the pre-eminent position that we occupy in the Commonwealth in relation to the supply of power at the lowest possible rate. In past years we have been able to provide electrical energy to our industries and domestic consumers at a rate much more favourable than the rates of all other mainland States of Australia, and only slightly less advantageous than the rate enjoyed by the Hydro-Electric Commission consumers in Tasmania.

However, this pattern is changing; with the new technique of taking the power station to the coal, and not the coal to the power station, the New South Wales authorities will be able to produce power at an attractive rate in that State. So intense is the research into power generation throughout the western world that, unless we are alert to the possibility, we shall lose our favourable and pre-eminent position in regard to power generation in South Australia. What has enabled us to achieve this position? It is probably true in regard to power generation, as it is true in regard to agricultural and other fields, that hard conditions make for good administration and development. I believe that is particularly true in South Australia. In the immediate post-war years we were faced with an intermittent supply of coal from New South Wales coalfields and other sources. We were frequently unable to provide the power required by the community, not, I emphasize, because we lacked generating capacity but because we lacked fuel supplies.

The then Premier initiated the development of the Leigh Creek project, and I remind the House (as well as the public, if it needs reminding) that it was the perspicacity of the then Premier (Mr. Playford, as he then was) which, with his faith in the Leigh Creek project and a determination to press ahead, overcame the opposition that was evident in regard to the Leigh Creek field. As a result of persistence and wise planning, South Australia has enjoyed a great benefit. Although it has been said many times, it will bear repeating: the then Premier of this State was responsible for a great break-through in the industrialization of South Australia, supported in no mean order by his wisdom in developing the Leigh Creek field. We could well listen to one who has established a reputation for sound forward planning.

When the Leader informs the House that, in his opinion, it is timely that we should establish a Royal Commission to investigate future power resources available to South Australia (he having a record of extremely successful forward planning to his credit) I believe we should accept his advice and the motion now before the House. With all the emphasis that I can command, I say that this is not a political stunt or an attempt to achieve any political kudos: it is a matter of hard necessity, and there is much merit in the proposal advanced by the Leader. In rebuttal of remarks in the mover's introductory speech, the Premier referred to the suggestion that in five years South Australia would be priced out of the market for attracting new industries and went on to say that he was aware that the largest user of electricity ever to come to

South Australia (namely, the zinc production plant at Port Pirie) was attracted by electricity tariffs that could compete not only with those in New South Wales and Victoria but also with that of the hydro-electric power in Tasmania.

On the face of it, that is true, but the industry was attracted to South Australia because of special arrangements made for the supply of power to it in the initial stages—arrangements beyond the normal tariff policy of the Electricity Trust. Therefore, it is not correct for the Premier to say that our normal prices attracted this industry, because that is not so. As every honourable member knows, it is in the establishing period of a new industry that costs are so vitally important when heavy capital amortizations are to be considered, as well as heavy initial costs of establishment. That special arrangement was in line with other arrangements the former Government made in attracting industries to this State, so far as it was able, because of the keen basis of our power generation costs, to make special arrangements which, although possibly not great in terms of percentage, were sufficient to tip the scales in South Australia's favour, at a time when competition was particularly keen. The demand exists for electrical energy all over the western world, but, in making comparisons with oversea countries, South Australia's demand for electrical energy has probably grown at a rate higher than that of almost any other country in the world.

It is rather interesting to note that our electrical energy requirements are three times as much as they were 10 years ago. I have perused the Electricity Trust's report for the year 1964 (which, incidentally, contains more detail than is contained in the last report presented to Parliament). Page 6 of the report refers to the growth of the undertaking and the sales of electricity from 1954 onwards. I shall quote two figures to illustrate my point. Electricity sold in the year ended June 30, 1954 amounted to a total of 675,000,000 units. In the year ended June 30, 1964, the total was 1,913,000,000 units which, as I have said, is about three times what it was 10 years previously.

I shall now refer to the cost of fuel in relation to power generation, which provides another rather interesting comparison. The cost of fuel ex Leigh Creek in 1964 was an average of 19s. a ton and they produced 1,617,973 tons of coal. The cost for the previous year, according to the report, was 19s. 7d. Over the past five years the total cost of coal produced at Leigh Creek has been reduced from £1 4s. 2d. to 19s. a ton. The decrease has been made possible by increasing annual outputs. This has enabled the trust to continually review downwards its price for electricity sold. Undoubtedly this position will continue so long as we are able to have continued access to virtually unlimited supplies of fuel for the purpose of generating electrical energy. One of the main points advanced by the mover of the motion for the need for a commission of inquiry was the interesting picture that we have in the northern parts of the State in relation to natural gases. As far as we can say, natural gas is the only possible new fuel which will have any impact on South Australian power generation in the foreseeable future. I have referred to atomic energy and have said that the proponents and protagonists of atomic energy have not been able to reduce their costs so rapidly as the people investigating and developing thermal stations of the conventional type. In his reply on this matter the Premier attempted to ridicule the possibilities of the use of natural gas. He said:

The amount of gas discovered at Gidgealpa is promising and interesting, but by any standards it is not a large amount. One illustration is that the United States of America burns every 10 days as much gas as is available in the whole of the Gidgealpa deposit. Another illustration is that over a period of 30 years the Electricity Trust alone could use five times as much gas as is available at Gidgealpa.

I wish to quote from some authorities which, with great respect, I think are much better informed than the Premier on this matter. The *Australian Petroleum Gazette*, which is the official organ of the petroleum industry in Australia, has much to say in its September issue about the matters we are discussing. I point out that the petroleum industry is a stern competitor of natural gas. Therefore, anything said by it about the possibilities of natural gas can be expected to be at least conservative. There is nothing like having candid comment from an opponent to get the truth. Referring to prospects for marketing petroleum products in Australia from 1954 to 1964 to 1974 the *Australian Petroleum Gazette* states:

Forecasts by the oil industry suggest that the total market for petroleum products in 1974 will exceed 8,000,000,000 gallons, about twice the actual 1964 consumption of 4,065,000,000 gallons. These forecasts do not take into consideration the availability of new forms of energy, in particular natural gas,

which is certain to enter the energy market within a few years. The (oil) industry's present projections for future product demand do not make allowances for the impact of natural gas on the market because adequate reserves have yet to be provided. In July the associated group of Australian companies which has discovered natural gas in Queensland announced plans to build a 260-mile pipeline from Roma to Brisbane. Subject to a satisfactory agreement with the two Brisbane gas companies on quantity and price the pipeline is expected to be completed by the end of 1966. Discoveries in South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia may also be commercially exploited by 1970. This could substantially modify the oil industry's projected demands for petroleum products. As natural gas becomes available it is axiomatic that markets currently held by oil and other burning fuels will be affected. As in other countries faced with a similar situation the refining industry in Australia will no doubt adapt itself to the changed refining pattern made inevitable by the new circumstances. However, the availability of a cheap fuel, such as natural gas, could lead to an even faster rate of growth of the economy. This in turn will give rise to an accelerated rate of growth in areas still dependent on petroleum products. Although the first gas pipeline will probably be commissioned in Queensland and possibly the second in South Australia, it is unlikely that natural gas will have a marked effect on the petroleum market in New South Wales and Victoria.

I think this comment is most significant. The industry agrees that natural gas will have a marked impact on the sale of its products, which it hopes will be counter-balanced somewhat by the added strength and growth of the economy which, in turn, will create its own demand for petroleum products that could not be transferred to natural gas. I point out that this forecast is made with a background of growing consumption trends of the main petroleum products in Australia, which I will quote. In 1964, for example, 20,963,000 gallons of heating oil was used, and it is estimated that by 1974 this will rise to 128,870,000 gallons. The use of furnace oil has risen in the 10-year period 1954-64 from 296,177,000 gallons to 948,429,000 gallons and is expected to rise by 1974 to 2,178,960,000 gallons. It is also pointed out that currently the consumption of liquefied petroleum gas has risen in the short period from 1964 to 1965 from 41,773,000 gallons to 58,000,000 gallons and is expected to rise by 1974 to 105,000,000 gallons. This reflects a very rapid growth in the consumption of all fuels. I repeat that in the light of these facts a forecast has been made as to the use of natural gas in Australia.

The Premier sought to minimize the importance of the natural gas fields to the State. He played down Gidgealpa as being of comparatively little significance. However, further on in the issue of the *Petroleum Gazette* I found another very interesting article entitled "New Energy by Pipeline". This special feature article discusses at some length the possibility and probability of the utilization of natural gas in Australia. It also contains a very interesting map showing the approximate location of the known gas fields in Australia. It shows, for example, Gidgealpa in the north-eastern part of South Australia and Mereenie and Palm Valley in the south-western corner of the Northern Territory. It shows that Gidgealpa can be linked to Adelaide by the direct route, if this were possible, of 500 miles, that we could bring natural gas from Mereenie and Palm Valley to Adelaide by about 900 miles of pipeline, or we could, for example, have a pipeline from Palm Valley and Mereenie via Gidgealpa to Adelaide at just a little over 1,000 miles of actual pipeline. It also suggests the possibility of linking Sydney with Roma and Mereenie and Gidgealpa and conveying such gas to Melbourne. There is already, of course, the possibility of the utilization of gas resources in Bass Strait. In summing up the possibilities, it was pointed out that the main controlling factor would be price, and, of course, everybody knows that that would be so. It goes on:

A natural gas industry in Australia will thrive only if its product can be supplied at prices competitive with those of alternative solid and liquid fuels. It is also important that both producer and consumer can be certain of uninterrupted long-term supplies. In Australia it is believed that sufficient gas reserves should be established to provide about a 20-year supply based on the estimated annual requirements of the fifth year of service. It is unlikely that supply contracts of less than 20 years' duration will be considered. On the basis of supporting an Australian market, which in its fifth year could reach nearly 600,000,000 cub. ft. a day, gas reserves would need to be approximately 5,000,000 million cub. ft. A substantial part of these reserves might well be established before Christmas this year in fields already discovered in Australia. The Associated Group's reports indicate that at June 30 this year 54 wells in the Roma area of Queensland drilled by the group have proved reserves of at least 125,000 million cub. ft. of gas. Phillips Petroleum and Sunray DX have found what promises to be a major gas field at Gilmore, 560 miles north-west of Brisbane. This field may well contain as much as 500,000 million cub. ft. of natural gas. In South Australia it has been estimated that the Delhi-Santos Gidgealpa field contains 450,000 million cub. ft. of gas.

That is a very significant figure, and I think it rather gives the lie to the Premier's pessimistic assessment of the Gidgealpa field.

According to my arithmetic, 450,000 million cub. ft. of gas would supply 100,000,000 cub. ft. a day for 13 years. It has been considered that a field would need to be able to supply at least 100,000,000 cub. ft. of gas a day for 20 years, so I say that 450,000 million cub. ft. of gas goes a long way to meeting that requirement. Therefore, the prospect that we find with Gidgealpa is backed up by the very extensive fields at Mereenie and Palm Valley, which are logically contiguous to South Australian industry. They are nearer to our industries and to our capital cities than they are to any other capital city of the Commonwealth, and logically we would have, I think, a first call on their use, because we could use the gas more cheaply than could any other large centre of industry. Dr. Charles Hetherington is quoted here as saying something about the potential gas reserves in the Central Australian and Mereenie structure, to which I have been referring. He said that the reserves in this field must be considered in the region of 1,000,000 million cub. ft. of gas. That is the opinion of such a well qualified geologist as Dr. Hetherington. The report goes on:

At the date of his report (December, 1964) some 500,000 million cub. ft. of natural gas had been proved by only three wells on the structure. It cannot yet be said with certainty that all these prospective fields in Australia will prove to be commercial. It seems most likely, however, that at least some will become profitable producers, and that others will be discovered. The speed with which full utilization of gas and oil has followed discoveries in other countries supports a not unreasonable forecast that 3,000 miles of pipeline could be required within five years to deliver indigenous petroleum to the Australian market from oil and gas fields in five States.

The article then goes on to discuss the possible use of these fields in various capitals. It deals with the possibility of a pipeline from Gilmore to Sydney, to which I do not wish to refer particularly at this stage. Regarding Gidgealpa, it goes on to say:

The future of gas at Gidgealpa in South Australia will also be decided soon. Delhi-Santos say that indications are that the Gidgealpa field has potential reserves of 450,000 million cub. ft. of gas.

If reserves are proved the potential market would justify a 500-mile pipeline from Gidgealpa to Adelaide. The cost could be in the region of £20,000,000. Adelaide has a potential domestic, commercial, and industrial market considerably larger than Brisbane's because of the likely use of gas for electricity generation in South Australia. Apart from that, further uses for Gidgealpa gas might be established in the base metal industry at Port Pirie and the steel industry at Whyalla. The Gidgealpa field lies in the Eromanga Basin just west of the Queensland border in the north-east corner of South Australia. Its structure is large, with several hundred feet of closure; its wells are good producers with open flow potentials of from 3,000,000 to 30,000,000 cub. ft. of gas a day. Other structures exist in the general area, and it is believed that much more natural gas will be found there.

The article continues:

However, the potential of the Mereenie field in the Amadeus Basin, 140 miles south-west of Alice Springs, cannot be disregarded. The gas at Mereenie contains possibly 50 barrels per million cubic feet of heavier hydrocarbons. One completed well had an open flow potential without treatment of 60,000,000 cub. ft. of gas a day. According to Dr. Hetherington a very large reserve of natural gas at Mereenie can be expected. He advised the Queensland Government that there was also a potential for oil and structures in the area were of such size that if oil were discovered the quantity cou'd be sufficient to provide more than Australia's oil requirements.

It is an exciting prospect for power-generating and associated industries in South Australia. In the light of authentic statements it would be wrong for us to dismiss this matter in a light-hearted way. The possibilities are too great to lie within the compass of a limited inquiry. The requirements of industry, and particularly of electricity generation and the supply of gas for heating and industry, can be associated with other tremendous potential users of gas, such as the chemical and fertilizer industries. It is incongruous that the Government should have considered this matter and decided to appoint a certain company to investigate the proposals and to issue a report. I do not accept that the Government's attitude to this matter is adequate. First, the company appointed is interested in the construction of a pipeline, but this is not the only aspect that we should consider. It is one, but only one, aspect of the whole problem. The question is far wider than the construction of a pipeline, so that it is not good administration to appoint as an adviser someone who is probably interested in building a pipeline that may come as a result of its recommendations.

That is not the correct thing to do. The report could unwittingly and unintentionally be weighted in favour of the company's prospects. The problem with which we are faced is far greater than would allow the limited resources of a company in a technical field to make a proper assessment and report. The matter requires the widest possible inquiry on every facet. We should know what resources we have; we should know what the prospects

are of further resources; we should know exactly how the qualities and quantities will stand up to continued output; we should know the cost of bringing this material to the market; we should know the best technical means for constructing the conduits that will bring it here; we should know something about the technical problems of piping gas over long distances in our climate and in the varying soil acidities associated with our countryside; we should know something about the distribution of the product; and we should know something about what it will cost when it gets here.

These things are important, as on any one could hinge the success or failure of the project. Integral in that inquiry is the question of who should build the pipeline and who should finance it; of who should control the price charged for the use of it; what relationship the capital cost will have to industries being served by it; what the resources are of the Government for building it, or what possibilities we have of attracting outside capital into the project, bearing in mind that the cost has to be kept to the lowest possible figure. In addition, there is the possibility of using other sources of fuel; the prospect of obtaining further huge quantities of oil; the impact of shipping; the world-wide conditions of peace or war; the effect on the South Australian economy of using our fuel or of getting it from outside. These are matters that should be considered in this inquiry, and I agree that the inquiry should be a wide one. I believe the Government's approach is completely inadequate.

I said recently that I believed the Government is too much absorbed in attending to legal and social matters of domestic importance, and is inclined to dismiss with scant consideration the gigantic problem of the future development of this State. A matter of great moment to the future development, is this possibility of power generation at a minimum cost for the next 40 or 50 years. I believe this State owes a great debt to Sir Thomas Playford for the tenacity of purpose with which he pursued the development of the Leigh Creek coalfield, and the advice and counsel so wise in those days is the same today. I believe we should heed his advice. The only thing the Government has done since this motion was moved is to appoint some consultants. I repeat the suggestion that these people have a vested interest in the proposition they are being asked to investigate, which is not proper, and which is embarrassing to the company concerned. Indeed, it could well result in a limited report being presented to the Government.

These people could well be interested in suggesting to the Government what action should be taken in regard to building pipelines, etc., for they are vitally interested in those matters. The Government has not hesitated to authorize investigations into town planning and to appoint committees to investigate future outports throughout the State; the Attorney-General has a committee investigating the work of justices of the peace; and we have had a long and involved inquiry into transport (which does not seem as though it will result in any benefit to the State, anyway). However, why does the Government not brief the most experienced people to make the widest possible inquiry into the most comprehensive technical, financial and practical means to attend to a project of this magnitude? This matter is urgent; the motion is designed to focus attention on what will become an acute problem for the State, unless active steps are soon taken.

Although I have a full measure of confidence in the Chairman, the board, and the management of the trust (to which I have often referred), these men are experts in the field of power generation, reticulation and administration: they are not (nor would they pretend to be) equally expert in the realm of discovery, mining, exploration, evaluation of resources in the mining sense, the impact of circumstances extraneous to their special fields of knowledge, or long-range supplies of various fuels. People who have special knowledge of these matters should be co-opted, under the powers of a Royal Commission, to express their views. Research and investigation by isolated groups must be collected, co-ordinated and evaluated by an authority that can view the picture as a whole.

A Royal Commission is the logical authority, and should be instructed by Parliament to undertake this work, so that South Australia's pre-eminence in the field of power supply can be maintained in the fiercely competitive field of industrial growth and social amenities. It is a question not only of price: it is even more pointedly a question of the survival of our mode and method of daily living. Every major development in the advancement of our living standard is based on power. Computers, hospital equipment, air-conditioning, communications by every means (particularly through radio and telephone), water supplies, sewerage systems, and, in fact, every modern amenity

for daily living, depend on power. Our water supply requires 65,000 h.p. of electrical energy every summer day. Therefore, a constant, unvarying and economical power supply will become even more essential as years pass. This is a matter to be considered not in the narrow fields of politics, departmentalism, face-saving, self-justification, or profit: the Leader's motion should commend itself to every forward-thinking administrator in every field. Before many years have passed we shall be judged by the action we take (or fail to take) now. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 2. Page 2514.)

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I support the Bill. I do not know who is responsible for making recommendations to the Government in regard to the salaries of officers for which Parliament is responsible, by passing legislation periodically to adjust those salaries. However, before becoming a member of this House I had always said that this was a low-wage State. Since becoming a member I have repeated that statement, for, apart from the Governor (whose salary was brought into line by Parliament a few years ago with the salaries of the Governors in the other States), one can commence with the salary of the Premier and proceed down through the salary ranges of other officers for which the Government is responsible, to see that that is so. Years ago, men working in the railways received a lower wage than that paid to general industry. That anomaly has been rectified by the Commonwealth Arbitration Court, but today we still find that the salaries of public servants are comparatively low. This applies also to Ministers and members of Parliament. In comparison with the salaries of members of Parliament in other States, our salaries are the same now as they have been for years. Our salaries are the lowest of those paid in the mainland States. I have not risen to speak about Parliamentary salaries, but merely to instance our position in respect of the other States.

Last evening the Leader of the Opposition commented on Ministerial salaries, to which I intend to refer later. As the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) knows, I became a member of the Botanic Garden Department's Board of Governors this year, joining with the honourable member to represent Parliament on that board. The honourable member knows that only recently the Botanic Garden Department lost a botanist not to the Eastern States (which, according to the table supplied by the Premier, pay higher salaries than those paid anywhere else in the Commonwealth) but to Western Australia. That State has a lower population than ours, and is still a claimant State, yet the officer concerned was able to receive £1,000 a year more in Western Australia than he received here. His salary here was fixed by the Public Service Board. When this was reported to the Botanic Garden Board I asked how the Botanic Garden allocation compared with the allocation for the Adelaide City Council. I was told that wages paid to employees of the Botanic Garden were below those paid to comparable employees of the Adelaide City Council. Because of this, the board is having extreme difficulty in obtaining and retaining labour.

I shall refer to other officers in the Public Service. The Assistant Returning Officer, who has to conduct elections for both Houses of Parliament, receives £3,000 a year less than his counterpart in New South Wales, who conducts an election for only the Lower House. In New South Wales members of both Houses meet and elect the Legislative Council. The South Australian Assistant Returning Officer receives £2,300 less than the salary of his counterpart in Victoria. The increases for the Auditor-General and for the Public Service Commissioner as provided in the Bill will make their salaries £100 above comparable salaries in Victoria. However, they will receive less than the salaries paid in New South Wales. I have it on good authority that the Victorian Government is considering introducing legislation to increase the salaries of the Victorian Auditor-General and Public Service Commissioner to £7,000 a year.

In this State, even with a change of Government, we are making little progress. It may be that the wrong advice is being given to the Governor, but something is wrong. When I first saw the increases provided in the Bill (although I did not think they were sufficient) I thought that, as they made the salaries of the South Australian Public Service Commissioner and of the Auditor-General £100 more than those of their Victorian counterparts, this was some compensation for the fact that their salaries had lagged behind the Victorian rates by £500 for some time. However, as a result of my information, I believe that the Victorian

salaries will be £1,200 above our rates in a couple of weeks' time. I draw attention to the fact that in New South Wales similar officers are provided with an allowance. Perhaps this necessity applies in South Australia; I do not know. The Public Service Commissioner and the Auditor-General are heads of departments and their salaries are the same as those received by the heads of other large departments. When the salaries of the Auditor-General and of the Public Service Commissioner are increased this increase is published in the press and is available in *Hansard*, although not many members of the public read *Hansard*. When the salaries of other heads of departments are increased they are not published in the newspapers. Therefore, the neighbours of the Public Service Commissioner and of the Auditor-General know what salary they are receiving. I suggest this matter could be discussed with the officers concerned, and perhaps they might prefer to have their salaries adjusted in the same way as the salaries of other heads of departments.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The salaries of Public Service officers are published in the Public Service List.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, but how many people buy the Public Service List or the *Gazette*? Compared with the number of people who read newspapers, very few read *Hansard* or the *Gazette*. However, if I lived next door to the Public Service Commissioner or to the Auditor-General I would know their salaries.

Mr. Hall: I do not think there is anything wrong with that. This is public money and they are public servants.

Mr. LAWN: Then why shouldn't the same position apply to heads of other departments?

Mr. Hall: A list of Public Service salaries is published but that could not be included in the press: it is too large.

Mr. LAWN: I cannot see any need to differentiate between these officers and other heads of departments. If it is right to publish their salaries then it is right to publish the salaries of all heads of departments. I notice that judges' salaries are still under review. The salary paid to the South Australian Chief Justice is £7,000, the same amount as that paid to his counterparts in Western Australia and Tasmania, which are two claimant States.

Mr. Ryan: Yet we are the third State in the Commonwealth.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. New South Wales is the No. 1 State, Victoria is No. 2, and South Australia is now No. 3, for we are senior to Queensland in population; yet our Chief Justice is receiving a salary appropriate to the position in Western Australia and Tasmania.

Mr. Hall: Are you advocating higher salaries for the judges?

Mr. LAWN: I understand from the Premier's explanation that their salaries are under review.

Mr. Hall: Do you know that certain unionists have expressed great opposition to increases in judges' salaries?

Mr. LAWN: I do not know how that interjection is relevant to my remarks. Is the honourable member suggesting that because some unionsts disagree with wage increases I should also disagree with them?

Mr. Hall: I am just pointing it out to you.

Mr. LAWN: The honourable member need not waste his time, for I have my beliefs and my principles and will stick to them through thick and thin. The other judges at present receive £50 a year more than the judges in Tasmania and Western Australia, so they are rated on a par with the lowest States of the Commonwealth—the two claimant States. I hope that the Government, when it finally reviews this matter, will place the judges at least on a par with those in New South Wales. I consider that they should be paid more than those in Victoria to counterbalance the fact that they have had to lag behind the Victorian judges. This would help balance the situation. I hope that in future adjustments will be made here simultaneously with those in Victoria.

Last evening the Leader of the Opposition compared the proposed salary and allowance of the Agent-General with the salary paid to Ministers in South Australia. If I understood the Leader correctly, I join with him in drawing attention to the anomaly that exists here. It is proposed that the Agent-General should receive a salary of £4,500 sterling and an allowance of £1,000 sterling, making a total of £5,500 sterling a year. The Leader pointed out that the Premier received a total salary, including his allowances, of £5,800, or £300 more in Australian currency than the Agent-General will receive in sterling. I maintain it is wrong that the Agent-General of a State should receive more than the No. 1 citizen of the State.

Mr. Clark: You are saying that the Premier does not get enough?

Mr. LAWN: Yes. I think the Leader's figures were a little low. Actually, the Premier receives a total salary of £5,900, so although the Leader was on the right track he was £100 out. Therefore, the Premier receives £400 more in Australian currency than the Agent-General

will receive in sterling. That difference is very small indeed, and I think that actually the Agent-General will be better off. He is in England merely carrying out certain duties on behalf of the State, yet the Leader of the Government, the No. 1 citizen of the State, receives a lower salary. I agree with the point the Leader of the Opposition made. He went on to deal with the position of the other Ministers, who in fact receive £2,100 a year above their salaries as members, making their total salary £5,200 a year. The Leader said it was £5,100, so again he was £100 out. Compare those salaries with that of the Agent-General! If I understood the Leader correctly, he was drawing attention to the fact that whilst he agrees (as I do) with the proposed increase he maintains that other salaries in this State need reviewing. I heartily agree with his remarks in that regard.

I referred earlier to the Botanic Garden staff and to the Assistant Returning Officer in South Australia. We have staff in this building whose saralies, which are fixed by the Public Service Commissioner, are grossly low. I have in mind staff whose salaries were fixed in the past by an old State award. Although this was substantially altered in 1961, it appears that certain staff here at Parliament House are still working under that award, which existed prior to 1961. I shall not go further with that point, and will merely say that this matter will be brought to the attention of the appropriate authorities in the next few days. I think I have shown that South Australia's system of assessing the salaries of its public servants is radically wrong and that some alteration is needed. I commend my remarks to the Government, which perhaps will be able to devise some better method of effecting adjustments from time to time so that the salaries of our officers will more closely approximate those in other States. I support the Bill.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I think the speech I have just heard is about the most inflationary one I have heard since I entered Parliament. Apparently everything attached to salaries is wrong when the salaries are lower than those paid to somebody else. I do not begrudge an increase when an increase is due, and I know that we operate under a system which is competitive. The honourable member has pointed out that in this State we have to compete with other States regarding salaries, but just where do we get if we fully adopt the policy he outlined? We chase all round Australia to find out the absolute highest in any salary in any category and we award that. That seems to be the principle, without any regard to who is to pay, what influence it will have on the rest of the community, or indeed on the effect on the prospects of the State as a whole. This is a completely ridiculous and irresponsible attitude.

The honourable member has forgotten the somewhat genuine concern of people on wages who have claims before the Arbitration Court. Those people were genuinely concerned that the salaries of the judges went up by about £40 a week when they could expect rises of only shillings a week. The honourable member is openly advocating the continuation of this move to widen the gap between what could be called the basic living wage and the salaries paid to the higher officers. If this gap widens, it is people like the member for Adelaide who will be responsible. As a member of the Liberal and Country League, I believe that every person should have the right to be rewarded for his work, for his ability, and for his saving. We should not consciously widen this gap between the highly paid officers and those who, while receiving near the basic wage, raise a family.

Mr. Clark: Haven't you got your tongue in your cheek?

Mr. HALL: No, I have not. I deplore the attitude that we have to pay the highest salaries regardless of where the money comes from. That is not an example that I set to the people of South Australia.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support this measure for an increase in salaries for these people. We have lost too many good people, and it is time that this sort of thing stopped. We have lost officers from departments, men with special knowledge, and I instance the botanist from the Botanic Garden. We should also look at the Agriculture Department to see what staff has been lost from this State. We must maintain a staff of a high standard. If we are going to have a man with only mediocre qualifications, the one who knows he is not worth more and is not likely to get more, we will reach a sorry position, and that should not happen. Young officers, particularly those in the hurly-burly of business, who are asked to make reports and advise the Government on everything, are those to be encouraged. Their advice is consequential on their knowledge and attainments, and we will have to pay higher salaries or we will lose more of them.

There was a time when this State was emerging from a purely primary-producing State, and

it is to the great credit of the previous Government that this State built up an enormous structure of secondary industry, and its value and the work put into it, can never be taken from that Government. That was necessary, but as we had to save every penny we obtained the reputation of being a low-wage State. At one time there were low wages in the railways. I was shocked when I found out what a trolley man on the tracks received, as it was just the basic wage. It is a wonder that this State achieved what it has, but there was a recognition that we had to do this in order to achieve something. However, the time for all that is past. I know this Government will get into trouble with the salaries because it will not have too much money, but it will not have officers either unless it is prepared to pay them and, to that extent, I support the Bill.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I agree entirely with what the member for Burra has said, particularly when we realize what has happened in the Agriculture Department. There is not much point in giving a blank cheque to the Director of the Agriculture Department, at present overseas, and asking him to recruit staff from other countries, when we should have retained local people in these jobs. It is the local people who should be receiving these benefits and not those from other countries. The Secretary of the Railways Department (Mr. Martin) has also tried to recruit labour from overseas. No persons in industry have had a harder life than those people engaged on the permanent way in the Railways Department. Whether they worked for the South Australian Department or on any railway system in the Commonwealth, these people have worked harder over the years than anyone else.

Mr. Casey: And under most trying conditions!

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, under the worst possible conditions. Honourable members were invited to visit the Islington railway workshops to meet these men and to inspect the rolling stock built there for the use of the railwaymen. The conditions of tradesmen who had to travel to all parts of the State needed to be improved, and a new sleeping car and the new tradesmen's cars will help greatly to alleviate the conditions of workmen who have to travel into the country. We are reaching the stage where the position of these men is being recognized more fully.

The member for Burra said that the Government would get into trouble if it paid these higher salaries. However, the Government introduced the system of service payment to try to keep these men in employment, as it appreciated the little people who really counted. There is no need to spend money bringing migrants from overseas if consideration is given to these little people. The Government must recognize what is happening today, and it is futile for the member for Gouger to compare the salaries of people on the basic wage with the salaries of judges. Are we going to write down the position of the Chief Justice and the puisne judges, or should we encourage people to accept these responsible positions?

Apparently some people consider it easy to obtain magistrates to fill vacant positions in this field. Was it easy to get people to leave their former positions and fill the vacancies which the Government filled recently? These men who were appointed as magistrates were probably receiving a larger salary in their private practice than they will receive as magistrates. The Government almost begged them to give up their practice to take on these responsible positions, and it is a credit to them that they agreed to do that and to assist the Government.

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

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Last evening, it sounded to me as though the Leader was attempting to give some form of pay-out to the new Agent-General, but I point out that that appointment should do credit to South Australia. The Leader has asked for an elaboration of the reasons for subdividing the total payments of the new Agent-General after March, 1966, in a different manner than hitherto adopted. There are three prime factors in the consideration: first, the outdated tax rebate on so-called cost of exchange to sterling; secondly, the special representation allowance presently paid by the Electricity Trust; and, thirdly, the manner of subdivision of the total payment between salary and allowances. The tax rebate procedure arose out of a theory that Australian pounds and English pounds were the same, but that there was a cost of exchange in transferring from Australia to England. This has not been so for well over 30 years, but the theory has continued. From next year when the Australian currency unit is known as a "dollar" the theory will be even less tenable than hitherto.

A second and more serious reason for abandoning the tax rebate arrangement is that it works out differently with different persons,

depending upon their private income, personal deductions, etc. To abandon the old arrangement with the new appointment, and instead add £300 sterling to the allowance, will place the new appointee in much the same financial position in that regard as Mr. Pearce has latterly been in, and it will cost the Government much the same. The present representation allowance from the Electricity Trust to the Agent-General is £200 sterling a year. In the future this will be paid to Government revenue, and a comparable amount will be added to the statutory allowance. Neither the Government nor the Agent-General will gain or lose by this re-arrangement, which is preferred as being tidier. It is desirable, in my view, that the provisions for the Agent-General be made wholly by Statute and not be subject to supplements in other ways, and apart from Parliament.

Concerning subdivision of the total of £6,000 sterling between salary and allowance, £4,500 is proposed as salary for Mr. Pearce and £1,500 sterling as allowances, including tax rebate at Government expense and payment by the Electricity Trust. After next March the proposal is for £4,080 sterling salary and £1,920 allowance. This would mean that 32 per cent of the total would be paid as an allowance, which seems reasonable. The proportion was 33⅓ per cent in the 1953 Act, and this proportion will be barely reinstated. For the Agent-General for New South Wales the proportion is now 47 per cent in allowances; for Victoria 62 per cent; for Queensland 36 per cent; for Western Australia 40 per cent; and for Tasmania 52 per cent. Thus, the proportion of the total payment to be paid as allowances after this amendment will still be less for the Agent-General for South Australia than for the Agent-General for any other State. Mr. Pearce was asked whether he would desire the new arrangements to be applied fully to him for the remainder of his period in office, but he declined because of the benefit of the existing arrangement on the payment that will be due to him on retirement for accumulated long service leave. That extra payment would considerably outweigh to Mr. Pearce any benefits that would come from the new arrangements on his current income tax. Taking the case of Mr. Milne, the Australian salary is £5,100, less Australian tax of £1,756, giving an actual salary of £3,344. However, converted to sterling it is £2,675 plus an allowance of £1,920, totalling £4,595. In Australian currency the comparative figures in respect of State Agents-General are as follows:

	Salary.	Allowance.	Total.
	£	£	£
New South Wales ..	5,625	5,000	10,625
Victoria	3,125	5,125	8,250
Queensland	4,805	2,810	7,615
South Australia . ..	5,100	2,400	7,500
Western Australia .	3,750	2,500	6,250
Tasmania	3,180	3,500	6,680

I do not know who is responsible for all the nominated British migrants coming to South Australia but the last count showed that 47 per cent of all British migrants coming to Australia came to South Australia. Perhaps this has something to do with the Agent-General in London. Since I have been in office I have taken note of the communications, inquiries and other work involved in the Agent-General's work. With all the inquiries and negotiations taking place we have not yet been able to make a score in this respect.

The Government is paying close attention to the encouragement of new industries to South Australia. Inquiries are continually being made and, in the future, we hope to reach a conclusion on these matters. I do not think the Leader of the Opposition would desire to reduce any of the standards built up by previous Agents-General in London. Mr. Milne is younger than previous occupants of the post and he has certain family responsibilities. Further, he has made a financial sacrifice to take this post as the practice of his profession would return a greater income. We should like to make this position more lucrative but that is not possible at present. I ask the House to support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Salary of Agent-General."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I thank the Premier for the information he has given about the appointment of the Agent-General in London. Although I had prepared an amendment of the clause, in the circumstances I do not intend to proceed with it. However, I cannot believe that when decimal currency is introduced the present exchange rate between England and Australia will be altered from the 125 per cent rate of exchange that now exists. If the rate does change, this country will be in a dire dilemma, as we are already in trouble with our oversea exchange. I cannot see that Australia will attain parity with sterling when decimal currency is introduced because, if that happened, it would be the end of Australia's secondary industries, it would create chaos, and it would cause much

unemployment. I believe it is beyond the bounds of possibility that the introduction of decimal currency will alter the exchange rate unfavourably for Australia. I have never questioned the amounts we pay to our senior officers, who I believe take on tremendous responsibilities. Over many years I have had very loyal and efficient support from such officers, and I would want nothing but the proper procedure to be provided. However, I point out the anomaly that exists here. To compare expense allowances between States does not mean anything, for each State has a different formula regarding what it provides to the Agent-General. For instance, if an Agent-General is responsible for official functions in London his allowance must be much greater, and if he is given some assistance regarding accommodation that, too, makes a significant difference in his living costs. Therefore, relevant circumstances of each State have to be taken into account.

We are to pay the new Agent-General £4,080 a year salary instead of the £4,500 at present being paid. At the same time we are increasing his allowance from £1,000 to about £1,900. I can tell the Premier that when salaries come up for adjustment again I will raise strenuous objections if the salary that is now to be quoted as the official salary is regarded as being something less than what it actually represents. If an attempt is made to raise this official salary above the corresponding salaries of other public servants in South Australia, I will do everything possible to defeat the move. In my opinion, the actual salary is really an increase beyond the £4,500 received by the present occupier of the position. I could sense that in the Premier's mind there was some suggestion that my remarks were perhaps an oblique criticism of the present appointment. Let me say categorically that there is no oblique criticism in this matter. When the present Agent-General was appointed I received him and discussed questions which arose regarding certain aspects of his work. I gave him the best attention and the best information I could and wished him every success in his new post. The future benefit of this State depends greatly on the success of his representation of this State. Let me completely disabuse the Premier's mind regarding any suggestion that I was criticizing the appointment. Whenever I have had any objection to an appointment I have never run away from stating my objections, and I would not do so now. The appointment of the Agent-General is made by the Government, and I have no doubt that the Government exercised the best judgment it could in filling the position. If I may say so, Mr. Milne follows persons who have filled this position with great distinction to themselves and with advantage to this State. Sir Charles McCann, Mr. Greenham, and Mr. Pearce (the present occupant) have all rendered magnificent service on behalf of this State.

Over many years I have never liked the juggling of expense accounts and salaries, for this is a bad practice and one that we should avoid. I do not complain regarding the £200 previously paid to the Agent-General by the Electricity Trust now being paid into general revenue. I believe that the Agent-General's job is to look after the interests of the trust without receiving a separate payment.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): As I said previously, the tax rebate procedure arose out of the theory of parity between the Australian and sterling pounds. I went on to point out that there was the cost of exchange involved in transferring from Australia to England. I did not say anything about the value of money appreciating on the changeover to decimal currency next year. I said that from next year when the currency would be known as the dollar the theory will be even less tenable than hitherto. I know that we have to add the 25 per cent exchange. I hope I can convince the Leader that we will not be worse off in respect of currency exchange next year than we are today. I think the Leader is stubborn about this point. This arrangement was offered to Mr. George Pearce, but he said, "No, let my salary stay as it is because I am making a contribution to superannuation that is a taxation deduction, and in addition when I return to Australia I shall be better off." Mr. Pearce was begged to stay for another 12 months when we assumed office, but he did not desire to remain. When he returns he will be better off than if he had accepted the provision to be made for the new Agent-General. I think the Leader will appreciate it is not a question of Cabinet making these arrangements. There is a Public Service Commissioner and an Under Treasurer, and the recommendation goes through the appropriate tribunals and Cabinet accepts the recommendations. I agreed to the recommendation on this occasion, as I am entitled to accept recommendations of officers appointed to do a job in the interest of this State.

Mr. SHANNON: I applaud the Government's move. It is better for the occupant

of this office to have a larger part of his remuneration set aside for expenses. If we are to be adequately represented overseas, we cannot be parsimonious about the entertainment of people who should be entertained in this State's interests. I know Mr. Milne well and, although certain ill informed people think that he is not as well fitted for this task as he should be, I do not hold that view. He will be a worthy representative of the State. He is highly qualified in accountancy and has a nice personality, one that will appeal to the people who go to South Australia House for any service they require.

I have had the great advantage of the services of Mr. Deane on the Public Works Committee for nearly 10 years and have learned to recognize his ability, and know what an excellent officer he is to work with. I compliment Mr. Milne on being able to work in London with Mr. Deane, a secretary who has had five years' experience in that office, and who returns to a sphere in which he knows many of the answers, although perhaps some things have changed since he was there last. I am confident that Mr. Milne and Mr. Deane will make an excellent team to represent South Australia, as both gentlemen have the qualifications necessary to make a success of the office in London.

Mr. Malcolm Pearce is an excellent officer who, I think, suffered from misinformed criticism by people who considered that he was inclined to be a little abrupt. People who met him for the first time may have thought so, but to those who knew him he was far from abrupt: he was a likeable and lovable man.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: No-one could have done a better job than he has done.

Mr. SHANNON: That is so. His ability cannot be questioned. Mr. Milne steps into his shoes with similar qualifications, and I look forward to a successful term of office for him. Although I may be out of order in saying so in this debate, I am happy with Mr. Lloyd Hourigan, Mr. Deane's successor as Secretary of the Public Works Committee.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (3 to 9) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ABORIGINAL AND HISTORIC RELICS PRESERVATION BILL.

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

DECIMAL CURRENCY BILL.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the law of the State in consequence of the adoption of decimal currency in Australia; to make other necessary provisions in relation thereto; for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object, as appears from its title, is to amend State law in consequence of the proposed adoption of decimal currency. Currency, coinage and legal tender are subjects of legislative power committed to the Commonwealth, and there has been introduced into the Parliament of the Commonwealth a Currency Bill which provides for decimal currency, coinage and legal tender to come into force on February 14, 1966. Part V of that Bill provides that for a limited period both currencies may be used. The basic provision of the Commonwealth Bill is to be found in clause 10 which provides that any reference in a law of the Commonwealth, bill of exchange, promissory note, security for money, contract, agreement, deed, or other instrument, or a reference in any other manner to an amount of money in the existing currency is to be construed as a reference to a corresponding amount of money in decimal currency. The Commonwealth Bill, when passed, will thus make provision for the transition to decimal currency throughout Australia, but the Commonwealth cannot, of course, directly repeal, amend of alter State legislation. Accordingly it is necessary for complementary legislation to be passed in all of the States to make the necessary alterations in the State laws. That is the object of the present Bill, which, by

clause 2, is to commence on February 14, 1966.

The basic plan of the State legislation is like that of the Commonwealth legislation. By clause 4 references to amounts of money in the old currency in any State Act or statutory instrument (which is widely defined in clause 3) are, except when inappropriate, to be read and construed as references to the corresponding amounts of money in the new currency calculated on the basis of exact equivalents; that is to say, on the basis that £1 equals $2, 1s. equals 10c and one penny equals five-sixth of a cent.

There are many instances in State legislation, as in the case of Commonwealth legislation, where references to money are to percentages or to proportions. Accordingly clause 4 (2), which follows the provisions of clause 10 (2) of the Commonwealth Bill, provides that references to proportions or percentages are to be read as references to the equivalent proportions or percentages in terms of the new currency. Subclause (3) provides that any forms in terms of the old currency may be filled in in terms of the new currency. This is based on clause 12 of the Commonwealth Bill. Clause 4 (4) expressly defines the meaning of the term "guinea" which, although well known, does not bear a legal meaning in terms of the existing Coinage Act. There are many references to "guinea" or "guineas" in State legislation. The object of subclause (5) is to make it clear that where any Acts refer to amounts of money in sterling they are, for the purposes of the referential conversion, to be read as references to Australian pounds. There are some such references and, at all events since 1900, they have been read in practice as references to Australian and not English pounds. An exception is made in relation to the Agent-General Act because the Agent-General's salary is in fact paid in sterling. Clause 4 (6) provides for calculations to the nearest dollar, ten, five, or one cent where provision exists for calculations to the nearest pound, shilling, sixpence or penny respectively.

Clause 5 is intended to cover documents that are not statutory instruments. An example would be the Estimates which are made for the purposes of State law. The clause will enable the necessary substitutions in decimal currency to be made for the existing references to pounds, shillings and pence. As I have said, clause 4 is the basic provision. A review has been made of all existing State legislation and it has been decided to provide for references to the old currency to be read as references to the new currency rather than to amend every existing provision, a step which might be dangerous and lead to difficulties. It is considered more desirable to make provision for the reading of references to pounds, shillings and pence as references to dollars, except in inappropriate cases. There are, for example, many Acts on the Statute Book referring to amounts of money which have long since become exhausted. On the other hand, there are standing authorities for the payment of money and appropriations which are partially spent but under which something remains to be done. It will clearly be inappropriate for references to past transactions to be translated in terms of the new currency but equally necessary that these Acts be read as authorizing payments of equivalents in the new currency in the future. To amend every Act on the Statute Book would involve a rewriting of numerous sections spread throughout the many volumes of State Acts.

There are, however, some few Statutes to which the reference formula will not apply and clause 6 deals with these. It specifically amends those Acts where the direct equivalence formula will not apply and at the same time makes specific amendments to all other references in those Acts where the direct equivalence formula can be applied. It is clearly desirable, where an Act is being directly amended, to amend every reference rather than only a few—otherwise the result would be an Act which referred to the new currency in some sections and to the old currency in others. I shall return to the schedule later in this report. Clause 6 (4) makes certain specific amendments to the rules made under the Savings Bank Act relating to deposits by minors and charges to be made for new pass books. These amendments have been included in the Bill at the request of the bank because the procedure for amendment of the rules is somewhat complicated and involves an amount of time.

Clause 7 is designed to make provision for transactions made in the present currency after decimal currency comes into operation. As I have said, Part V of the Commonwealth Act enables persons to enter into transactions in terms of the old currency. Where this is done there could be some doubt as to whether any and, if so, what payments would have to be made under that law. I can best illustrate this by reference to the Stamp Duties Act, a Bill for the amendment of which is before us. That Act, as amended in accordance with the

Stamp Duties Amendment Bill, will provide for the payment of duties in terms of dollars and cents. There is nothing, however, to prevent a person from executing, say, a transfer of land under the Real Property Act for a consideration expressed in pounds. The object of clause 7 is to make it clear that in such a case the stamp duty payable is to be payable in the new currency as if the consideration has been expressed in terms of the new currency. There could be other similar transactions. Clause 8 is designed to enable amendments to be made to statutory instruments—in particular, regulations—to substitute decimal currency for existing currency without the necessity of complying with the normal procedure. There may be some hundreds of statutory instruments which will require amendment in this way, and compliance with the normal practice could take a considerable time. It is obviously necessary that some simplified procedure should be prescribed to overcome these difficulties as soon as possible.

Clause 9 is designed to cover the situation which may arise in cases of doubt or difficulty. Subclause (1) enables the Governor by proclamation to resolve such doubts or difficulties or give any necessary direction, while subclause (2) will enable the Governor to add to the Acts specified in the schedule by making any necessary amendments. For example, it may become necessary to reprint an Act from time to time. Application of the reference formula will not, in itself, enable a reprint showing equivalents in decimal currency to be incorporated. In such cases the Governor may specifically amend an existing Act by providing for the substitution of the new for the old currency, thus enabling the Act to be reprinted as amended.

I deal now with the list of Acts specifically amended by clause 6 and the schedule to the Bill. The first of these is the Cattle Compensation Act, which is particularly amended to allow the use of old style cattle duty stamps for a limited period after the new currency comes into operation, and to permit refunds for unused stamps. The amendments to the Crown Lands Act remove some unnecessary references to money in certain sections providing for repayments by instalments over a period of years. There is no need to set out the exact amount of each instalment in such cases, and the amounts mentioned in the Act are not directly convertible. Two other amendments remove references to pounds in three schedules. The Gas Act requires specific amendments in sections 33 and 37. Section 33 provides for increases or reductions in dividends corresponding with increases or reductions in the price of gas. These are to be at the rate of one-sixth of 1 per cent for every variation of one penny (or part), with a limit on any increase in dividend to 7 per cent. The amendments will provide for increases or reductions by one-fifth of 1 per cent for every variation in price of one cent (or part). Since one penny will equal five-sixths of a cent, it will be seen that the new rate of one-fifth of 1 per cent for every cent equals one-sixth of 1 per cent for every penny. The amendment to section 37 will fix the maximum charge for the hire of prepayment meters at five cents instead of five-pence. In fact, it is understood that section 37 is now virtually unused by the company.

I come now to the Industrial Code, the amendments to which have been agreed between the Australian Council of Trade Unions and the National Employers' Policy Committee following discussions with the various State organizations. The first amendment will amend every award, order, determination, etc., in force on February 14, 1966, by substituting exact equivalents for amounts specified therein with, however, provision for calculations to the nearest dollar for annual salaries, the nearest five cents for other periodical wage rates, and all other amounts being calculated to five decimal places and taken to the nearest fourth place. There is also provision for republication of awards, etc., in both currencies. The second series of amendments is to section 45 (1) (*c*) of the Code. Section 45 provides for variations of awards and orders on variations of the living wage, and subsection (1) (*c*) provides for "rounding off" where fractions are concerned. Annual salaries are computed to the nearest shilling omitting all fractions. These will now be computed to the nearest dollar, with the proviso that where a fraction of a dollar exceeds 49c. the computation is made to the next highest dollar. Weekly wages are computed to the nearest multiple of threepence, any fractions of one penny half-penny or more counting as threepence; in future the calculations will be to the nearest five cents, fractions of over two cents counting as five cents. Similar amendments are made to section 194 (1) (*c*) dealing with variations of determinations of industrial boards in accordance with living wage variations.

The Local Courts Act, Second Schedule, contains references to amounts of 3s. 4d., 6s. 8d., and 13s. 4d. These amounts are amended to

30c., 65c. and $1.30 respectively, a slight reduction being made in each case. The schedules to the Pawnbrokers Act contain references to amounts which are not readily convertible. In particular, the first schedule specifies charges which may be made on pawn tickets of one penny, and for profit of each 2s. 6d. one penny halfpenny. These charges are altered to one cent and two cents respectively, a slight increase in each case. The second schedule provides for certain charges of one halfpenny and one penny; these will become one cent in each case, again involving increases. Taken overall, the increases do not represent a great deal, especially having regard to the fact that the charges have not been increased for over 20 years, as well as to the fact that there is only one pawnbroker operating in this State at the present time.

Section 9 of the Places of Public Entertainment Act relates to fees payable for licences, which are in certain cases to be calculated without reckoning fractions of a penny. This will now read "not reckoning fractions of a cent".

The Savings Bank Act is amended in two respects. Section 39 permits the bank to receive sums of not less than one penny in the school bank department; this will be altered to make the minimum one cent. Section 52 provides for interest on deposits of not less than £1. This will now become one dollar, and the proviso to section 52 permitting interest on deposits of 10s. in the school bank department becomes unnecessary. The first amendment to the Swine Compensation Act is to remove the word "pounds" from the expression "five pounds per centum" in section 12. Direct conversion would have the effect of doubling the rate of interest from 5 per cent to 10 per cent. The second amendment is similar to the amendment to the Cattle Compensation Act, allowing use of old stamps for a limited period and refunds for unused stamps. The last amendment in the schedule is the deletion of the references to "coin weights" in the Weights and Measures Act. These references have long since been outdated, since this matter is governed by Commonwealth law.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (RATES).

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Succession Duties Act, 1929-1963.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The principal amendments are three-fold. First, in accordance with the policy of the Government announced at the last election, it raises the basic exemption for widows and for children under 21 from £4,500 to £6,000, and for widowers, ancestors and descendants from £2,000 to £3,000. Secondly, it increases the rebate of duty in respect of land which is used for primary production and which passes to a near relative, so that an amount of £5,000 in a particular estate is entirely freed from duty, and so that larger estates receive substantial concessions in addition to the basic exemptions which are provided. This, too, is in accordance with election promises. Thirdly, it provides for increased rates on higher successions as a taxation measure to raise revenues more nearly in line with revenues raised in other States, and at the same time provides for the elimination of a number of methods by which dispositions of property may be arranged to avoid or reduce duties payable.

At present an ordinary succession to a widow of £6,000 involves a duty of £225, and it is intended that this will be entirely eliminated. The new duty will remain lower than the present rate on widows for successions under £19,000, and beyond that figure will be higher than at present. For widowers and adult children there is at present a duty of £125 on a £3,000 succession. This will be eliminated and the new rate will remain lower up to a succession of £8,000, and will be higher above that figure. The new provisions mean that a widow succeeding to a primary-producing property with a net value of £11,000 will pay no duty, whereas at present she would pay £682 10s., and she will pay less than at present if succeeding to primary-producing property with a net value below about £23,000. A son succeeding to primary-producing property with a net value of £8,000 will, under the new proposals, pay no duty instead of £525 at present, and he will pay less than at present if succeeding to primary-producing property with a net value below about £17,500. The effective rebate of duty to a widow succeeding to primary-producing property will vary from £775 if the succession is worth £11,000, up to

£2,000 if the succession is worth £110,000. This compares with rebates of £292 10s. and £2,884 respectively at present. The rebate in the new provisions is more favourable than at present for all successions to primary-producing property to widows of less than about £28,000. For other near relatives the rebates follow a closely similar pattern.

For the year 1964-65 the succession duties raised in this State amounted to £3,302,000, or about 63s. a head of population. For the other States the comparable revenues a head were: New South Wales about 92s., Victoria about 100s., Queensland about 62s., Western Australia about 38s., and Tasmania about 55s. The five other States together raised about 84s. a head, or nearly one-third more than South Australia at 63s. This arose substantially because the effective severity of our rates was appreciably lower than elsewhere, particularly on the larger estates, and partly because it has been practicable in this State to arrange various means of disposition of an estate to reduce duties payable. It is difficult to compare South Australian tax rates with those elsewhere, for the South Australian rates are levied upon successions according to the size of each succession and without regard to the size of the total estate. Elsewhere the rates vary according to the size of the total estate and not according to the extent of each individual succession. However, a table derived from Commonwealth statistics of estate duty levied through State offices for 1963-64 (the latest published) shows the percentages of State probate or succession duties allowed as deductions for Commonwealth duty purposes according to size of estates. I ask leave for this table to be incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

SUCCESSION DUTIES.

	South Australia. Per cent.	All other States. Per cent.
£10,000 and under £15,000	7.6	7.2
£15,000 and under £20,000	8.1	8.5
£20,000 and under £25,000	9.8	9.6
£25,000 and under £30,000	10.3	10.4
£30,000 and under £40,000	10.9	11.8
£40,000 and under £50,000	10.9	13.9
£50,000 and under £60,000	9.9	15.9
£60,000 and under £70,000	13.5	18.0
£70,000 and under £100,000	13.6	21.3
£100,000 and over	18.4	23.9

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The table shows that on estates up to £30,000 the present South Australian rates are broadly comparable with the average in the other States, but on estates of greater value than £30,000 they bear much less heavily than those of other States. The rates and provisions now proposed will narrow those differences. Owing to the time taken in assessment and the time allowed for payment of duty, the net yield in revenue by virtue of these amendments is not expected to be very great in 1965-66. It will possibly be less than 5 per cent of the present yield, or about £150,000. For a full year, however, it is hoped that the net revenue will be a 20 to 25 per cent increase or about £750,000. Even so, the yield a head would still be below 80s., whereas the other States combined last year raised about 84s. a head.

I turn now to the provisions of the Bill in more detail. An important change made by the Bill is that an administrator of an estate will be required to include in the one return all property which by virtue of this Bill is to be deemed to be derived from a deceased person. This will avoid the present loss of revenue owing to the separate treatment of different successions, for example, testamentary successions, joint estates, settlements and gifts. At present, under the principal Act, separate and additional returns are required from the administrator, a donee of a gift, a surviving joint tenant, etc., and the property to which the returns relate is separately chargeable with duty and, except in a few specified cases, may not be aggregated with other property derived from the deceased.

New subsection (2) of section 7 of the principal Act (added by clause 6 (*b*)) provides for the general aggregation of property subject to duty, so that duty will be assessed on the total amount of all dutiable property derived by a particular beneficiary and the whole of the composite duty must be paid by the administrator. (The amount of this duty must, by virtue of the general law relating to trusts, be paid out of the estate, and the administrator will then have to recover from any donee, joint tenant, etc., the due proportion of duty attributable to any gift, joint property, etc.). This amendment will not affect the obligation of a trustee of a settlement or deed of gift to register the document even though the administrator is required to include the relevant property in his composite return and to pay duty on it. The requirement to register will ensure that the documents come before the Commissioner of Succession Duties and will protect the revenue, because the trustee is not always the same person as the administrator and many settlements are made many years before the death of the settlor.

Another amendment (new paragraph (*n*) of section 8 (1) inserted by clause 7 (*c*)) relates to gifts (whether made by deed or otherwise) which, under section 35 (1) of the principal Act, are dutiable only if made within 12 months of the death of the donor. The new paragraph extends this dutiable period to three years, as is the case with New South Wales, Victoria and Commonwealth estate duty. This extended dutiable period will apply as soon as the Bill becomes law so that, in the case of a person's dying immediately after that time, any gift made within the preceding three years will be subject to duty. Clause 3 (*a*) tightens the provisions of the principal Act by inserting therein a definition of "disposition", modelled on a definition in the New South Wales Act, so that any surrender, release or other like transaction will be subject to duty in the same manner as a simple transfer, conveyance, etc., is. There is some doubt whether the present provisions of the principal Act apply so as to render gifts by surrender, release, etc., subject to duty.

Clause 3 (*b*) revises the definition of "net present value" by removing the anomalous distinction that property passing under a deed of gift is valued at the time of the donor's death whereas, in the case of a simple gift, the date of the disposition determines the value. The new definition makes the date of the disposition the determining date in both cases and the effect will be that, once the beneficial interest in property has passed to the donee, he will be taxed on the value thereof. He will not be able to reduce the amount of duty applicable merely by dissipating the gift. In other respects this definition is revised in keeping with the new provisions of section 8, which I shall explain shortly and the effect of which is that many of the references in the principal Act to property accruing on a person's death are rendered redundant and misleading.

Clause 4 inserts new section 4a in the principal Act providing that, except in relation to persons dying on active service, which I shall explain later, the amendments made by the Bill apply only in relation to persons dying after the Bill becomes law. Clause 5 inserts a heading to sections 7 to 19 of the principal Act. Clause 6 replaces the portion of section 7 which provides for duty to be assessed on the total value of certain types of property with new subsection (2) requiring duty to be paid on the aggregate amount of all property derived by any person from a deceased person. This clause also adds new subsection (3) to section 7 as a machinery provision. Clause 7 (*c*) effects a revision of Part II of the principal Act by adding new paragraphs (*d*) to (*p*) to section 8 (1) specifying all property which is to be deemed to be included in the estate of a deceased person and which is to be subject to duty, clause 7 (*a*) and (*b*) making necessary machinery amendments. Under the principal Act this property is dealt with, in slightly different fashion in each case, by sections 14, 20, 32, 35 and 39a. These sections are reproduced in the new paragraphs with some changes of substance as follows: first, property comprised in a deed of gift or gift (new paragraphs (*f*) and (*n*)) will be dutiable if the disposition occurred within three years of death. (Under the principal Act the relevant period is one year.) Secondly, where, in relation to property passing under a deed of gift (new paragraph (*m*)), the donor has not parted with the beneficial interest in any such property within three years of death, such property becomes dutiable, the period of three years being substituted for the period of one year under the principal Act.

Thirdly, gifts with a reservation (new paragraph (*o*)) are at present subject to duty even if the reservation ceases or is surrendered many years before death. The new paragraph removes this anomaly by excluding such gifts from the dutiable estate if the reservation ceases and the donee assumes full possession and enjoyment continuously for three years before the death of the donor and there is no fresh or renewed reservation in that period. This paragraph corresponds with a provision in the corresponding Victorian and New South Wales Acts. The words "whether enforceable at law or in equity or not" qualifying the reservation have been taken from the New South Wales Act. This will strengthen our Act by making gifts with a reservation subject to duty whatever the legal nature of the reservation.

Under section 8 (1), as amended, all property therein mentioned will be deemed to be derived from a deceased person so that the ancillary provisions of Part II will apply in like manner to all such property. The scheme of the subsection, as amended, will correspond with a provision in the Victorian Act. The new scheme envisaged by section 8 (1), as amended, necessitates a re-arrangement of several provisions of Part II and many amendments of a machinery or drafting nature which are provided for by many of the remaining clauses. New subsection (1a) of section 8

(inserted by clause 7 (*d*)) will give extra-territorial application to all property mentioned in that section. At present the principal Act applies extra-territorially only in the case of property comprised in a settlement or deed of gift and in the ordinary case of property derived under a will or upon intestacy. Provision against double duty being payable in any such case is made by existing subsection (2) of section 8.

New subsection (1b) of section 8 (also inserted by clause 7 (*d*)) is the same as subsection (5) of existing section 35, and new subsection (1c) of section 8, modelled on existing section 21, enables a different net present value to be given to property passing under a document which is part of a settlement and in part a deed of gift. The Bill provides for the repeal of existing sections 21 and 35. Clause 8 (*b*) adds new subsection (2) to section 11, replacing subsection (3) of section 20, and clause 8 (*a*) makes a consequential amendment. Consequentially upon the new scheme of section 8 (1), as amended, the effect of section 11, as amended, will be that duty chargeable on any property mentioned in section 8 (1), as amended, will be a first charge on such property which will include property passing by way of gift, but as mentioned in new subsection (2) of section 11, there will be exceptions in the case of a settlement, deed of gift or gift.

Clause 9 (*b*) adds two new subsections to section 12 so as to enable the Commissioner, if the administrator is not able to pay duty on any property comprised in section 8 (1), as amended, to require a trustee of such property or any person who is or was beneficially entitled thereto to file a return. Clause 9 (*a*) makes a consequential amendment. Section 12, as amended, will conform to section 26 (1) and 37 (1) of the principal Act. Upon approval of the return such person will, by virtue of new section 16a (inserted by clause 13), be required to pay the duty. Section 14 relating to gifts made in contemplation of death is repealed (clause 10) and replaced in part by new pargraph (*d*) of section 8 (1) and in part by new section 19a. The amendments to sections 15 and 16 (clauses 11 and 12) are consequential on clause 9.

Section 28 (1) provides that, in the case of property comprised in a settlement or deed of gift, a trustee or a beneficiary nominated by the Commissioner must pay duty out of such property. This provision is replaced by new section 16a (inserted by clause 13) providing that a trustee or other person who is required to file the statement pursuant to new subsection (3) of section 12 shall pay duty on the property concerned but, in the case of the trustee, liability for duty will be limited to the value of such portion of the trust property as, before the death of the deceased person, he had not disposed of pursuant to the trusts. In the case of a beneficiary, however, there is no such limitation—once he has become entitled to the beneficial interest in dutiable property he will be personally liable for his due proportion of duty. This appears to be a necessary amendment in view of the scheme of the Bill which makes the administrator (and through him, the estate) liable for duty in such cases. This amendment is designed to prevent, say, a donee of property from throwing the burden of duty attributable to such property on beneficiaries under the will of the deceased person where, for example, he was given the property two years before the death and in the meantime has dissipated or disposed of the property.

Clause 14 amends section 18 consequentially on new section 16a. New section 19a, which I have previously referred to, is inserted in the principal Act by clause 15, which clause also inserts certain headings and repeals sections 20, 21, 21a and 22 now redundant by virtue of the new scheme of section 8 (1). Clause 16 repeals sections 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 and also inserts a heading to section 31, but the effect of the repealed sections is preserved by other sections of the principal Act as amended by this Bill. Clause 17 amends section 31 consequentially on new paragraph (*f*) of section 8 (1). Clause 18 repeals section 32, the provisions of which have been transferred to section 8 (1), and also inserts a heading to section 33. Clause 19 amends section 33 consequentially on the new provisions of section 8 (1). Clause 20 repeals sections 34, 35, 36 and 37, now redundant by virtue of the new provisions of section 8 (1), and also inserts a heading to sections 38 and 38a.

Clause 21 makes a consequential amendment to section 38 by extending the application of that section to all property mentioned in the new provisions of section 8 (1). New section 38a (inserted by clause 22) recognizes administrative practice by enabling the Commissioner to extend the time for payment of any duty under the principal Act. At present the Act provides for an extension of time for payment only in respect of certain classes of property. The clause also inserts a heading to the remaining provisions of Part II. New

section 46a (inserted by clause 23) is complementary to section 46 which gives an administrator or trustee power to impose a charge on property for the purpose of adjusting duties as between persons beneficially entitled to property subject to duty. This power will no longer be sufficient in all cases because, in the case of property given away within three years before death, for example, the property may not be in existence or may have been disposed of by the donee at the time when the administrator is required to pay duty on it. Such duty must be paid out of the estate, and by virtue of the new section the administrator will be able to recover from the donee the due proportion of duty attributable to the property concerned. Subsection (2) of the new section provides that where duty is recoverable from a trustee there will be the same limitation on the trustee's liability as is provided for by new section 16a (2), and that the trustee will have power of sale over the trust property in order to indemnify the administrator who has paid duty. Subsection (3) of the new section is a machinery provision. Clause 24 amends section 48 consequential on the new provisions of section 8 (1).

Clause 25 adds a new paragraph to section 55aa (1) of the principal Act which confers a remission of succession duty on the estates of persons who died on active service in the World Wars, in Malaya or in Korea. The scope of this section is extended to any proclaimed areas or operations, and may thus be applied to any members of the forces who die in Vietnam or Malaysia or in any operations that may be proclaimed, subject to the limitation that the death must be caused by wounds, an accident or disease and must occur within 12 months thereafter. In addition, by clause 26 (*b*) the amount of the exemption is raised from £5,000 to £10,000. New section 55b (4) (inserted by clause 26 (*d*)) enables this remission of duty (namely, the exemption of £10,000) to be granted in the case of a person dying on active service in any such area if the death occurred before the Bill becomes law. Clause 26 (*a*) and (*c*) and clauses 27 and 28 amend sections 55b, 55c and 55d consequentially upon the new scheme of section 8 (1), and clause 29 is consequential on clause 30.

Clause 30 repeals and re-enacts section 55f relating to rebates of duty allowable in respect of land used for primary production which passes to a widow, widower, descendant or ancestor under the will or upon the intestacy of the deceased. The new section provides for a reduction of up to £5,000 on dutiable property, the £5,000 being the total amount which may be deducted in a particular estate. The value of the interest derived by any such beneficiary will be deducted from the value of the aggregate amount of property which he derives, and duty will be assessed on the resultant amount. For the purposes of the rebate, only moneys charged on the land and any amount required to be paid by a devisee as a condition of his succession to the land and any amount by which the value of his interest is reduced by reason of any obligation imposed on him as such a condition will be taken into account by the Commissioner in determining the value of his interest.

Clause 31 amends section 56 consequentially upon section 8 (1), as amended. Section 56 enables the Commissioner to assess duty on property given to an uncertain person or on an uncertain event on the highest possible vesting that may be possible under any will, settlement or deed of gift. This section is amended to extend its application to all property which is subject to duty and to any possible aggregation of property with any other property that a person derives from the deceased person. Clause 32 (*a*) repeals subsection (1) of section 58 which provides against double duty being payable and which is no longer necessary in view of the new scheme of section 8 (1). Clause 32 (*b*) makes a minor drafting amendment to subsection (2). Clause 33 amends section 63 of the principal Act consequentially upon the new scheme of section 8 (1).

Clause 34 (*a*) and (*b*) extends the scope of section 63a of the principal Act which requires insurance companies to obtain a certificate from the Commissioner before paying out on any policy on the life of a deceased person. The amendment extends this requirement to policies on the life of the deceased person where the proceeds are payable to some other person. Clause 34 (*c*) and (*d*) and clause 35 are consequential on the new scheme of section 8 (1). Clause 36 makes an important amendment, the effect of which I have explained earlier. This clause amends the Second Schedule to the principal Act to provide for a general increase in succession duty rates although the basic exemptions are increased—from £4,500 to £6,000 in the case of widows and children under 21 years, and from £2,000 to £3,000 in the case of widowers, ancestors and descendants over 21 years.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1964.

Motion carried.

Resolution agreed to in Committee and adopted by the House. Bill introduced and read a first time.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its principal object is to vary the present rate of stamp duty payable on the sale of cattle under the Cattle Compensation Act from threepence for every £10 of the purchase money to sixpence a head of cattle sold at up to a price of £35, and 1s. a head where the purchase price is over £35. Clause 5 makes the necessary amendment. The amount to the credit of the Cattle Compensation Fund into which the stamp duty is paid, has been steadily rising over recent years as the incidence of compensable diseases has been reduced. While the need for retention of a substantial balance in the fund still exists to meet contingencies as, for example, an outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia, it is considered that the present duty can be safely reduced.

An additional reason for the alteration is that the present rate is not directly convertible to decimal currency. Adoption of the new rates will simplify calculations and facilitate such conversion. Clauses 3 and 4 bring the provisions of the principal Act concerning payment of duty into line with those of the Swine Compensation Act, which requires payment of duty on the sale of swine carcasses as well as swine. Although owners of cattle slaughtered for sale and condemned for compensable diseases are entitled to compensation, they do not pay stamp duty. It is considered desirable to remove the anomaly between the two Acts, and the clauses which I have mentioned require the payment of duty on sales of cattle carcasses as in the case of sales of swine carcasses. In these days of rising costs, I am sure that all members will be pleased to know that this is one measure that reduces costs.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

COMPULSORY ACQUISITION OF LAND ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 2231.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose this Bill which, in its present form, can do grave injustice to individuals. I believe it has been prepared without due regard to the rights of individuals, to the position in which they can be placed, or to the disabilities they can suffer under it. Under the Bill the Government can seize a property but it is uncertain when the person receives compensation. The person can be dispossessed of his house without money to purchase another and he has no assurance that he will receive reasonable compensation within a reasonable time. I was surprised and shocked when this Bill was introduced, because I did not believe there was any case for altering the present provisions that have stood the test of time. At present, certain forms have to be complied with, and the Government has been unable to seize, for public purposes, a property overnight. However, surely it is unnecessary to go to the extremes of this Bill.

When the Government requires property for a public purpose usually the property is acquired years before the public purpose arises. This Bill in its present form is completely foreign to this Parliament. When a person has property that he rightfully owns and it is required for public purposes, the public should pay to him a reasonable amount, it should be paid promptly, and every effort should be made to see that he is not inconvenienced because he owns the property to be acquired by the Government. When it is necessary to acquire property it is easy to put in an order and take the property, but that is not the ethics of Parliament. Perhaps the Attorney-General does not worry about these things, but I do because I know the hardships associated with provisions in this Bill. It is a measure that should not have been introduced in its present form. If we are acquiring property for a public purpose we should adopt the procedure outlined in amendments to be moved by my colleague.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I told him I would accept them.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: They should have been in the original Bill. It should not be necessary for the Opposition to have to place them in the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: No serious attempt has to be made at negotiation.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is suddenly decided that the property is required, and it is seized. The compensation to be paid is then left indefinitely. If this is a sample of the legislation to be introduced, the sooner this Government is kicked out of office the better. Surely, it is necessary to ensure that all citizens are dealt with fairly, particularly in such a case as this, where they will be inconvenienced, probably suffer hardship, and be disturbed in their occupation of a property that they have legally acquired and owned. No justification has been given by the Government for this change. I hope we will not see any more of this class of legislation introduced into Parliament.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I am surprised at the emotional speeches that have been delivered on the Bill. I may say that the complaints from responsible and senior officers of the Lands and Crown Solicitor's Departments about the extraordinarily cumbersome procedure provided by the present Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act are not new, but are of a long standing indeed, and they have a great deal of basis and justification. The acquisition of land properly needed for public purposes can be grossly delayed, and can prove to be unnecessarily complicated and expensive both to the person from whom the land is being acquired and to the Government, under the present procedures. Therefore, it was recommended by officers concerned that the procedure in South Australia follow a far more satisfactory procedure that was in force in other States of the Commonwealth. The Bill was drafted on that basis, using the provisions in force elsewhere, and all the dreadful things the Leader of the Opposition foresaw would happen under this legislation have not happened in Western Australia or anywhere else.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: But they do, unfortunately!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They do not. What the Leader has been talking about does not happen in Western Australia. In fact, I think the Bill was well drafted. However, we were prepared to examine any reasonable proposals for safeguarding the public under this measure. We took into account, after the matter had been introduced, the proposals of the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce that had been brought to the Government, the proposals of certain judicial officers who pointed out that difficulties in procedure could give rise to something of a feast for the legal profession in determining whether sufficient inquiry had been made, and we took into account the matters raised by the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson).

The Government is prepared to accept the amendment which the honourable member has on the file. I had already indicated that to him before the House met this afternoon. I intend to move other amendments on the file that will deal with other difficulties raised by the Government. I do not apologize for the fact that those matters were not included in the Bill beforehand. I think it is proper that the Government should accept submissions made to it while a measure is before the House if it thinks those amendments will improve the Bill.

I do not think we are in any way being dictatorial or unparliamentary, or standing over the public in taking that attitude. This measure is necessary for us to proceed with the acquisition of land for public facilities such as schools and hospitals and for the provision of land for freeways. The present legislation is in no way attuned to the kind of land acquisition that the Lands Department and various other departments that can acquire land for public purposes are now facing. I commend the measure to the House, for I think it will give to the Government the facility to provide for the public those things that need to be provided. At the same time, when amended, it will provide all the protection to the public that anybody could require.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh.

Noes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Lawn. No—Mr. McAnaney.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Acquisition of land required by Ministers and prescribed authorities."

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON moved:

To strike out "section is" and insert "sections are".

Amendment carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I move:

In new section 23a after subsection (1) to insert the following subsection:

(1a) The notice to treat referred to in paragraph (*b*) of subsection (1) of this section shall not be published in the *Gazette* unless—

(*a*) application has been made by the Minister or authority, as the case may be, to a Judge in Chambers for an order under this subsection; and

(*b*) the Judge, upon being satisfied that diligent inquiry had been made, has made an order directing that the notice to treat be so published.

The reason for this amendment is to make it clear that diligent inquiry has been made. Otherwise, if we have not got a court order certifying that diligent inquiry has been made, it could be that after the whole thing had been washed up to everybody's satisfaction somebody would come along and contest it on the ground that diligent inquiry had not been made. If honourable members remember the difficulties that arose under the Road Traffic Act about inquiry for people before a nominal defendant was appointed, they will remember what expense people could be put to and how proper processes could be defeated by technicalities. The suggestion was made to me by an eminent judicial officer that this was a simple way to cure what would otherwise be a lucrative practice for some sections of the legal profession, which could be involved in this Act. I take pleasure in depriving some members of my profession of this possibility.

Amendment carried.

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

In new section 23a (3) (*b*) after "Act" to insert ", and such person shall thereafter be entitled to receive from the Minister or the authority, as the case may be, interest at the rate of five per centum per annum, on such amount of the compensation payable to him under this Act as is for the time being unpaid, until the full amount of such compensation has been paid."

This amendment arose from submissions made to the Government by the Adelaide Chamber of Commerce Inc., which raised three matters in connection with the Bill. We did not consider that the other two matters contained much substance; they are already covered by the Act. The Government felt it was proper where compensation was outstanding that, when the rights of the people to the property concerned had been converted into a claim for compensation, interest should run on so much of the compensation as was outstanding, and in consequence I move the amendment.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I do not object to the amendment; in fact I think it is proper. Under the old Act the claim was made before a court, which dealt with it, but that was at the election of the owner making the claim. In this case the position is reversed in that the promoter has gained the title and, as the owner has no option in the matter, he should be entitled to interest as from the date of transfer of the title.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

In new section 23a (13) after "may" second occurring to insert "subject to section 23b but".

This is a drafting amendment.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

In new section 23a (13) after "notice" to insert "(being not less than three months' notice)".

This is a further protection to the owner and, I think, a proper protection in so far as it defines the notice to be given.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

After new section 23a to insert the following new section:

23b. (1) If—

(*a*) any land is acquired by virtue of a proclamation made under section 23a of this Act; and

(*b*) the promoters have, not later than three weeks after the date of publication of the proclamation in the *Gazette*, received from every person who appears to the promoters to have a right to compensation in respect of the acquisition notice of his claim for compensation,

the promoters shall give notice to each such person stating the names and addresses of claimants from whom the notices of claim have been received and requiring him, within such time, not less than four weeks after such notice is given, as shall be specified in the notice, or within such further time as the promoters may in writing allow, to prove—

(i) his title to the land so acquired;

(ii) that no person other than the claimant or claimants from whom the notice or notices of claim have been received, has any estate or interest in the land so acquired; and

(iii) that all rates, taxes, charges, mortgages and encumbrances relating to the land so acquired have been paid or discharged or will be paid or discharged out of moneys to be paid by the promoters under this section.

(2) If the claimant or (if more than one) all the claimants to whom the notice is given by the promoters in accordance with subsection (1) of this section complies or comply with the notice within the time specified therein, the promoters shall, before entering upon or taking possession of the land, pay

to the claimant or claimants, on account of the compensation which he is or they are entitled to receive under this Act in respect of the acquisition, the amount of the promoters' valuation of his estate or interest or their respective estates or interests in the land so acquired.

(3) For the purposes of section 46 of this Act, any payment made under subsection (2) of this section to a claimant shall be deemed to be an unconditional offer in writing referred to in that section made to the claimant by the promoters.

(4) Except as provided in subsections (3) and (5) of this section, any payment made under this section shall not affect the respective rights of the claimant and the promoters, and shall not for any purpose be referred to, in any pending or subsequent proceedings for the determination of any claim under this Act for compensation before a court or an arbritrator in respect of the acquisition of the land.

(5) The amount paid to a claimant under subsection (2) of this section shall, where appropriate, be deducted from the total amount of compensation payable to the claimant by reason of such acquisition, but, if the amount paid under this section exceeds the total amount of compensation to which the claimant is entitled, the amount of the excess may be recovered by the promoters from the claimant as a debt in any court of competent jurisdiction.

(6) Where any sum has been paid to a claimant by the promoters on account of compensation to which such person is entitled under this Act, no interest shall be payable on that sum to the claimant by the promoters after the date of payment of that sum.

In the second reading debate I said that under the Bill as it stood an owner could be deprived of his title without any consideration passing to him, or he could be deprived of the occupancy of his land or property and not have the wherewithal to reinstate himself in business or in a living area. The amendments are designed to ensure that when the owner has made a proper presentation of his claim and it has been accepted as such (and all parties who had claims under the title had fulfilled their obligation to tender their claims), it should be the obligation of the promoter to pay to the owner the value of the land as determined by the promoter. I am aware that the promoter's value is not necessarily the owner's value, for if it were then the matter would not have gone to compulsory acquisition. There is the outstanding question of the court's final determination of the value.

I point out that the promoter in this case can only be a Government instrumentality or a body approved by the Minister to be a promoter. In that case, the valuation will not merely be the valuation of a private person, who in all probability would write it down to the lowest possible value. In most cases the valuation would be made by a Government valuing authority, probably the Land Board or the valuing officer of a department who has no particular interest in writing down unnecessarily or beyond a reasonable limit the valuation of the land. I would hope that in most cases the valuation would be made by the Land Board, for it is the Government's main valuing authority and is a most competent body. Therefore, the valuation would be realistic. I consider the amendment goes a long way to meeting the serious objections we raised on this aspect.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I do not entirely agree with my friend in this matter, because I am not happy about the term "promoter's value". I have seen departmental values which have been ridiculously low and which could not be sustained and, indeed, the valuation has been frequently departed from to a large extent when the price has been finally fixed under the provisions of the compulsory acquisition legislation. This term does not define the authority, and I would prefer that we have what, after all, is the official authority for land valuation, namely, the Land Board. I believe the Land Board would be rather a better authority. The promoters in many instances would be the Highways Department, and in other instances they might be semi-Government instrumentalities.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: The Highways Department uses the Land Board.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know it does, but it need not necessarily use it for this purpose. Under this provision the promoters could be the Highways Department, which need not necessarily go to the Land Board for the valuation.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: It is a bit unlikely.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If it is unlikely, then there can be no objection to mentioning a specific authority. The Land Board is a thoroughly competent body, comprising persons of integrity and ability, and I do not think the Government would be in any way embarrassed by its valuations, which often would be accepted without any further proceedings. If some specific authority were set out in the Bill we would be less likely to run into trouble. The Land Board has so often proved to be right in these things that people would have some hesitation in proceeding further if they knew the board's valuation. We should

not leave it to all sorts of authorities to decide what they will pay to owners under this clause.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I see some difficulties in the Leader's proposal. The acquiring authorities could be bodies corporate other than the Crown. They could be bodies not in a position to require a valuation from the Land Board. We could run into administrative difficulties unless we prescribed a duty for the Land Board to make valuations in circumstances of this kind. It seems that we shall run into another lengthy drafting difficulty. This draft was worked out at a series of long conferences, with Mr. Zelling, Q.C., approving it, and I should be reluctant to depart from it.

There is another influencing factor in this. Where the money is to be paid over, in the interim interest will run on the remainder. It would be to the promoter's advantage to avoid any interest payment by making a true valuation immediately. It is surely in the interests of the promoter to get as near as he can to what he thinks will be the valuation of the court in this matter. It is preferable to leave the situation as it is; otherwise, there will be real administrative difficulties.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I appreciate the amendment providing for interest. That is eminently fair but it is not a penalty interest: it is a rate of interest that is today lower than the bond rate of interest so, from the point of view of a promoter, there is no penalty in having to pay interest at that rate.

Mr. Shannon: He is enjoying the benefit of the occupancy of the land.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In the first place, he has the land; in the second place, he is getting his money not at a bond rate but at a fraction under. I do not deprecate the value of this amendment. If it was a rate of 8 per cent, the promoter would be anxious to get somewhere near the full value in his original payment, but it is about equivalent only to the ordinary bond rate of interest, a rate that anyone tomorrow can get on a Government bond with no trouble. The fact that the Attorney-General has said that miscellaneous people will be valuing these properties is an argument for having some set authority under this Act, which is, after all, a public Act.

If the Land Board is not normally the valuing authority for that, it could easily become so for this purpose. The term "promoters" is wide. If the promoters so fancy, they can submit a ridiculously low value for a property, because the rate of interest they have to pay is not a penalty rate. The rate of compensation should be the rate that the authority should ultimately expect to pay, which would be about the Land Board's valuation. The board is a conservative valuer and its valuation would be fair.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government is prepared to look at this matter. Consequently, I ask that progress be reported.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ELECTRICAL WORKERS AND CONTRACTORS LICENSING BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 2. Page 2509.)

Mr. HALL (Gouger): The Minister of Works and the member for Semaphore have stated some reasons for the introduction of this legislation, but no reasonable justification has been given by either of them. Their reasons have not been adequate, and I believe that one or two of the real reasons have not been stated. This Bill was introduced at the behest of the member for Unley, who has said many times that he has been promoting this type of legislation since he came into the House.

Mr. Corcoran: Are you suggesting that he would do this for himself?

Mr. HALL: No, I am not. I did not mean to give that impression, but because of his connection with the electrical industry this Bill has been introduced.

Mr. Langley: I am sorry, but this is Labor policy.

Mr. HALL: This Bill has not been introduced for safety reasons. The reasons given by the Minister of Works and the member for Semaphore do not exist as they relate to accident statistics. Every statistic is proof against what has been said by these members. I do not oppose a proper standard being set for electrical work, particularly in this modern age.

Mr. Burdon: How many electrical fatalities were there in 1964?

Mr. HALL: No-one would oppose the idea of proper standards for an industry which, amongst others, was becoming increasingly complex. It would be foolish to oppose the institution of proper standards. Although this Bill aims to achieve certain standards for electrical work in this State, it has the inevitable flaw of socialistic legislation, which has cropped up continually this session. This component has been part of many Bills that

have been discussed; it is the restriction of personal freedom, the achieving of an end at all costs, although the cost is met by the people's inconvenience. In this instance, we have a standard set not only for electrical installation but also for appliances inside the house, and this will affect many people. How silly can we get! The honourable member for Unley is not known for speaking on many Bills, but apparently he is to be known for sponsoring a very socialistic and restrictive piece of legislation. Of course, this is to be a privileged society and only those recognized by this legislation will be able to do the work. I ask the honourable member whether it is sensible for this Bill to prevent the placing of a piece of insulating tape around the cord of an electrical appliance, but not to prevent the use of an appliance when wires are completely bare. The Minister of Works referred to statistics for other States, but I should have thought that the Minister would not have mentioned them. I desire to give figures for the years 1960 to 1962 inclusive.

Mr. Hughes: Did you wire your caravan?

Mr. HALL: I did, and I think it will stand inspection. In any case, it helps to illuminate the many constituents who come to see me. In fact, I am getting so many callers that I shall have to provide more lighting facilities.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: You are getting some from Barossa, aren't you?

Mr. HALL: Yes, and from Gawler, but I give them good advice and send them back to their members, although they say they seldom see their members.

Mr. Corcoran: The constituents would get the illumination from the caravan, not from you.

Mr. HALL: In 1960, the deaths caused by electrical current in New South Wales numbered 34, in Victoria 15, in Queensland 17 and in South Australia seven. Of course, there is no licensing or control in respect of the repair of appliances in South Australia, but there is in Queensland, as the honourable member for Unley said last night.

Mr. Langley: Isn't that correct?

Mr. HALL: Although Queensland had this control, there were 17 deaths in 1960 in that State, compared with seven in South Australia. Apparently, control and licensing are ineffective and dangerous. In 1961, 29 deaths were caused by electrical current in New South Wales, 27 in Victoria, 12 in Queensland and 6 in South Australia. Again, it was far more dangerous to live in States that had full control over these things. I think women would use electrical appliances for longer hours than men would, as they handle irons, heaters, washers and all the other electrical appliances in the home. There would be millions of these appliances in Australia. Of these deaths, in New South Wales two, in Victoria four, in Queensland two and in South Australia none were women. It was the same story the year before. In 1962, 28 people were killed in New South Wales, 17 in Victoria, 10 in Queensland and 7 in South Australia. Of these, four in New South Wales, one in Victoria, one in Queensland and none in South Australia were females.

Mr. Clark: What does that prove?

Mr. HALL: Apparently the honourable member cannot follow that argument.

Mr. Clark: Nobody can.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member has great difficulty in following arguments, so I have made special allowances for him. However, I cannot remain on the same argument all the time for one member, so I must press on. We will have the ridiculous situation in South Australia whereby a dangerous appliance can be used but it cannot be repaired except by a licensed person.

Mr. Langley: We have not done anything wrong.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member cannot be accused of doing anything wrong, as he has done nothing in this House! Clause 9 (*a*) provides:

> Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, but subject to any other Act or law, it shall not be unlawful for a person, other than an electrical worker, whose trade or occupation normally includes the performance of work on any appliance, plant or machinery driven, or operated by, or incorporating any electrical installation, to perform or carry out that work in the normal course of his trade or occupation or for purposes incidental thereto, so long as he does not perform or carry out work on any part or circuit which is, or may be, connected to a source of electricity supply.

Legally, that clause means that a person will not be able to change a spark plug in his car. That is how sensible this legislation is! A spark plug is connected to a high voltage. Let the member for Unley deny that. If this Bill passes it will be unlawful for an unlicensed person to change a spark plug in a motor car.

Mr. Clark: How silly can you get!

Mr. HALL: I agree; how silly can it get. We had a remarkable contribution by the member for Semaphore (Mr. Hurst) last evening, who, again, seemed to base his argument on spurious statistics in an attempt to prove his case. He said:

I do not agree that South Australia's record in electrical accidents is better than the record anywhere else in the Commonwealth.

He had better talk to the statistician, because somebody has made a mistake. He said, referring to the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn):

The honourable member would not know what a qualified electrician was.

I point out that the member for Light has undertaken a course himself and is qualified. I wonder who is the ignorant party! Another gem appears as follows:

It is for the householder's own protection that he be deprived of the right to do his own electrical work in the house.

He is deprived of the right to repair his own appliance, although he can use it. Surely, the honourable member would also like to take away the right to use it! He made a silly reference to the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) having no knowledge about electricity but we all know that the honourable member is engaged in an engineering business and would certainly possess that knowledge. The member for Unley became helpful by way of interjection and said that Queensland licenses appliances, thereby tying up that fact with his statistics in regard to deaths by electrical causes. We can discard the speech of the member for Semaphore as being based on incorrect information and containing little wisdom. We have found serious faults in the Bill, and in Committee I intend to move several amendments in an endeavour to limit its effect, similarly to the way in which the Victorian legislation is limited. I shall be urging the Committee to adopt the words of the Victorian Act, and to amend the definition of "installations" by eliminating the reference to appliances. I believe this is necessary, and it would prevent people from breaking the law, which they inevitably will break.

I shall also move to try to enable many motorists in the State to change spark plugs in their motor cars. I am sure members will agree with that. Undoubtedly other members will move amendments to improve the Bill. I do not object to a move to introduce proper standards that will protect the public from improper installations. However, at the same time I do not wish to penalize the public, and that is what this legislation will do. The figures given by the Premier and by the member for Semaphore are the opposite of what they should have been and this was an endeavour to get support for the Bill. I support the second reading and I hope that reasonable amendments will be accepted in Committee.

Mr. LANGLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 4, at 2 p.m.