HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 10, 1965.

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

ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Constitution Act Amendment (Ministers),
Foot and Mouth Disease Eradication Fund Act Amendment,
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: MINISTER'S APPOINTMENT.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I seek leave of the House to make a brief statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I desire to announce to the House that, as a result of the passing by both Houses of Parliament of the Constitution Act Amendment Bill (Ministers) and subsequent assent to the Bill, I am able to inform honourable members that the honourable member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) has been selected as the ninth Minister of the Government, and has been appointed Minister of Lands. On behalf of all members of the Parliament, I offer him sincere congratulations on his elevation to this position, and wish him every success. Because of the wide publicity that has taken place and because of your exalted position, Sir, I take this opportunity to make known that an invitation to accept this post was extended to you but that you declined and preferred to remain Speaker of the House, for which we commend you.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to convey the congratulations of members on this side of the House to the honourable member for Millicent. I have always thought that the two big rural portfolios of Lands and Agriculture could not be adequately looked after by one Minister, and that was why we on this side of the House supported the amending Bill. We believe it is necessary for our important rural industries to have the attention of two Ministers. However, this gives me an opportunity to refer to the new appointment, and on behalf of honourable members on this side of the House I extend best wishes for the honourable member's successful (although not too long) occupancy of the Ministerial portfolio. One aspect of this matter surprises me. I was under the impression that the Bill to appoint the ninth Minister had to be reserved for Royal assent. However, I assume that the Government has looked at that aspect, and I accept that the position is in order. I offer my congratulations to the honourable member for Millicent.

The SPEAKER: Both on behalf of the House and personally, I endorse the congratulations that have been conveyed to the honourable member for Millicent by the Premier and by the Leader of the Opposition. The new Minister is young and has a promising career in front of him, and we wish him well.

Mr. CORCORAN: I thank the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition for the congratulations they extended to me on my appointment as the ninth Minister. I am very conscious indeed of the honour and responsibility bestowed upon me, and I assure the House that I will do my level best at all times to justify the confidence placed in me by my colleagues. So far as I am aware, I have always been an approachable character, and I assure honourable members that in my capacity as Minister of Lands they will have an open door where that is possible and that I shall be only too pleased to help whenever I can. I look forward to the challenge that lies before me. I hope that all members of the House, initially anyway, will bear with me until such time as I have had an opportunity to get to know the department thoroughly. This, I hope, will not take very long.

QUESTIONS

HOUSING FINANCE.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It came as a shock to me yesterday when I heard that the Housing Trust had had to adjust its programme and to ask builders to slow down in order to enable the trust to meet its obligations. Will the Premier, as Minister of Housing, obtain a complete statement from the State Bank, the Savings Bank and the Housing Trust concerning the sum that will be made available this year for housing in this State? Will he also ascertain whether there is a possibility (and I sincerely hope there will not be) of further unpleasant surprises in store for the building industry? This industry has already had some notable slackening because private savings banks have not had the deposits to sustain the earlier building rate. As a matter of urgency, will

the Premier bring down a complete statement for the House?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report on the matters raised. However, I did agree yesterday to obtain certain information for the Deputy Leader. The Leader appreciates that this can be only a passing reference by me because, as he said, the amount of deposits in private banks is one of the big difficulties associated with the Loan programme for housing, and yesterday I referred to the delay that had occurred in arranging necessary advances by the Savings Bank.

NETLEY BUS SERVICE.

Mr. BROOMHILL: At the commencement of this month the Municipal Tramways Trust altered bus services in the Netley area, and re-routed the buses so that the bus that previously came through from Ascot Park to Richmond now ran along Anzac Highway. As a result of these alterations, I have been approached by many people who have had difficulty in linking up with transport on the Anzac Highway and with the Glenelg tram service, and who wish to travel from Ascot Park to Richmond. As these alterations have created many problems for people working in the numerous factories in the Richmond area, will the Premier inquire of the Minister of Transport whether the trust has noticed the complications caused by the new bus services, and whether it will consider the consequent problems?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I understand that complications have arisen because of a new service from Mooringe Avenue to Adelaide, which is operated by the trust's one-man buses. However, I shall obtain a further report for the honourable member and let him have it soon.

MAITLAND AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. FERGUSON: On August 11, a member of another place asked a question about the construction of the Maitland Area School, and the Minister said that tenders were expected to be called early in October, but that the calling of tenders would depend on priority and availability of funds. Can the Minister of Education say whether the Public Buildings Department can now call tenders and, if it can, whether the funds will be available to commence the building of this new area school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain that information for the honourable member.

WOOL PACKS.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about weight being deducted by woolbrokers throughout Australia when using secondhand wool packs?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is considered that the propriety of the deduction of 11 lb., whether new or secondhand packs are used, is a matter for report from the South Australian Wool Brokers Association. The information available indicates that when secondhand packs are used, the wool loses some of its attractiveness and that therefore there is a depreciation in value. If this depreciation is even ¼d. a pound this would result in a loss of up to 7s. 6d. a bale. The cost of new packs is quoted at 19s. each *ex* store, compared with 14s. each for secondhand packs. Secondhand packs are imported mainly from Japan, and about 50,000 a year come to South Australia. It is considered that the importation of used wool packs constitutes a definite disease risk. There is no limitation on the origin of the packs. They may have strands of wool adhering to them, and this wool could be of South African origin, or of some other origin. The only precaution taken is that the packs be held in bond for 90 days from the date of shipment. This period may be adequate to cover foot and mouth disease virus, but it would be insufficient in the case of many external parasites, such as ticks from South Africa, and some bacteria and probably other viruses. The packs would be stored in shearing sheds, often in close contact with sheep during shearing, and when handled for other reasons. However, the present conditions of importation have been defined by the Commonwealth Department of Health, despite earlier protests.

Mr. CASEY: The reply I received from the Premier did not answer the question I asked of him. I point out that, although I appreciated his answer, all members know that wool packs come from many parts of the world. I was indebted to him for the information about the number of days the wool was held in bond, and also for the statement that new packs have an advantage over secondhand wool packs in that the wool opens much more attractively from a new pack. Although that may be so, they are debatable points. My original question dealt with the fact that secondhand wool packs are deductible at a weight of 11 lb., the same as are new packs. However, I point out that, because of the age of a secondhand pack

and because of its exposure to climatic conditions, its weight may actually be reduced to about 9½ lb. Will the Premier take up this matter with the appropriate authorities and ascertain whether this anomaly of charging in respect of an 11 lb. pack, whereas in fact the pack may be only 9½ lb., can be overcome? I understand that the total wool clip in South Australia is over 500,000 bales, much of which would be done up in secondhand packs, and, obviously, many woolgrowers are at a disadvantage because of this practice.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall have that matter examined.

TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: In explaining the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill (dealing with the co-ordination of transport) now before the House, the Premier said that the charge to be levied in respect of goods carried in competition with the railways would be up to 2c a ton-mile, but I can find no clarification of that statement and, apparently, the tax will vary. Can the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, say what the variation will be and to what type of goods the varying rates will apply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am unable to give the honourable member that information, but I point out that certain amendments to the Bill will be placed on the file not later than tomorrow, which, I regret, were not contained in the Bill when it was introduced. Although the honourable member is correct in saying that up to 2c a ton-mile may be charged, the charge may be as low as ½c, as varying rates will apply. I would have to consult with my colleague the Minister of Transport on any information to be made available but, if it is possible to publicize the rates to be charged, that will be done. If a charge of 2c a ton-mile were to be made, it could mean that it applied to goods which, normally carried by the railways, were being carted in competition with rail services. I further indicate that there will be a variation but it will not exceed 2c.

The SPEAKER: I should like to explain to honourable members that I allowed this question to be asked while I was thinking of other matters. However, it related to business on the Notice Paper and was out of order. I mention this in case other members are thinking of asking questions on the same subject.

UNIVERSITY GRANTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In this morning's *Advertiser* appears an article headed "Varsity Money May Be Pruned Next Year", which states:

The Minister of Education said last night that the University of Adelaide might have to forgo £60,000 from its 1966 budget.

The press report of the Minister's telecast seems to show that he reproduced on television the gist of the answers he was giving in this House up to about a fortnight ago, in which answers he complained bitterly about the offer of a matching grant by the Commonwealth Government (which I thought was rather looking a Commonwealth gift horse in the mouth) and pleaded the poverty of the State Government to match it. On October 26, in reply to a question I asked him, the Minister said that he imagined that the Government would be able to make a firm decision, within the next seven or 10 days, on whether or not to cut down the university grant next year by £60,000, because that sum had been used up this year to match the Commonwealth grant. The report in this morning's paper is in the subjunctive and "may" and "might" are used, and it seems to be in the same language as he used until a fortnight ago in the House. Will he say whether the fact that he made a telecast on the subject last evening means that the Government has made a firm decision to cut down the grant to the university by £60,000 next year or whether this was simply reproducing again for the public's benefit what the Minister had said in the House?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: At no time did I say that the Government was going to make a firm decision in about seven days about whether the university grant for its 1966 budget would be cut by £60,000. If the honourable member has interpreted my statement in that way, that is incorrect. In my discussions with the Vice-Chancellor and in the subsequent letter addressed to him, it was pointed out that the Government "may" not be able to meet the full sum for the university's 1966 budget. That is still in the same tense—"may".

Mr. Millhouse: It is in the subjunctive.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes. There is therefore nothing for me to add on that subject in answer to the honourable member's question.

Mr. Millhouse: When is a decision likely to be made?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Obviously, whether the Government will be able to do this is a matter for the future.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It has been reported to me that an application has been made by the University of New England (in New South Wales) for a grant of the money that South Australia has declined for the purpose of erecting halls of residence at Bedford Park. Can the Minister of Education say whether such an application has been made and, if it has, whether that will further delay the erection of halls of residence at the University of Adelaide at Bedford Park?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have no information concerning the University of New England in regard to the matter raised by the honourable member. A decision has been made in relation to the construction of the hall of residence at Bedford Park, and we expect that site work will commence at the end of 1966. Provision is being made to take up a part of the grant from the Commonwealth Government with a view to undertaking that work.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am indebted to the Minister for the answer he gave, although I am disappointed he could not supply me with information about the application by the University of New England. Can he say what part of the grant offered to the State by the Commonwealth Government for halls of residence at Bedford Park the Government intends to take up?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is expected that the cost of the site works to be started at the end of 1966 will be about £35,000.

Mr. Millhouse: How much was offered?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I cannot answer that question from memory, but I will check it.

FISHING CRAFT.

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Marine a reply to my recent question regarding a survey charge on certain types of fishing craft up to 25ft.?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: When the honourable member asked this question originally he supplied me with a letter from a gentleman who had approached him about this matter. Accordingly, the reply is drafted somewhat as a reply to a letter. I do not intend to refer to the writer's name as I think that would be unfair. The General Manager of the Harbors Board reports:

The Survey and Equipment of Fishing Vessels Regulations were originally framed by the board to cover all fishing boats but were modified to apply only to vessels of 25ft. and over at the request of the former Minister of Marine. Once a length limitation is set, there will always be vessels outside the scope of the regulations and anomalies will arise. I might add here that all other States, with the exception of Victoria, have regulations concerning the survey of fishing vessels. The survey fee of £1 per lineal foot, payable every two years, returns a revenue to the board of £6,468 per annum against an expenditure of £7,885 (1964-1965 figures). As regards the *Troubridge* this vessel has to be surveyed every year, not every two years like fishing vessels, and the work is done at Port Adelaide within a few hundred yards of the surveyor's office, thus involving no travelling time, hotel expenses, fares, etc. The survey of fishing vessels is carried out on dates nominated by the various owners and does not take more than an hour or so per vessel. Any contention that there is a "loss of fishing while the survey is in progress" is hardly a valid argument. A distinction is already made in the regulations between sea-going and non-sea-going fishing vessels in the type of equipment to be carried, being less in the case of non-sea-going craft. The survey regulations were promulgated in order to save the lives of fishermen and not as a source of revenue. The vast majority of fishermen have accepted the survey regulations as a necessity and it is only a question of time before they are extended to cover all fishing boats, regardless of length. In fact, the Government could so direct at any time.

Mr. McKEE: As I understand that the deterioration of this type of craft is not great, will the Minister consider extending the period between inspections of these boats from two to three years?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have received numerous requests concerning the survey of fishing boats, but never a request of this nature. I have been asked to reduce the charge for the service and to extend the survey to smaller boats. However, this is not a revenue-raising project at all: it is merely a safety measure. I will have the honourable member's question investigated. Such safety measures as this are necessary, for while many fishermen may take every precaution possible, there is always the individual who does not do so, and he is the person who makes it difficult for the others.

BARLEY.

Mr. HALL: I have a letter concerning the purchase of new season's barley by a prospective purchaser, who states:

My desire was to purchase this season's barley in bulk to put in a 1,300 bag silo for later feeding to sheep . . . I suggested that I pick up from any near farmer and that the usual channels of payments operate, that is, I pay the Barley Board and the Barley Board pays the grower in the usual manner.

This was refused by the board. The letter continues:

They were very helpful and polite at the Barley Board and I have no complaints with their operations.

Therefore, this man has no complaint with the board's operations. Apparently the board has taken the view that it is bound by the Act and is unable to accede to what appears, on the surface at least, to be a reasonable request about the purchase of barley. The letter continues:

I do feel that a fellow producer should be able to purchase, under the circumstances, in the manner described.

As this prospective purchaser wished to observe all the usual safeguards in purchasing from the board (it would be entirely under the board's financial conditions) and as he intended to purchase near his farm and place of operation and thereby save himself considerable carriage (I understand he would have to go perhaps another 20 miles to get supplies), will the Minister of Agriculture examine the Act to see whether a consumer could pick up from a nearby producer under board supervision?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I should be pleased to examine the matter for the honourable member. With your permission, Sir, at this stage I should like to extend my congratulations to the new Minister-elect. I understand that I will be Minister of Lands until midnight tonight. I assure the new Minister that he will have a very good staff to work with; they have been most courteous and helpful to me, and I am sure they will be the same to him. I shall have much pleasure in working in close harmony with the new Minister.

SALESMEN.

Mr. HUGHES: On October 12, I think it was, I directed a question to the Attorney-General regarding unscrupulous booksellers going out into the country and collecting money and leaving books. In my opinion, this action contravenes the existing legislation. The Attorney said he would have the matter investigated. Can he now say whether that investigation has been completed?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There have been several investigations of cases of apparent breaches of the Book Purchasers Protection Act. Unfortunately, none of the investigations has succeeded in producing a prosecution, for although there are apparent breaches of the intention of the Act there are certain loopholes in the Act. In consequence, we are now examining (and the Parliamentary Draftsman has instructions to draft) a measure relating to door-to-door salesmen which is designed to catch all people of this class who are going in for unpleasant activities at the moment. There have been many complaints not only about booksellers but about people selling all classes of goods and business from door to door in a very unsavoury and unsatisfactory manner. Unfortunately, with the present time table of legislation before the House it does not look as though we can introduce that legislation before the House rises in December, but I certainly hope we will introduce it before the end of the session.

CAMPBELLTOWN SCHOOL.

Mrs. STEELE: Last week I addressed a question to the Minister of Education concerning the Campbelltown Infants School. I understand the Minister now has a reply relating to the Campbelltown Primary School, although I imagine that information relates also to the infants school. Will he give that answer?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The position at the Campbelltown Primary School is well known to officers of the Education Department and there are a number of schools both in the country and the city which have similar accommodation problems. However, replacement buildings such as those suggested by the honourable member are considered to be best left until the enrolment at a school has stabilized, as this better enables the permanent construction requirements to be gauged. New primary schools are to be built in the areas near Campbelltown and this will reduce the school enrolment. The Dernancourt school is expected to open in February, 1966, and the Newton Primary School is scheduled for completion later in the year. In addition, consideration is being given to building a new school on a departmentally owned site at East Marden. The erection of each of these schools will reduce the enrolment at Campbelltown and will have the further effect of slowing the growth rate. In the meantime, sufficient classroom accommodation is provided for classes at the school and it is well provided with special facilities such as library and activity rooms. Although the primary activity room is in use as a classroom at present, it will revert to its intended purpose in 1966.

Mrs. STEELE: I was actually seeking information about the Campbelltown Infants School, whereas the Minister's reply specifically refers to the primary school. Will the Minister investigate the position regarding the infants school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes, I shall be pleased to obtain that information.

CONCESSION FARES.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier an answer to a question I asked recently concerning the granting of concessions by the Municipal Tramways Trust to school and university students?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Students under 19 years of age holding scholars' concession tickets are able to use the concession ticket at all times other than during the vacation periods for the school concerned. I understand that representations will be made to the Government soon by the University Students' Representative Council for travel concessions to be extended to university students over the age of 19 years. When received, these representations will be considered.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE.

Mr. COUMBE: The Morphett Street bridge, which is being constructed by the Adelaide City Council, will provide a much needed outlet from the city of Adelaide to that portion of the city included in the electoral district of Torrens. Features have appeared in the newspaper regarding the progress of plans that have been made, and I know that concern is being expressed to see that this project proceeds as quickly as possible. Part of the Morphett Street Bridge Act provides that work shall be in accordance with plans and specifications approved by the Minister and to the standards and designs required by the Minister. Will the Minister of Education ascertain whether the plans approved by the City Council have been submitted to the Minister of Local Government and, if they have, whether he has approved of them? If they have not been approved by the Minister, could they be approved so that this project might proceed without delay?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will try to get the information for the honourable member.

WATERVALE WATER SCHEME.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works information additional to that which he gave yesterday regarding boring operations at Watervale?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In reply to the honourable member's question on the Watervale town water supply, the Minister of Mines states that this bore was originally drilled with a down-the-hole hammer drill in December, 1964, to a depth of 265ft. A short pump test conducted several days later gave a yield of 3,100 gallons an hour for a drawdown of 22ft. Salinity at this time was 1,285 parts per million (90 grains per gallon). Subsequently, the bore was reamed to take 8in. casing with a percussion plant. This work was completed at the end of May, 1965, when the bore was fitted with 196ft. of 8in. casing. Towards the end of June, 1965, the bore was developed by using a submersible pump. On the following day pump tests at various rates were conducted for a total period of 5½ hours. At the final stage water was being pumped at the rate of 7,000 gallons an hour for a drawdown of 180ft. from an original static level of 17ft. At the conclusion of the test, water level recovered to 25ft. from the surface in 100 minutes. Water samples taken during the test varied in salinity from 1,265 to 1,375 parts per million (89-96 grains per gallon). In September, 1965, a salinity probe was run in the bore to test whether brackish water was entering around the casing shoe. This indicated relatively high salinity water in the lower part of the bore, from 196-268ft. Salinity at this depth was up to 2,000 parts per million. In the upper part of the bore salinity fell to below 1,500 parts per million. During this test the bore was pumped at a low rate, and the first sample collected at the surface had a salinity of 1,430 parts per million. Five minutes later salinity had risen to 1,635 parts per million. In view of the relatively high and fluctuating salinity no further work has been recommended.

MURRAY RIVER.

Mr. McANANEY: The press reports that there will be a reduction in the quantity of water available from the Murray River, and the Minister of Works reported yesterday on the levels in Lakes Alexandrina and Albert. As there is considerable evaporation of up to 9in. or 10in. a month during the summer in that area will the Minister ascertain whether the River Murray Commission can maintain the usual pool levels in Lake Alexandrina during the coming summer?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member, I point out that yesterday I gave a full report in replying to a question by the member for Albert about Lakes Alexandrina and Albert. I assured the honourable member that every endeavour would be made to keep the water at the approved level. With regard to the River Murray Commission's finding, while we have a reduction to 94 per cent of the total, this will not affect South

Australia because up to the present South Australia has not used its full quota. I understand the honourable member is worried about Jervois. However, the fall there was not caused by the adjustments at the barrage but by the wind across the lake.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When the agreement for the establishment of the Chowilla dam was being worked out in Canberra, it was pointed out to the Commonwealth and New South Wales Governments that the dam would probably not be effectively operating until 1970, and that there would be a period when South Australia would not be adequately protected in the event of a severe drought extending through two seasons. At that time New South Wales agreed to make available to South Australia and Victoria certain waters from the Menindee Lakes, in return for which South Australia and Victoria undertook to pay the interest charges on the works in that area. I think that the sum was about £167,000, to be shared equally between Victoria and South Australia. Yesterday, the Premier of Victoria told me that Victoria would be using Menindee water to meet its obligations to South Australia. Can the Minister of Works say whether arrangements have been made to place the water at the Menindee Lakes in accordance with the agreement to make it available to South Australia, so that we can have adequate water not only to maintain the levels of the lakes (which are already causing concern) but also to enable the river to be kept in a fresh condition so that adequate good water will be available for reticulation and irrigation?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am indebted to the Leader and appreciate the information given by him. I have not been able to catch up on all the details of these matters, but because of his question I will obtain a report and inform him of the details.

PENOLA WATER RATING.

Mr. RODDA: I have been approached by constituents of mine concerning the Penola water supply. They are not objecting to the efficiency of the scheme or the supply, but they have some doubts as to the method of rating. They believe that with the initial set-up they are being charged for the water used. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report on how the townspeople in Penola are rated under this new scheme?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I believe that there is no variation in the method of rating throughout the State, but as the honourable member has raised this question I shall obtain a report and let him have it soon.

PARAFIELD GARDENS FREEWAY.

Mr. HALL: Recently, when attending a meeting at Parafield Gardens, I was again informed that the route of the proposed freeway extending to areas north of Salisbury and to Elizabeth would bisect Parafield Gardens. As I understand that the appropriate authority is still investigating the question of metropolitan freeways, will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads take this matter up with his colleague, so that it can be considered when a final decision on the route of the freeway is to be made?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

HOUSING TRUST PROGRAMME.

Mr. HUDSON: I understand that the current rate of completion of houses and flats by the Housing Trust, and the number of houses and flats under construction by the trust, are at high levels compared with those of previous years. Will the Premier obtain the quarterly figures for Housing Trust completions and for houses and flats under construction as from the beginning of 1962 to the present day, so that honourable members (as well as the public at large) will not gain a false impression from the report in yesterday's *Advertiser*?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

PARA HILLS SCHOOL.

Mr. HALL: It was announced some months ago that the new Para Hills Primary School to replace the temporary wooden structure at present in use would be constructed and that it was expected to be ready for occupation on the first school day of 1967. Several months ago some activity took place in regard to providing a water supply for the site of the new school, and various minor preparation works on the site were also undertaken. However, I understand that, since then, no further progress has been made. Because a school of such magnitude would take many months to complete, concern has been expressed that it may not be completed by early 1967. Will the Minister of Education obtain a report on the progress of this project?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes, I shall be pleased to do that.

SITTINGS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: There has been some doubt in my mind and, I think, in the minds

of other members about how long the present session of Parliament is to last. I noticed that the Attorney-General, in answering a question a few minutes ago, said that instructions had been given for the drafting of a certain Bill and that, although he did not expect it to be ready for introduction by the beginning of December, he hoped it would be ready by the end of the session. This seems to show that the session will not end by December 2, as has been rumoured. Can the Premier say whether the Government has decided how long the session will last and, if we are to adjourn on December 2, when the session will be continued and completed?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I believe that I made this information known to the House previously. If the legislation to come before the House has not been finalized by December 2, the House will adjourn until January 25, after which sittings will continue during February and possibly into March. Of course, this depends on when the business is finished. I have no desire to sit early next year, but the House must sit until its business is completed. I shall not ask the House to sit at night during the first week of resumption in January but, in order to finalize matters, I will ask honourable members to sit at night during February.

PARAFIELD GARDENS HOUSING.

Mr. HALL: Will the Premier ascertain whether the new houses at the Housing Trust estate at Parafield Gardens will be occupied on schedule early in the new year or whether their occupation will be held up because of a lag in sewerage installations?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain that information for the honourable member as soon as possible.

LEARN-TO-SWIM CAMPAIGN.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question arising out of the difficulty a constituent of mine had in enrolling his daughter for the learn-to-swim campaign?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: In his question the honourable member asked me two things: first, whether I would clarify departmental policy on children attending independent schools participating in the learn-to-swim campaign and, secondly, whether the experience in the case to which he referred was the general experience of the parents of children who attended independent schools. In answer to the last part of his question let me say that it is not a fact that this is the general experience, particularly bearing in mind that the statement concerning the alleged experience of the constituent of the honourable member is not, in fact, correct. I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that the newspaper report following his question stated:

A telephone call to the Education Department disclosed that because the girl attended an independent school and not the school where the classes were to be held, her application had been refused.

That is incorrect. The constituent of the honourable member drew attention to what he called a departmental delay. He said that his daughter's application, in answer to an advertisement in the *Advertiser* on Saturday, October 23, was posted on Sunday, October 24, and that his daughter missed both her first and second choice because of departmental delay. This year such advertisements had previously appeared in the *News*, the *Chronicle*, and the *South Australian Countrywoman*. When the application was received there were no vacancies at the pool of first or second choice.

I should now like to clarify departmental policy on this matter so that it will be fully understood. No distinction or discrimination is made in any way in respect of any application for enrolment in Education Department vacation swimming classes. However, policy in regard to enrolment at school pools, since the inception of the campaign, has been to give children who attend a school with its own pool two weeks' grace in which to complete their enrolment. This has been done with the intention of rewarding the children and parents of the school, in a small way, for the contribution made in raising finance for the erection and subsequent improvement and maintenance of the pool. After the two-week period of grace all other applications for school pools are dealt with in the order in which they are received. No discrimination is made whether the application is from a child atending a private school or a State school. After enrolments are completed for the centre, all remaining applications are diverted to a second choice, or to a beach if the enrolments have been completed for the second choice of swimming centre. As all applications are handled individually by trained staff it is unlikely that only the honourable member's constituent's application form was returned. The procedure adopted by the Physical Education Branch in such a case is to forward a "beach only" enrolment card and a covering note together with the original application form. To date, over 1,200 applications for pool centres have been diverted in this way.

In regard to the telephone call received at the office from the constituent in question, my officer reports that he was most abusive and quite unprepared to listen to reason. Further, during the conversation, he mentioned that his daughter attended a certain independent college. When it was pointed out to him that the Physical Education Branch, on behalf of the Education Department, provided that school with assistance in the way of swimming instructors during term time at the Unley pool, he still insisted that discrimination was being made in respect of children from private schools and threatened to take the matter further.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

COUNTRY FACTORIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT 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 Superannuation Act, 1926-1961.

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.

It arises directly out of the Government's electoral promise that it would take early action to place the superannuation provisions for Government officers and employees upon a basis equal to those of other States and the Commonwealth. As the Opposition Party made an electoral promise in closely similar terms, I do not expect that this Bill will be controversial. Shortly after the Government took office the Treasury was asked for a full report upon how the South Australian provisions compared with those of other States and the Commonwealth, and for proposals to implement the policy undertaking. Those proposals were submitted on the basis of a fair average of the provisions in the other States and the Commonwealth, not being as favourable as the best nor as unfavourable as the worst of other schemes. Several conferences were held with the representatives of the Government Superannuation Committee, on which all the major unions and associations as well as pensioner associations are represented. As a result of these conferences a very large measure of agreement was reached, resulting substantially in the Bill now presented. The result may be fairly described overall as a good average of the provisions existing elsewhere. The Government thinks it reasonable to make provisions which may be a little better than average in some respects, for it will be apparent that other States will from time to time make improvements and we do not always want to be the State which is lagging, nor yet do we want too frequent amendments merely to keep level.

Honourable members will recall and greatly regret that some months ago the Public Actuary died. So far, a replacement has not been secured. We have, nevertheless, found it practicable to proceed with all the proposed amendments except one. It is proposed to provide for optional subscription for full pension upon retirement up to five years earlier than the compulsory retirement ages of 65 for men and 60 for women. It has not been possible to include the necessary provisions in the present Bill because they are necessarily of a highly technical nature. This is a matter which can be dealt with by special supplementary legislation in due course, and the Government will bring down such a measure as soon as reasonably practicable. It has in mind certain special arrangements for contributors on present contribution schedules to purchase full pensions upon early retirement, and there will therefore be no serious consequences through the unavoidable delay.

Before referring to the clauses of the Bill it will be useful to outline the main features of the changes and how they compare with other schemes. The standard rate of Government subsidy elsewhere varies from 71.4 per cent in the Commonwealth and three other States to 62.5 per cent in Queensland, whilst New South Wales has subsidies varying from 60 per cent to 72.5 per cent. The average of all these rates is about 69 per cent. It has been decided to adopt a standard subsidy in this State on the basis of 70 per cent by the Government. This is slightly better than the average, but will be very much easier to apply and administer with decimal currency than 69 per cent. Members will recall that our State scheme commenced on a 50 per cent subsidy basis and has subsequently been

adjusted first to a 60-40 basis and then to sixty-six and two-thirds to thirty-three and one-third (that is, two to one). In the application of the new rate of subsidy for present pensioners, any individual pensioner whose payments to the fund were on a basis of subsidy less favourable to him than 70 to 30 will be given an appropriate increase so that the Government will provide 70 per cent of the standard pension. There are many cases of pensioners where, by virtue of past special concessions in contributions, or increases in pension rates either without contribution or at reduced rates, the Government already pays 70 per cent or more. In those cases there will be no further increase, but, of course, no person receiving better than a 70 per cent subsidy will suffer a reduction. So far as present contributors are concerned, the excess which they may have paid beyond the new standard 30 per cent will be calculated and placed to their credit. This will be available to cover future contributions at the new lower rate, or, if desired, it can be held until retirement as a special retiring lump sum payment.

For widows the present proportion of a full contributor's pension is 60 per cent. In most other funds the proportion is 62½ per cent though in Tasmania it is 66⅔ per cent. It is intended that in South Australia it be 65 per cent. This figure is chosen as being easy to apply with decimal currency and is a little above the average elsewhere. This change will mean that all widows' pensions will be raised by one-twelfth. Payments on account of children of deceased contributors or pensioners are at present £2 a week for orphans and £1 a week if the mother is living. It is proposed to put both on the same level of £2 a week or $4 a week. This will be rather better than most other schemes for dependent children with the mother living, and about equal to average for orphans. With decimal currency it is proposed that the new unit be worth $2 a fortnight compared with the existing unit of £52 a year, and there will be two new units for each old one. This, as well as providing for conversion to decimal currency, provides for fortnightly instead of half-monthly payments which will be more convenient. Also, it will involve a slight monetary advantage to the pensioner as there are slightly more than 26 exact fortnights in a full year.

The entitlement to contribute to the South Australian scheme has been slightly less favourable than most others for salaries below about £1,700 a year but rather more favourable above that level. Following representations from the employees and officers, it is proposed to increase entitlement in the lower levels, broadly on the basis of contributing for a pension of 70 per cent instead of 65 per cent of salary. In the higher levels this falls off to 50 per cent. For salaries between about £1,700 and £3,000 this will mean a rather lower entitlement than previously, but no present contributor will be called upon to reduce the extent of his contribution. It is reasonable that if the Government is to support higher pension entitlements for groups presently below average, it should not have to continue to support those significantly above average. New schedules of contribution rates are also proposed. These are lower than hitherto for two reasons. First, they are based upon a 70 per cent Government subsidy instead of two-thirds. Secondly, they take account of the significantly higher interest earning rates of the fund. Broadly, the rates are lower to the extent of over 20 per cent for young ages and more than 10 per cent for ages near the retiring age.

To meet the relatively isolated cases of new entrants aged over 45 years where contribution rates even on a 30 per cent basis are heavy through the short period of contribution before retirement, specially reduced rates are provided for a pension of up to $14 a week, which is the amount presently free of "means test" for Commonwealth age pensions for man and wife. The other matters are mainly administrative, or are connected with necessary adjustments with decimal currency. It is intended that the changes come into operation on February 1 next, which is convenient because of the operation of decimal currency from mid-February. The estimated additional cost to the Government arising out of the amendments proposed is about £40,000 a year immediately, but this will increase considerably in the future as more contributors become eligible for pension. At present the total Government payments for superannuation are about £1,500,000 a year.

I now turn to the Bill itself. Clause 4 removes the requirement that an actuary must be a member of the board. Clause 5 provides for fortnightly instead of annual calculations of the cost of management of the fund, and is purely administrative. Clause 6 will enable female employees in the service who continue to be employed, to continue to contribute for superannuation after marriage. Clause 7 will enable subscribers to the Police Pension Fund

to take advantage of the voluntary savings fund. Clause 8 inserts a new section 75c into the principal Act to give effect to the matters which I have referred to in my opening remarks. It consists of 18 subsections and will apply on and from February 1 next. Subsection (1) of the new section provides that after January 31, 1966, pensions shall be payable fortnightly instead of twice monthly as at present.

Subsections (2), (4), (5) and (7) increase pensions to widows, both present and future, from 60 per cent of contributors' pensions to 65 per cent, and rates for dependent children whose mothers are living from £1 to £2 a week. Subsections (3) and (6) make provisions along existing lines covering cases of widows who remarry. Subsections (8) and (9) provide for the necessary adjustments in respect of past contributions following the decision to provide for an increase in the Government subsidy from 66⅔ per cent to 70 per cent with a credit to contributors who have paid more than 30 per cent in contributions. Subsections (10) and (17) (*a*) provide for the new scales of contribution for units taken up after February 1, 1966. As I have said, the new scales are lower than the present ones in view of the increase in the Government contribution to the fund and the higher earning capacity of the fund. Subsection (11) provides the new scale of units of pension for which contributions may be made. As I have explained, the entitlement is increased for lower levels and is slightly decreased for salaries between about £1,700 and £3,000.

Subsections (12), (13), (14), (15) and (16) are machinery provisions. Subsection 17 (*b*) makes the necessary provision to enable future new entrants aged over 46 years to pay certain minimum contributions at reduced rates. Subsection (18) is a machinery provision. Since all of the new contributions and scales of units of pension are set out in terms of decimal currency, it is necessary to provide for these amounts to be read in terms of existing currency until decimal currency comes into operation. Clause 9 amends the regulation-making power by adding two paragraphs thereto. Paragraph (*d*2) is amended to make it possible for any surplus in the fund from time to time to be distributed wholly or in part among contributors. New paragraph (*d*3) enables the making of regulations prescribing the rate of conversion into Australian currency of salaries paid in another currency, for the purpose of determining the number of units for which persons receiving such salaries may contribute. In particular, members of the staff of the Agent-General are paid in sterling, and the new provision is intended to cover such cases. Clause 10 sets out the new rates of contribution payable for males and females for units taken up after February 14, 1966.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

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 Prices Act, 1948-1964, 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 principal object is to extend the duration of the principal Act, which expires in December, for another 12 months. Before dealing with this extension, I refer to two other matters. First, with the adoption of decimal currency in February and the continued use for a limited period of the old currency, some provision will be required in relation to prices orders in force on and after the date of adoption of the new currency. Such a provision is contained in clause 3 of the Bill which adds a new subsection to the interpretation section of the principal Act to provide, in effect, that on and after February 14, 1966, maximum prices shall be either those fixed in the old currency or as the case requires equivalents in decimal currency calculated according to what is known as the comprehensive table which contains references to halfpennies and which the Prices Commissioner proposes to adopt. This is purely a necessary machinery amendment.

The other matter to which I desire to refer is the continuance of the sections inserted in the principal Act in recent years covering certain trading practices. It is the Government's intention to introduce as soon as practicable a general measure governing restrictive and unfair trading practices which will include the provisions now in the Prices Act. Those provisions will then be taken out of the Prices Act and enacted in permanent form. However, the Prices Act expires in December and it has not been and will not be possible to introduce the new measure before the House rises

in December. It is for this reason that the Prices Act is now being extended in its present form. I deal now with the subject of the continuance of price control, dealt with by clause 4 of the Bill.

In asking the House to agree to an extension of the Prices Act for another 12 months the Government is satisfied of the continued need for a public authority to watch price movements which may occur over this period, and to take action where warranted in the interests of the community. As a result of the £1 basic wage increase last year, the 1½ per cent margins increase and the increases in customs and excise duty recently, internal pressures in the economy are increasing and are already evidenced by an upward trend in some prices. It is considered necessary that the machinery to contain unjustified price increases be retained. Continuance of the Prices Act will also ensure that the lower prices of a wide range of commodities in this State as compared with other States will also be maintained. The Government's reasons for wishing to extend this legislation include the following: first, the introduction of decimal currency in February, 1966. Unless watched carefully, some traders could use the advent of decimal currency to their own advantage. The continuance of the Prices Act will enable the public to be protected against any unwarranted price rises that could result.

Secondly, the Government's policy is to ensure that the consumer gets a fair deal. Current trading conditions have become so complex and involved, that many consumers, including persons on fixed incomes, find it difficult to make ends meet without some assistance and guidance. The department has rendered a valuable service to many of these people in the past and it is most desirable that they continue to be afforded the opportunity to approach the Prices Department which not only looks after their interests but is constantly rendering them assistance in a number of ways.

Thirdly, the policy of my Government is also to watch the interests of the primary producer and to give assistance wherever possible. In this respect and particularly under the present circumstances, some of the benefits which primary producers are enjoying would not be possible without the extension of the Prices Act.

Fourthly, apart from pricing, the department is covering a rather wide field of activities which include special investigations for the Government. The outcome of these investigations has been of considerable benefit to various sections of the community. Inquiries into a number of hire-purchase agreements. insurance claims, used car transactions, etc., have also been made, and it is in the interests of the community that these activities be continued.

Fifthly, this State continues to enjoy the lowest home building costs in Australia and savings on homes are considerable. For example, a five or six-room home of about 12 squares of brick construction can be built for up to as much as £800 less than it can in other States. As a result of the lower costs, more houses can be built here with the same amount of money than in other States. If the Prices Act is not extended, this most favourable differential could be considerably whittled down.

Since the 1961 census when South Australia was shown to be one of the best housed States in the Commonwealth, this State has improved its position still further. The following figures (Commonwealth Statistician) illustrate the number of new houses and flats completed for the year to June 30, 1965, for each 10,000 head of population: South Australia, 122; Western Australia, 115; Victoria, 99; New South Wales, 95; Tasmania, 74; and Queensland, 85. Proof of the State's commercial growth is given by the following percentage increases for 12 months over the previous 12 months for retail sales of goods (excluding motor vehicles, parts, petrol, etc.) as obtained from the Commonwealth Statistician:

	Percentage increases for 12 months ending June over previous 12 months.	
	1964.	1965.
	%	%
South Australia	9.2	9.3
New South Wales	3.9	6.4
Victoria	6.7	7.4
Queensland	8.2	7.8
Western Australia	6.6	8.1
Tasmania	3.7	6.9

Sixthly, the legislation on unfair trading practices has since its inception proved itself to be working well. A number of undesirable practices have been stopped since the legislation was introduced. It is most desirable that these measures, which have proved popular with a large cross-section of the business community and the public in general, be continued. I ask the House to vote for an extension of the Prices Act until the end of December, 1966.

Mrs. STEELE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (DECIMAL CURRENCY).

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 Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1964.

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 purpose is to make certain adjustments in relation to the totalizator investments, the stamp duty on betting tickets, and the tax on winning bets consequentially upon the introduction of decimal currency, and accordingly clause 3 provides that it shall come into force on February 14, 1966, the date upon which decimal currency will be adopted. I shall deal with the three matters, which I have mentioned, in order.

The present provisions of the Lottery and Gaming Act prescribe as a condition for issue of a licence for the operation of a totalizator that there must be provision for bets in units as small as 2s. or 2s. 6d. and, as a result of this, 2s. 6d. has become the most widely used effective unit for totalizator investments. It is proposed that the new unit be 50c (the equivalent of 5s.) and clause 4 accordingly amends section 20. In relation to money values this new unit will be no greater than the value of 2s. 6d. when those provisions were first enacted.

The existing provisions as to payment of totalizator dividends are that if the investment is 5s. or less any fraction of less than 3d. is not paid to the bettor; if the unit of investment exceeds 5s. but does not exceed 10s. any fraction smaller than 6d. is disregarded; while if the unit of investment is over 10s. any fraction of 1s. is not paid. Fractions not paid to the bettor are paid to charity. As a matter of practice it is very seldom that a unit of investment is greater than 5s. and the 2s. 6d. unit is by far the most widely used. These matters relating to fractions are provided for by section 28 (1) (*b*) and (2). It will be seen that one result of the present provisions is that copper coins are not required in any case for either investments or dividends for totalizators. The lowest silver coin in decimal currency will be the 5c coin and accordingly clause 5 (*a*) provides in effect that fractions of 5c in relation to the minimum unit of investment (that is, 50c) shall be disregarded.

These amendments are introduced following lengthy discussions with representatives of the South Australian Jockey Club and persons conversant with totalizator procedure. The South Australian Jockey Club has in turn discussed the matter with the South Australian Trotting Club, metropolitan race secretaries and the Country Racing Clubs Association who have agreed that the proposed amendments would seem the most practicable. The clubs did suggest that dividends should be paid to the nearest 5c thus eliminating fractions for the benefit of charities, but the Government has not agreed with this. Subsequently the clubs suggested that provision be made for a guarantee of the return of stake money in the extraordinary case where the dividend might be less than the stake, the necessary funds to do this to be provided out of fractions arising from other totalizator dividends at the same meeting. This has been agreed as reasonable, particularly as the clubs have agreed to make up the difference from their own entitlements if the fractions available from the meeting proved in an extraordinary case inadequate. Clause 5 (*b*) makes the necessary provision, and subclause (*c*) makes a consequential amendment to section 28 (2) providing that any amounts remaining shall continue to be paid to charities. The subtraction of fractions for these particular purposes will be very small indeed, and the expected net result of the new provisions on fractions is that charities may benefit to the extent of perhaps £25,000 a year instead of £20,000 or thereabouts at present.

Section 44 of the principal Act provides for a stamp duty of one halfpenny on every betting ticket. The existing equivalent of one halfpenny in the new currency will be five-twelfths of a cent, but it is proposed that the tax should be altered to two-fifths of a cent, which is very slightly less than one halfpenny. In effect, adoption of the new rate will mean that stamped tickets will be issued at the rate of $1 per thousand. Retention of the old rate would have meant £2 1s. 8d. per thousand, an amount not directly convertible to decimal currency. The loss of revenue would be about 4 per cent and amount to a loss of about £1,000 a year. Clause 6 makes the necessary amendment.

I deal now with the winning bets tax. This matter has been discussed with the Bookmakers' League and the Betting Control Board, who between them must implement the tax and do the administrative work. The present rate of tax is 3d. for each 10s. or fractional part of

10s., no tax being payable on a bet of less than 5s. It is proposed to vary this to provide that there shall be no tax on a bet of $1 (10s.) or less, and thereafter 5c on a bet of under $3, 10c on a bet of $3 and under $5, and so on. We discovered in the course of discussion on this matter that to nominate an even dollar becomes somewhat complicated. People will be able to bet 20c, which is equal to 2s., on the flat. For those who are fortunate enough to back a winner with a bookmaker at odds of 4 to 1, for a bet of 20c they can collect a full dollar (in other words, 10s.) without paying tax. However, once it gets over the first dollar but is less than three dollars they will pay a tax of 5c (or 6d.). As soon as the return is more than three dollars but less than five dollars the tax will be 10c (or 1s.).

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: What is the net result in return?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I doubt whether there will be much difference one way or the other. It is considered that there will be a privilege to the flat bettor. The Derby bettor will be permitted to bet 40c, equal to 4s., and in the other enclosure bettors will be able to bet not less than one dollar, or 10s. There will still be a 5s. totalizator. Bettors in the flat enclosure may save a little in tax, but this will not apply in the other enclosures.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: At present the tax is about 3¾ per cent. What will it be under this new provision?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have not worked out that percentage.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The House is entitled to know.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Leader will get the percentage figure at the appropriate time. The necessary provision for the tax is made in clause 7 (*a*) of the Bill. This new scale will involve about a 3 per cent loss of revenue because it is rather less severe than the present tax. It is estimated that Crown revenue may be reduced by about £17,000 a year, and that of the clubs by £6,000, as a result of this new scale. I will get the percentage figure later for the Leader. To obviate the necessity of dealing in copper coins and to simplify calculations, it is considered that the most practicable course is for the bookmaker to calculate the amount chargeable with tax having regard to the amount to be paid out to the bettor in whole multiples of 5c. In other words, the tax will be calculated on the amount payable to the bettor to the nearest 5c. The tax will then be deducted, and the balance calculated to the nearest 5c will be paid to the bettor. Clause 7 (*c*) so provides and clause 7 (*b*) makes a consequential amendment. Clause 8 directly amends the remainder of the principal Act by substituting in all cases references to amounts in money in the new currency for amounts referred to in terms of the old currency. This is purely a machinery provision which has been omitted from the Decimal Currency Act because of the specific amendments required to the sections of the Act to which I have referred. Agreement has been reached with the bookmaking fraternity on the decimal currency odds to replace the existing odds for late scratchings and withdrawals from races after betting transactions have been opened. I have a schedule here, and I ask leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Decimal currency odds to replace existing odds for late scratchings and withdrawals from races after betting transactions have opened.

Even money	50c in dollar.
Up to 12/10	45c in dollar.
Up to 15/10	40c in dollar.
Up to 18/10	35c in dollar.
Up to 22/10	30c in dollar.
Up to 3/1	25c in dollar.
Up to 45/10	20c in dollar.
Up to 6/1	15c in dollar.
Up to 12/1	10c in dollar.
Up to 18/1	5c in dollar.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: An instruction has been forwarded to bookmakers to purchase new ribbons for displaying the odds, which will be of a regulated form and which have been approved by the Betting Control Board after agreement with bookmakers. I doubt whether it is necessary to include these details in *Hansard*, but if any member wants that information I shall make it available. Agreement has almost been reached that in the event of clubs not being able to provide sufficient boards of information, the B.C.B. probably will provide them. Decimal currency is to be introduced on February 14 next year, and boards will display the odds shown to 10, so that calculations can easily be made, and, in addition, it will be shown under the existing currency what the bettor should receive in decimal currency.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

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

That disagreement with the Legislative Council's amendments be insisted on.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the Assembly would be represented by Messrs. Brookman, Corcoran, Dunstan, Nankivell, and Ryan.

Later, a message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council conference room at 7.45 p.m.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (RATES).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 3. Page 2581.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I oppose this Bill, and hope that it will be summarily rejected by this House. If it is not, I hope that it will be dealt with appropriately in another place. It is thoroughly bad and dishonest and, if it is passed, it will not only have a bad effect on the community but will cause great hardship to people whom the Treasurer in his second reading explanation said it would help and support. I shall quote the Labor Party's policy speech to show what was promised to the people of South Australia: I shall quote completely untrue paragraphs in the Treasurer's speech to this House; and then I shall give the facts as stated by a most competent taxation assessor who has analysed this Bill. The policy of the Government was stated in the Labor Party's policy speech. I have an official copy, which states:

Our policy on succession duties provides an exemption of £6,000 for the estates inherited by widows and children. It also provides that a primary producer will be able to inherit a living area without the payment of any succession duties, but a much greater rate of tax will be imposed on very large estates. This will be more in keeping with that which is in operation in other States.

On a different topic it states:

There are certain loopholes in the existing legislation where the legal avoidance of stamp duty is possible, such as the conveyance of properties, and legislation will be amended in keeping with our policy to overcome this problem.

Members will realize that the statement about succession duties had two provisions in it, both of which were concessions to the taxpayer, but there was a clear warning that for large properties there would be a higher tax demanded. Stamp duties are not provided for in this Bill and cannot be. That is something that we have not yet seen, and I do not know what is involved. In the policy speech there was no suggestion that we were going to have an entirely new form of taxation on succession: an entirely new, complicated form of taxation with pernicious clauses including one with a retrospectivity of three years. We were not told that, although the exemption to widows was to be increased to £6,000, an amount would be taken from widows that meant they would be infinitely worse off under the Bill than they were before the exemptions were granted. Indeed, that fallacy was continued in the Treasurer's second reading explanation, in which he said—

Mr. Hall: That does not have anything to do with the Bill.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, it is completely false regarding the Bill. I do not hesitate to say so. The member for Glenelg smiles, but he does not worry whether widows are taxed or not.

Mr. Hudson: I object to that remark, and ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr. Millhouse: What's he doing, taking a point of order?

The SPEAKER: I ask the Leader whether he will withdraw the remark to which the member for Glenelg has objected.

Mr. Millhouse: Why?

The SPEAKER: I think it was a reflection on the member for Glenelg that was not warranted, and I think that on second thoughts the Leader will withdraw.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If, Sir, you rule that my remarks are unparliamentary I will unreservedly withdraw, but unless you do that, Sir, I decline to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: I rule that the remarks are an unwarranted reflection on the member for Glenelg, and ask that they be withdrawn.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I withdraw the remarks. When I was drawing attention to the fact that this legislation has a most undesirable reaction on the amount to be paid by widows, the member for Glenelg smiled.

Mr. Hudson: That wasn't correct.

Mr. Coumbe: I saw you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Let me, if I may—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McKee: It is better than crying!

The SPEAKER: Order! If I do not get order, I shall name members.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In his second reading explanation, the Treasurer said:

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.

That, of course, completely overlooks the fact that the new Bill takes away from the beneficiary of an estate all of the benefit that was provided under certain sections of the Succession Duties Act, known by the people handling estates as "Form U benefits", which, in respect of an estate of any consequence, are substantial. I shall refer to a report prepared by a most competent person handling successions for his livelihood, who is completely proficient to assess what is involved in the Bill. I think the member for Mitcham and the Attorney-General will agree that most honourable members are not qualified to deal with the technicalities of a Bill of this description.

Mr. Hudson: What is this person's name?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Honourable members can take my word that he is a competent person, and if the member for Glenelg has any problem about it I am prepared to be the author of the statement, so that he can take me to task if he can show that the report is wrong in any particular. It states, as the first main effect of the amendment to the Succession Duties Act, that in the case of a widow or a child (under 21) surviving, the survivor's share of jointly held assets was previously assessed separately from the deceased's own personal assets under Form U under which the relative exemptions applied, in addition to those exemptions under Form A. If the estate was £5,000, the Form U benefits were also £5,000. The exemption under both headings under the old provisions of the Act was £4,500 each. The duty on each was therefore payable on £500, which was £75 or a total of £150.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Will you describe what the succession in Form U was?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The report states that in accordance with the Bill the duty would be assessed on the full £10,000 with an exemption of £6,000, resulting in a duty payable on £4,000, which would be £600 (in comparison with the £150 payable at present). There, we have a low estate that will be taxed 400 per cent higher than it is at present. Another case deals with a widow or any other descendant (other than a child under 21) or ancestor surviving. This again is a case of an estate of £10,000 where, under own estate and Form U benefits, there will be an exemption under the present legislation of £2,000 leaving, in both cases, a duty to be paid on £3,000. In both cases the duty will be assessed at £375 so that the total duty on that estate will be £750. In accordance with the new Bill the duty will be assessed on the full £10,000 with an exemption of £3,000 resulting in duty payable on £7,000. At the increased rate of duty at 15 per cent (it was previously 12½ per cent) it means that the duty payable would be £1,050 in comparison with the £750 now paid. My next case refers to a widow or child under 21 who survives, and the estate is £4,500 with Form U benefits of £3,000.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You should say what is the basis of the Form U benefits.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: They are all set out in the principal Act in, I think, sections 32 to 53; they are all provided by regulation. I have here a copy of the Form U that is provided under regulation. It is freely available and is used in practically every estate.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Not in every estate.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is used in practically every estate.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is not used in practically every estate or anything like it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is used in estates of the type to which I am referring, which are estates of small, thrifty people, and in these cases joint ownership of a house is the correct form.

Mr. Shannon: You are correct in saying that Form U is used most frequently in the estates that the Attorney-General alleges the Government is trying to assist.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I suggest that the Leader explain what benefit is being made.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I suggest to the Treasurer and to the Attorney-General that when a statement is made in this House that benefits are to be given under legislation they should check up to see what will be the effect of the legislation introduced. The Attorney-General has plenty of time in which to justify this Bill. However, I say this legislation is a fraud and I do not care who hears me say it. I hope that it is tipped out.

here or that, if it is not tipped out in this House, it will be tipped out in another place. I hope the Government will go to the people on it. Then if the Attorney-General wants to justify it he will be able to go on to public platforms all over the State and do so. He can then say that Form U does not mean anything.

Mr. Hudson: He didn't say that.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That applies to the honourable member for Glenelg, too. I was dealing with a particular case when I was so rudely interrupted. This case is where a widow or child under 21 survives and where the estate is modest and valued at £7,500. Of that, £4,500 is subject to Form A and £3,000 is subject to Form U. Exemption under present legislation would be complete in both instances; no duty would have to be paid on that estate at present. However, under the new provisions, which are supposed to be so beneficial to widows, duty would be assessed on the full value of £7,500 with an exemption of £6,000 resulting in duty payable on £1,500 at 15 per cent or £225 in comparison with no duty at all at present. How does that line up with the policy speech made on behalf of the Government in which not one word was said about this? The case to which I have referred is not a case of a big estate but of a modest estate of £7,500. The Government gives money with one hand and more than takes it away with the other. Honourable members opposite cannot deny these facts.

Another example is of an estate where a widow or child under 21 survives, and where the estate is £9,000. The documents are lodged under Form A for £4,500 and under Form U for £4,500. At present no duty whatever would be paid in this case; in both instances the exemption of £4,500 would completely cover it. However, under the Bill the duty would be assessed on the full value of £9,000 with the exemption of £6,000 taken off, resulting in duty payable on £3,000 at 15 per cent which would be £450, compared with the present position of no duty at all. Is there anything in the Government's policy speech that discloses that that was what the Government intended doing?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: You are very carefully not disclosing the facts at all.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am disclosing the facts. This is a place of free debate: this House is not gagged yet. The Attorney can get up and tell me where I am wrong.

Mr. Shannon: If the Attorney won't take your word, I shall give him cases and names.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This legislation was introduced ostensibly to give relief to the small people, particularly widows, and to impose a higher tax on the larger estates. I do not pretend to be an expert on this matter, and I would say there are very few such experts in this House, but an examination of this legislation by an expert shows that the taxation will rest much more heavily upon small estates than it will upon large estates.

Mr. Hudson: But you won't tell us who this expert is!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The larger estates are not affected very much by the fact that joint titles are held, but the smaller estates are greatly affected. The benefits provided for the smaller estates by previous legislation are going to be swept away by this Government. Another thing that is completely and utterly wrong is that some of the provisions of the Bill are retrospective for three years. Does any honourable member opposite deny that? The interesting thing is that the trustees are going to be responsible for the payment of the tax on any gift that may have been made about three years before, and such circumstances often exist in the case of small estates. As members know, we have no gift duty in South Australia. Under the Commonwealth legislation a person can make a gift up to £2,000 in any 18-month period, I believe, to a child or a relative without having to pay gift duty to the Commonwealth.

Mr. Hudson: What happens if the person making the gift dies within three years?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A gift of more than £2,000 in a stated period has to bear Commonwealth gift duty. If the person making the gift dies within three years it has to be brought into account; any gift duty paid is deducted, otherwise it is treated as a part of the estate. I believe that succession duty is a type of tax that should not be imposed to the limit, for I believe it has most undesirable effects upon the thrift of a person. Speaking as a person who administered this legislation for many years, I believe that this type of tax causes the greatest hardship because frequently it becomes payable when no provision has been made for it and when no provision could have been made for it. It is a large tax, and it is demanded peremptorily. The provision that is being abolished was designed specifically to alleviate the great hardship that arises out of what I say is not a desirable form of tax.

In his second reading explanation the Treasurer said that taxation on the smaller estates in South Australia was about comparable with the taxation of the other States, and he set out a table showing comparisons. Although I doubt whether any honourable member here, unless he had academic knowledge, would be able to check the Treasurer's statement, I accept it as a statement that is capable of being examined. That table was as follows:

	South Australia.	All other States.
	Per cent.	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

The following figures then show that South Australian taxation is lower. The examples I gave are in the bracket in which this State's rates are above the rates of other States.

Mr. Shannon: Those we promised to relieve.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, and that is the bracket that is to be most affected by this iniquitous Bill.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Utter nonsense! You are coming here to protect the big people who are hit by this Bill, but the small people are not.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Attorney-General can justify his point of view, and we will listen to him with great interest. When we go to the election on it, I am prepared to debate it with him in his own town hall. I will even pay half the cost of the hire of the hall.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The last time you could not get a big enough audience for the mayor's parlour.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know, as does the Attorney-General, the facts of this Bill, and that although it is represented to the world that the Government is good, giving an exemption, and looking after the poor people by increasing exemptions by 25 per cent on the one hand, on the other hand it is robbing the people. On the one hand it considers itself to be noble, generous, kind, and good, but on the other hand it is sneaking away the special concession given by Parliament to meet the case of grave hardship which could, any day, hit families and for which most of them could not provide. I give an example of what may appear to be an exaggerated case to emphasize what can happen under this type of legislation. Assume that a gift of £50,000 was made to a son within three years of the death of his father. The son in investing the £50,000 proceeds to lose it. What happens? The trustee is responsible for the payment of a duty of £10,000. Assume that the same man left to his wife £10,000 for her sustenance: the whole of that amount would have to be paid by the trustee, not to the wife but, in relation to the gift that was made three years before, to the Minister collecting succession duties. Do members consider that this House should countenance such a provision? I do not hear anyone justifying it.

Mr. Quirke: They have not heard that before.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not agree with the provisions of Commonwealth legislation, but under that legislation this is an entirely different matter. These gifts have been made and will continue to be made, and it is proper that they should be. Why should a father, with the opportunity to set up his son or daughter, be penalized for doing so? What Government member with a child would not want to do it if he could?

Mr. Hughes: Everyone would like to do it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Of course, it is a natural and proper regard one should have for one's children, and a proper responsibility. But here, we are deliberately trying to penalize that action. If the Bill is defeated, I hope the Government takes the defeat to heart and goes to the people to see what they think of it. This is a confiscation made under the assurances that the Government is doing good: it is a deliberate cheat. It is one of the worst Bills introduced since I have been in this Chamber, and it has been introduced under the spurious pretext that it helps poor people, whereas, it is taking away a previous provision to relieve persons who would otherwise suffer grave hardship. Labor's policy speech stated that a primary producer would be able to inherit a living area without paying succession duty. It is interesting to consider what is a living area under this Bill. According to the Bill, the value of a living area is equivalent to that of a £5,250 house built by the Housing Trust. I have never heard of anything so debased in its interpretation. If any honourable member opposite, who has any knowledge at all of primary production, will say that a £5,000 property represents a living area, I shall indeed be interested to hear him.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It cost £27,000 to set up every soldier settler.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, and even more than that.

Mr. Hall: Similar to the Australian Mutual Provident Society scheme.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: To establish a settler on an A.M.P. property it cost about £28,000, but we see that the promise is now down to £5,000. The Bill is thoroughly bad and dishonest, and I hope that the House will reject it. If it does not do that, I hope another place will.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I rise to support my Leader. I hate to be repetitious, but I also desire to quote from the Labor Party's policy speech, as follows:

Our policy on succession duties provides an exemption of £6,000 for the estates inherited by widows and children. It also provides that a primary producer will be able to inherit a living area without the payment of any succession duties, but a much greater rate of tax will be imposed on the very large estates. This will be more in keeping with that which is in operation in other States.

Now, the Bill deals with the matter in a slightly different form, and a promise given is not a promise actually kept. In his second reading explanation the Treasurer said:

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 . . .

Several times I have asked for the clarification of a living area. During the election campaign the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) assured me that when the present Government stated its agricultural policy it would have more to say on the subject, but nothing has been said. By way of interjection the Minister—I mean the member—for Glenelg stated that about £20,000 net was required to set up a property. He went on to qualify this, but I shall not attempt to interpret his qualification. However, I endorse what the Leader said: £28,000 was the average sum required to set up an A.M.P. settler 10 years ago. A similar figure applied to setting up soldier settlers 15 years ago. Where is this promise of accepting an exemption of a living area in respect of succession duties? If a property is divided between brothers they receive a rebate in proportion to the percentage of their inheritance of the total estate, but no more than £5,000 is allowable in this instance. On an estate of £20,000, £5,000 is allowable, whereas £6,000 was allowable previously, under section 55 (*f*) of the Act, now being replaced by the provisions in clause 30 of the Bill.

The concessions allowable on probate and succession duties where an estate is transferred from father to son for the purposes of primary production are being repealed. On an estate of £30,000 the exemption, on the formula adopted, was £8,000; on an estate of £40,000 it was £10,000; on £50,000 it was £11,000. The overall charge made for every fraction in excess of £20,000 and up to £50,000 (which is the normal range of most farming properties) was on the basis of 17½ per cent. However, under the new legislation this is broken down into more categories. There is also an increasing schedule of charges; it is 20 per cent in the first group; 22½ per cent in the second, and between £40,000 and £50,000 it is 25 per cent. Most of us realize that an agricultural property is not always looked on as an investment. Although, in fact, it represents much capital investment it provides a living only to those people who occupy it.

The problem today is to enable the people concerned to continue to occupy a property from one generation to the next, and to perpetuate the practice of farming that property. The tragedy is that in the past (and it can only be aggravated by this Bill), many properties have had to be broken up to meet probate, or put into the hands of trustees who administer the property. Until the duties are recovered the property is not transferred back into the family. I support what my Leader has said in relation to city properties. When buying a house through the Housing Trust, through one of the banks, or through the war service scheme, a house is required to be purchased under a joint tenancy with the wife. The authorities maintain that this provides security for the wife as well as additional security for themselves. It is probable that about 75 to 80 per cent of suburban residences fall into this category.

Mr. Freebairn: The Savings Bank insists on it.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Most banks do. The War Service Homes Commission insists on it, and so does the Housing Trust.

I freely admit that, if the Attorney-General were to ask me to itemize those things which come under Form U, I could not do so, but house property under joint tenancy, superannuation benefits, life insurance policies and endowment policies come into this category. Let me take a simple case of a man with assets of £4,500 in his own name and assets of £9,000 held jointly with his wife, making a total estate of £13,500. I venture to say that these days that is not an excessively large estate. I am dealing only with a typical case of the average person. What do we find under the present set-up, before the Act is amended?

We find that £4,500 is taxable on what is known as Form A, and that £4,500 is exempt. The £4,500 is this man's share in the estate—he owns half the property valued at £9,000. That half is exempt. On his death, no succession duty is paid in this instance, and the house property passes to the wife, no duties being payable. Let us be magnanimous and allow £6,000 exemption for the widow instead of £4,500. Now the sum is £4,500 plus £4,500 half-share in the house, making a total estate of £9,000. Now take away the £6,000 allowable under this Bill, and this leaves an estate of £3,000 for duty.

Then, if we look at the schedule, we see that that is chargeable on the basis of 15 per cent. So whereas the widow now pays nothing, she would be obliged to pay £450. This is a case of an average housewife in a good working-class family. They would possibly be the assets of a person of, say, 50 years of age, who had worked and built up an estate of £4,500, had paid life insurance premiums, and had bought or built a house about 25 years previously for £2,000 to £2,500. Today, £13,500 would be the value of the estate of the average businessman. Whereas his wife had nothing to pay under the present set-up, she would now have to pay £450.

My second point is that most people have set aside money for estate duties by way of insurance policies. They have taken out life insurance policies or endowment policies that mature at the retiring age of 65; they could be probate or endowment policies. Much insurance of this type has been sold. People have been advised to take out this form of insurance to protect their estates so that the wife pays nothing. Therefore, it is normal for these policies to be a component part of most estates coming up for succession duties and probate. What will happen in future? We shall have to take out additional policies to cover the increased death duties that will be levied as a result of aggregation. Ultimately, it will mean that people will strain their resources to pay for additional insurance, only for the benefit of the Government. It is really a manual tax, a working man's tax, that he will pay directly to the State. He will go without a portion of his salary or wages to pay towards these duties, and under this provision, where Form U is no longer treated separately, it will all be lumped together into his estate, and the biggest part of it will be taken out.

I have drawn attention to two aspects of the Bill and indicated how it affects the primary producers, bearing in mind particularly the promises made at the last election. They do not seem to be the same promises as when the second reading explanation of this Bill was given. This will further embarrass many primary producers whose estates have increased in value over a period of years, at a time when their productive value is not increasing commensurately with their sale price. It will be patently obvious, when the new land tax comes into operation, that land values for the purposes of death duties are slowly sneaking up and the returns from properties are not correspondingly increasing in value. So any increase in tax on these people will mean an additional hardship for them, particularly in the event of the death of a joint owner. It will mean that it will be even more difficult to retain reasonable properties as one unit.

We have to think in terms not of decreasing the size of properties but rather of making allowances for them to increase in size in order to keep the returns proportionate in value to costs. It know it is not the policy of the Government to aggregate property; in fact, its policy is to break up estates, but that will only create additional problems, and this legislation will only assist in creating further problems. I have cited the case of an average salaried man, in the so-called service industries. Schoolteachers, clerks, and people of that sort comprise 60 per cent of the work force, and these are the people whose estates will come into the group of which I have given an example. It was stated in the *Advertiser* that this was a tax in respect of which more would be collected in duties from fewer people. I believe that this state of affairs is completely wrong. There is no question that the thrifty man will be taxed as a result of these increases. It would be more truthful to say that more people will pay more with no further benefits. I cannot support the Bill.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I remind the House that at the time of the last election we were told that we would live better with Labor (that was the catchery) and so we should vote for Labor. Most people did and they are now finding it dearer to die with Labor. This Bill will create yet another catchery—the higher cost of dying. In my opinion, it is so bad that it should be tossed out at once; it should be condemned out of hand. I do not intend to attempt to amend it or go into much detail about it, in view of the many examples cited and because it has been adequately dealt with by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Albert.

Mr. McKee: He does not understand it. He distorted the whole situation.

Mr. COUMBE: I intend to show how the Bill will affect the people of South Australia if it becomes law. We listened with interest to the Treasurer's second reading explanation.

Mr. Nankivell: Did you understand it?

Mr. COUMBE: I said that we listened with interest to the explanation, which was completely misleading. It created a false impression in this House and the press report created such an impression with the public. This is no reflection on the reporting, because I believe that the explanation, as given to this House, was correctly reported. However, the impression created by it was completely false and misleading and there is a sense of dishonesty in this regard, because the impression was created that the Bill would give generous concessions to widows, dependent children and other beneficiaries in straitened circumstances—handouts to worthy people.

Mr. McKee: I object to your referring to the Treasurer as having been dishonest.

Mr. COUMBE: I am not saying that the Treasurer has been dishonest: I am saying that the impression created led to this confusion and that it is questionable—

Mr. McKee: So are you.

Mr. COUMBE: — that this impression was created.

Mr. Casey: Let us get back to *Hansard*. Never mind about the press.

Mr. COUMBE: What I am saying is going into *Hansard*.

Mr. Curren: Are you quoting the Liberal and Country League bible?

Mr. COUMBE: I shall not take that any further for the honourable member, because he may regret what he has said. Although benefits are handed out in the Bill, they are taken back twofold. The examples given by the Leader of the Opposition show that, although the principal Act intended to confer benefits on widows and dependent children, the provisions of this Bill will cause many of those people to suffer because of the new adding back provision, which means that an estate can easily attract a higher rate of duty. This provision will cause disadvantages similar to those now experienced by many wage earners who are required to pay extra tax when their income increases. Many widows will go from the exempt bracket to a bracket that attracts a high rate of duty. Therefore, the benefits provided will be completely nullified by this adding back.

Mr. Casey: What is the valuation of property below which it will not apply?

Mr. COUMBE: It is set out in the schedule.

Mr. Casey: You are making statements but you are not backing them up with figures.

Mr. COUMBE: I shall come back to the honourable member. The principal Act was designed many years ago for the specific purpose of raising revenue and certain exemptions were granted to widows and dependent children. This type of exemption has always been regarded as a basic principle in legislation dealing with death duties, succession duties, estate duties, wills and such things. Previous South Australian Governments of various political persuasions have always tried to protect estates left to needy persons. However, in terms of this Bill, the widows of those on modest incomes who leave small estates will lose the benefit that the original Act intended them to receive. There was no mention of the adding back provision in the second reading explanation.

Mr. Clark: Will you explain the adding back principle, if you understand it?

Mr. COUMBE: I shall give the honourable member a good example of how it works. The second reading explanation contains some spurious remarks and some window dressing. If this measure becomes law, it will be a bitter pill for many South Australians. It may have been a sugar-coated pill according to the explanation, but that was completely misleading and I consider that the way it was introduced was pretty raw politics. Many of the provisions penalize good husbandry and good management of one's personal affairs and, because of that, it is retrograde legislation. This is penal taxation in its most blatant form and the Bill will shock many people in South Australia because of the effect it will have on their estates. It will also shock many people who supported the Labor Party at the last election and who read or heard at the time the policy speech was given that certain things would be done in relation to succession duties.

Mr. Freebairn: It will be the beneficiaries who will get the shock!

Mr. COUMBE: Exactly. Widows and beneficiaries will get a shock when they see this Bill in operation, and the many people who were told before the last election that they would live better with Labor will find that they will die dearer with Labor! This legislation will affect many people on modest incomes who will leave modest estates to their wives and

families, and many of these people supported Labor in the last election.

Mr. Lawn: Didn't anyone die when we had a Liberal Party dictatorship?

Mr. COUMBE: If the honourable member is patient enough, I will eventually answer his question.

Mr. Clark: I have seen people make promises too often.

Mr. COUMBE: I have promised to give an example, and I shall do so. However, I have not reached details yet; I have been talking only about the second reading explanation, which is all that most people have read about. They have not studied the Bill, and they cannot be expected to do so. In the second reading explanation concessions (which are quite illusory) were stressed and the steep increases that will come into effect were played down. I frankly admit that several very deserving categories in the community will get some benefit (for instance, the exemption for widows is increased) but what is being given with one hand is being taken back twofold with the other by the imposition of what amounts to rather confiscatory rates of duty.

The Labor policy speech promised to adjust succession duties, so it was logical for us to expect that this Bill would be introduced and that it would impose some increases in rates of duty. However, not only is there to be an increase in rates but an entirely new principle of adding back is being introduced. Probably this Bill would go through if it contained modest and reasonable increases, as they were mentioned in the policy speech of the Party opposite, but the measure not only adjusts rates but brings in a new principle that will hit most people in receipt of modest incomes. This is a sectional tax, and if the Bill comes into operation we will find that fewer and fewer people will be paying more and more. It will not only have an effect on people benefiting from estates but will discourage thrift and initiative. What will be the attitude of many people? They will say, "Why should we work so hard and for such long hours, save money and take out life insurance? Why not spend all our money and have a good time while we are here? Let the social welfare State take care of our children." That attitude could so easily be adopted by so many people. If a person works hard, is prudent, and provides for his family his money will be filched by the Government. People may easily adopt the attitude that I have suggested as a natural corollary of this legislation; this attitude was taken by coalminers a few years ago who, when taxation was so heavy and savage, introduced a darg. This legislation will severely penalize the families of those who, by being prudent, adequately provide for their dependants.

The member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell) gave an example of how ownership of houses would be affected. Many married couples place the house they own in joint names. Under the existing Act, if the husband dies his share of the house passes automatically to the widow without any duty being attracted. Under the Bill, however, his share of the house will be added to the remainder of his estate—that is, the money he has in the bank and any other assets he has gathered in a lifetime of work. The duty is paid on the gross amount, so the higher rate is immediately attracted. This is grossly unfair. Many men have arranged their personal affairs in such a careful way on the good faith of the existing law that they have ensured that their families will be adequately provided for, but the duties payable under this Bill will diminish the value of what their widows will receive. This will completely upset the arrangements that most good-living men and women have made. This is a serious aspect to consider, and the amendment to the principal Act will completely change the existing state of affairs, because it deliberately alters the legislation by introducing this method of adding back. This method brings back into a person's estate assets that he has disposed of during his lifetime, and this will be resented by many families on modest incomes and owning modest estates. I repeat that more and more married couples in the community are putting their houses into joint tenancy. More and more people today are buying their own houses and the percentage of those who own their own houses is much greater than it was some years ago. The Housing Trust has enabled many people to buy their houses and the Commonwealth is assisting in encouraging this method of ownership. Therefore, couples are becoming more conscious of owning their own houses and when they buy them they put them into joint tenancy. Because of this, when the Bill becomes law, a great and increasing number of people will be affected adversely by its provisions.

The greatest stumbling block to many married couples, especially in a case where a husband dies while he is fairly young and leaves a young wife and little children, is the provision to bring back into an estate assets that have

been accumulated during the course of a life-time and add them to the half share of the house. This will act severely against people because in many cases they are buying their houses under mortgage and will be repaying instalments for many years. This could have a tragic result in the case of a young widow who is faced with mortgage repayments for perhaps 30 years. I fear that if the death duty is severe in such a case it could mean that the widow could be forced out of the house because she would have to sell it to meet the probate costs and death duty. This would end the plans that she and her husband had so carefully nurtured over the years. Coupled with these matters is the question of retrospectivity which seems to me to be completely unjust. It means that action will be taken against a husband and father who has provided for his wife and family under the existing law in perfectly good faith. The present Act is designed to allow him to dispose of assets during his life-time without duty being levied on them after his death. Surely provision could have been made so that this duty would not apply to actions taken under the existing law. I submit that the provisions in the Bill are completely unjust and unfair, and will affect mainly those people earning modest incomes and with modest estates.

Mr. McKee: You are repeating yourself.

Mr. COUMBE: I could see that the member for Port Pirie was getting worried.

Mr. McKee: I am getting bored.

Mr. COUMBE: Let us take the case of the honourable member for Port Pirie.

Mr. McKee: State a case truthfully.

Mr. COUMBE: I am going to state the honourable member's case. Although I should not like to see it happen, the honourable member may unfortunately meet with an accident, and his widow may be left—

Mr. McKee: You are not pointing the bone at me, are you?

Mr. COUMBE: I do not wish to cause a by-election. Perhaps it would be better if I took the case of a person like the honourable member who may have made provision, say six months ago, that certain of his assets should be disposed of so that they did not attract death duties, and that these should go to his widow and children. If the Bill were passed it would mean that the action he had taken would be completely void. If the Government were sincere in this regard and wanted to make a provision retrospective for a number of years, surely it could be made to take effect on the passage of the Bill rather than apply to an action taken in perfectly good faith under the existing law and as provided for under that law.

Mr. McKee: I suggest that the honourable member get leave to continue his remarks, and study the Bill carefully.

Mr. COUMBE: I will do that for the honourable member and perhaps I might be able to illumine him a little. I will put the honourable member at peace by saying that I am about to conclude my remarks. The Bill is so bad that it should be thrown out. It is not worth amending and should be dismissed out of hand. It would be a retrograde step to pass the Bill in its present form. I am not going to attempt to amend the Bill because it will have such a bad effect on the people of the State that it will penalize good management. I resent the way the Bill was introduced in that the second reading explanation was misleading. I completely oppose the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SITTINGS.

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

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I do not intend to oppose the Leader's motion, although it is unusual to have a substantial number of members absent while the House is sitting. Standing Orders provide that the House may not sit while a conference is taking place. Provided the Leader assures me that the business of the House will be confined to second reading speeches and matters that are not controversial, I am happy to agree to his motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I should like to—

The SPEAKER: This is a motion to suspend the Standing Orders, and it cannot be debated. I can only allow the Premier to reply to the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to tell the House how far I should like to go, but I can only do that after I have obtained the suspension of Standing Orders.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House, and there being present an absolute majority of the whole House I accept the motion as put.

Motion carried.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The House has agreed to the appointment of managers to

attend the conference. My reason for moving this motion was to enable second reading explanations of Bills to be given. It will not be necessary for any votes to be taken, other than for the adjournment of a debate.

The SPEAKER: The House has suspended Standing Orders. I point out that neither the Clerk of the House nor I consider the Standing Orders satisfactory in this regard. The time has long passed when the Standing Orders should be reviewed. However, in the meantime it is our duty to enforce them.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 4. Page 2611.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill increases charges and no doubt arises out of the Government's desire to attract additional revenue. It has two main features, and although I do not particularly agree with one of those features I do not oppose it to the same extent as I oppose the second feature. Two things are involved in this legislation, in general terms. First, the taxation on cheques is increased from 3d. to 5c, the equivalent of 6d. Although I do not believe that is desirable, I must confess that it is not so far out of line with the position in other States. While it is something that personally I do not desire (in fact, I would be opposed to it) I do not regard it as being of the same character as the other feature of the Bill that provides that all receipts shall be stamped and that issuing receipts shall be compulsory. In my opinion, this is most undesirable, and I think this House should examine it very carefully.

Some years ago this question was examined by the Government of the day when it was looking for additional revenue. The cost to the community to provide this revenue is not justified in the light of the amount of revenue the Government will collect. Therefore, when the question of increasing stamp duties was considered previously we increased the amount payable on cheques from 2d. to 3d. This represented a 50 per cent increase, and was regarded as heavy. However, we did not touch duty on receipts because of the effect we considered it would have upon industry, upon the cost of giving service to the community, and upon the ultimate cost of goods to the householder. I think everyone here realizes that every charge we put upon the trader or the community generally is passed on ultimately to the consumer, and that in fact in many instances a little extra is also passed on.

At present there is no compulsion to give a receipt. If I have an account with a firm and I do not ask for a receipt I merely receive a monthly statement setting out the purchases I have made during the month, the payments I have made, and the balance outstanding. That system is much more desirable to most people than what is proposed in this Bill, and, more importantly, it is much less costly to the trader. In the days when receipts were issued as a general rule the purchaser forwarded his payment, and then another stamped envelope with a receipt had to be sent out. For the Government to collect a small amount of tax in this respect the trader is actually up for a cost of about 1s. 3d. in giving a receipt. I consider that is undesirable in every way, because it is an added cost to the community.

I also have grave doubts regarding the provision that introduces a sliding scale of duty stamp payments for receipts. If it were a fixed scale a person could purchase a stock of stamps, and he would not need to go chasing around to make up an odd amount because the amount involved was not appropriate to the value of the stamp that he had. I believe this provision also imposes a considerable disability upon industry. In some instances it will be a high cost for the receipt for a transaction which to the trader returns a small profit. There is only a small margin when selling stock, but if the total transaction involves a large sum the amount of stamp duty will be extremely onerous. Extra stamp duty on cheques should have been avoided as this is not desirable in the interests of the State, but it is not such a difficult tax as that which compels a receipt to be given in all instances. This legislation will cut across transactions where normally no receipts are given so that this imposition on our commercial life should be avoided.

I intend in Committee to move that the provision requiring a receipt to be issued as a general rule should be deleted. The existing position is satisfactory to the community, and presents no difficulty for a purchaser wanting a receipt to get one. However, most purchasers prefer to have a monthly statement of account setting out full details rather than a statement setting out details of certain payments. One or two exemptions are provided to this rule of giving a receipt. I do not know the basis of the exemptions, except that provided for a pensioner. I can understand that this should be done as an act of grace because he is not able to pay. However, I

cannot understand why a fruitblocker, who delivers £20 worth of fruit to a factory, has to put a duty stamp on the receipt, whereas a person working in the factory and giving £20 worth of service is not required to use a duty stamp. The sale of the fruit is the wages of the fruitblocker, so why should a distinction be made? This problem should be overcome not by charging the wage earner for a duty stamp on his wage payments but by not having compulsion. The Government is prone at present to rush in with compulsion where it is undesirable and unnecessary. The amount of duty obtained by this somewhat devious proposal will not be much, but this further imposition will be obnoxious to the trading community.

This State has to compete with other States of the Commonwealth but we do not start on an equal basis. We have to make the goods here and they have to be transported to other States before competing on the market with goods made in those States. Most workers are employed in factories in this State, and if conditions are made unattractive in this State we shall inevitably reap the reward of our actions. Already there is a reaction against establishing a particular industry in South Australia. I understand that recently an industry made a survey to see where it would establish in Australia, and I heard on reliable grounds that it visited all States of the Commonwealth except this State. Why? It is because we have lost cost consciousness. A heading in today's newspaper states, "Record Government Expenditure". If that is so, there must be a record Government taxation and this places the State in an unfavourable position to meet the challenge of commerce. The newspaper also states that we are going to increase charges for using our harbours. The result of this imposition will be that another industry will not establish in this State.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: A while ago you complained that we were not spending enough.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not against taxation, but I have always said that for this State to progress it must keep taxation costs down. I think that Government members consider that it can adopt a principle of levelling down, but the more this is done the lower is the standard of everyone. This type of philosophy will have a reaction in the community that will astound Government members who are happy to spend money on every conceivable project. This State was developed because we were careful in our administration to keep taxation costs down, and we were able to show industries coming to Australia that they could establish in this State without detriment to themselves. They could establish here and compete equally on the Australian market. In those circumstances, we attracted industries to this State, as a result of which the economy of the State improved, as did the financial resources of the Government and the people's standard of living. If we increase taxation so that our costs are above the Australian level, the inevitable result will be that South Australia will not see new industries because they will not come here. In the last few months we have seen a drift of industries away from South Australia.

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This State built up its economy on the basis that it was a low-taxing State. We have the natural resources and advantages that will enable the State to continue to attract industries, but we shall not be able to accomplish that unless we offer, in some form or other, advantages that do not exist in the other States. Present Government policy seems to be to study the position in the other States with a view to finding something that is taxed slightly higher than it is taxed here. It will then immediately bring our taxation up to that level, and it will not be long before industry in South Australia will have the worst of every world. We shall have the worst features of taxation in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria all combined in our own economy.

If that is to be the Government's policy, it will not be long before this State will get back into the doldrums from which it managed to escape only by prudent administration and careful husbandry of its finances, as well as by rigid Treasury control (which, I am afraid, we do not have now). In Committee I will move a number of amendments to the Bill. Although I do not favour the provision that doubles the duty on cheques, I think that, as a revenue-producing measure, it is infinitely better than the provision relating to compulsory receipts. Not only will that result in extra costs to industry but those costs will ultimately be passed on to the consumers in the way of additional charges. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 9. Page 2671.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): It is not intended to offer any substantial opposition to the Bill, for it contains some valuable provisions. The first main feature is a technical matter dealing with harbour lights and pilot requirements. This appears to be a necessary amendment, because it will provide additional facilities for navigation. The next feature deals with the increasing (by regulation) of the statutory limits in respect of harbour improvements from the present rate of 1s. to 5s. a ton. However, the 1s. rate has been in the principal Act since 1936, and from inquiries made I understand that the provision has rarely been used. Therefore, I am surprised that the rate should be increased. However, this matter is covered by regulation, and the House will have an opportunity at a later stage to consider it, if necessary.

If the Bill sought to increase the rate by administrative or statutory means (and not by regulation) the action would be criticized. In his second reading explanation the Minister illustrated how the relevant clause is a departure from accepted practice. In the past all goods in the port have been subjected to the same rate, but it is now suggested that by the addition of the words "or any" differential rates can be levied on different goods. Although this may or may not be a good thing, the Harbors Board will have the opportunity to vary the rate to attract custom and, perhaps, to place a charge on certain commodities. The case of Port Lincoln has been cited but I do not intend to canvass that, as the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson), who represents that district, will know the circumstances relating to Port Lincoln far better than I do. At present the Public Works Committee is considering the addition of a facility at Port Lincoln, especially for the handling of tuna, to which the relevant clause may be applicable. I think the important thing to bear in mind is that the Harbors Board will have the opportunity to vary the charge of a particular commodity, whereas in the past it has been restricted in this respect, regardless of the nature of the commodity and of its place of origin.

The board will now have the opportunity to create an incentive or to recoup a charge on a rather costly operation, which will be advantageous, so long as it does not drive away from a particular area an industry which has been developed there and which experiences a rather narrow economic margin. The next provision deals with Crown lands held by the board, in respect of which difficulty in giving a title has been experienced. The Opposition agrees to this provision, particularly because of the difficulty that has arisen in the past in respect of development of the Gillman Estate on LeFevre Peninsula. This area has been inspected both privately and at an official level, and I have seen it for myself perhaps more closely than have other honourable members. If the facts are as stated in the second reading explanation, it is necessary to give the commissioners powers so that the housing, industrial and recreation schemes can proceed without being held up for lack of a title. In these circumstances, I support the Bill.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I should like briefly to address myself to this Bill, which is of some interest to me because of a former association with the administration of the Act. I offer no objection to the Bill, which deals with three specific matters. The first is, of course, a technical one relating to the control of shipping and the requirement to display certain signals when approaching some ports. That is something with which I do not think the House will want to interfere. It is purely technical in regard to the control of shipping. I see no difficulty there. It merely applies the normal practice to ships approaching ports in this State. I do not object to it.

Then there is something which, as we have just been informed, has been a source of difficulty for some time. A large area in the Gillman Estate has been reclaimed at some considerable cost by the transfer of surplus sand from the seafront at Taperoo and points further south along the coast. It has been brought across and deposited in the low-lying and swampy area around Gillman. As a result of that transfer, several desirable residential and industrial sites have been created. I commend the former board for its foresight in this matter. The concept of the whole operation has been good. The transfer of the sand and soil has been economically carried out and, as a result, for example, the new high school in the Taperoo area has been built on land that hitherto was untidy and virtually valueless sand dunes. This is only one example of the beneficial results flowing from the far-sightedness of the board.

The newly created industrial area of the Gillman Estate has not previously been sufficiently under the control of the Harbors Board for the board to be able to give clear titles, because of technical difficulties in the transferring of titles. It has not been able to give a clear title to this land on its being purchased by authorities and industries desiring to establish their factories and workshops upon it. This has substantially impeded the development and occupancy of the newly developed Gillman Estate. When I was Minister, we examined all possible ways of breaking through this problem. I suggested several alternatives, each of which was examined by the board and the lands titles authorities, but in every case there proved to be some inherent difficulty that it was not possible to overcome. I am pleased that the Minister has seen fit to introduce this amendment as a considerable amount of capital is tied up, because of the cost of creating this industrial estate, which it is not possible to unlock and utilize to get the benefit from the expenditure on it until we can give title to the land. There are at least two industrial concerns desiring to establish themselves in this area, but they have not proceeded with the purchase projects because they could not get a title. Although it was possible for them to physically occupy the land and establish themselves upon it with no fear that they would suffer thereby, from the point of view of utilizing the asset for the purpose of financing the whole enterprise a real difficulty has been created. When this Bill is passed those difficulties will be removed, and industries desiring this land can get a title and use it as a negotiable instrument in their operations. I commend the Minister for bringing this matter forward. I support the move.

As regards the other matter dealt with by this Bill, namely, the amendment to the section of the principal Act dealing with the harbour improvement rate, I have some reservations. This rate is a special rate which, when the Act was originally framed, was provided so that the harbour authority could, if it felt it necessary or desirable, levy a special rate known as the harbour improvement rate upon a certain port in order to assist in the financing of improvements at such port. I think the idea was perfectly acceptable and had merit. It was probably included as a piece of machinery that could in certain circumstances be desirable and enable the board to recoup itself for perhaps unduly high expenditures in establishing a port for a specific purpose. I believe that was the thought behind the provision when it was inserted in the parent Act.

So far as my memory goes, this provision has never been used by the harbour authority since it was placed on the Statute Book. From some researches I have done, I believe it has never been used, so the question of amending or even retaining it remains somewhat obscure. Whether it is worthwhile retaining something in the Act that has never been used, and, therefore, apparently is not likely to be used, is something that perhaps the Minister would like to think about further before he finally commits himself on it in Committee. I have no great objection to it but there is the possibility that at some future time the board will feel it desirable or even necessary, before it agrees to the establishment of additional facilities at a port, to make it a condition of the establishment that the industry concerned should accept some special loading on the commodities it puts through the installation. If that position arises, the amendments proposed in this Bill are eminently desirable. They enable the rates to be brought into line with present-day money values and also enable the board to recommend to the Governor that regulations be promulgated to enable it to attach the rate in a selected manner. Previously, as the member for Torrens pointed out, if the rate applied at a port, it had necessarily to apply to every commodity shipped through it. The illustration used by the Minister in his second reading explanation was a good analogy. However, I have some reservations about the particular port he selected for his illustration. The producers and people interested in the production and export of meat and fish from Port Lincoln have always found themselves trading in a narrow and competitive market.

The Public Works Committee is presently examining a project submitted by the Government and it would not be fitting or proper for me to comment on the project. However, the meat exporting and fish exporting industries would have considerable reservations about asking for or utilizing such a facility if they had to pay even a fractional loading on the normal rate charged for the handling of goods through the installation.

The meat exporting industry is extremely competitive and producers on Eyre Peninsula have been struggling for many years to find suitable reliable and profitable outlets. Much of the production must be exported, because it is surplus to local requirements. This applies particularly in the lamb trade, where about

80 per cent of production is either utilized in the larger centres of population in the State or sent overseas. Because of the inescapable costs of treatment of meat by the Government Produce Department at Port Lincoln, the charges for handling have to be maintained at a rate equal to or slightly above the rates operating at the larger meat works in the State, and although this has created some difficulty for the producers they have accepted it, because they know that the cost of maintaining these works at the high standard necessary is substantial.

However, if as a result of harbour improvement the producers are asked to pay a loaded charge for the export of their meat, they will not be anxious to avail themselves of the facility provided. Much the same conditions apply to the export of fish, mainly tuna in the round. Safcol has successfully established a market for the product of the tuna fleet operating in Port Lincoln waters to balance export with the working of the company's cannery. If that company's catch increases because of the operation of more boats, or because of a favourable season, it will find difficulty in operating unless it is able to trade freely on the existing export market. The company could not utilize the full catch for canning purposes, because canned fish must be sold almost entirely on the home market, and, although that market is developing well because of the efficiency of the company, if the returns available from export are not maintained and if there is not an expanded export market for fish in the round without an additional charge, the company will be embarrassed.

I do not want it to be said that I accept lightly the possibility of a loaded charge for the export of meat or fish from Port Lincoln, because I consider that there is not room for the industries to negotiate a higher charge and still operate on a reasonably profitable basis. Of course, I know that this has not been used as a threat to the industries and I hope that the establishment of facilities at Port Lincoln does not involve an inherent requirement of an additional charge. However, if such a charge is made, I shall protest vigorously.

I am prepared to support the second reading and to let the Bill go through the Committee stage until we come to this particular clause, when the Minister may wish to report progress so that he can look at this matter of the port improvement rate. If he is satisfied that he must retain the proposed amendment, I shall not offer any serious objection to it. However, I give him the opportunity of examining it.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Marine): I thank the honourable members who have spoken on the second reading for their fair and reasonable attitude to the Bill. The only clause that gives any concern seems to be clause 4 and I inform the honourable member for Flinders that I think I used a rather unfortunate illustration when I referred to the meat and tuna industries at Port Lincoln. As far as I know, the honourable member is correct. I doubt whether this provision has even been used and I am confident that there is no immediate intention of using it if it is amended.

I discussed the matter with the General Manager of the Harbors Board and we considered that, as the clause was written into the principal Act in 1936, the time was opportune to amend it so that it would be in keeping with today's money values. If the Bill reaches the Committee stage this day, I shall ask the Committee to suspend consideration of clause 4 and to deal with clause 5. I shall then report progress to enable me to discuss the matter with the Chairman and General Manager of the Harbors Board tomorrow morning, and again tomorrow afternoon with the General Manager.

I understand that, in accordance with Standing Orders, a vote should not be taken while a conference is in progress and, as I have no desire to offend Standing Orders, I think it is correct that at this stage I should ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

FAUNA CONSERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This Bill to amend the Fauna Conservation Act, 1964, has a threefold object, namely—

(*a*) to clarify the position of police officers exercising powers under Part II with regard to the production of identity cards;

(*b*) to solve problems arising from the existing wording of section 40 (2) on such matters as the granting of permits to authorized bird banders permitting them to attach bands to birds for ornithological purposes in a fauna reserve or sanctuary or a game reserve and

conferring upon landowners power to destroy pest fauna within a sanctuary or game reserve on their land; and

(*c*) to provide that a person granted a permit to destroy pest fauna may permit either for payment or otherwise other persons to destroy the pest fauna without requiring a Ministerial endorsement to the permit as required by section 69 of the principal Act.

Clause 3 accordingly amends section 14 of the principal Act to provide that the provisions of Part II of the Act requiring an inspector to show an identity card to any person when exercising any powers under that Part shall not apply to members of the Police Force, who may perform any such powers without producing an identity card. This amendment is desirable for the following reasons:

Section 13 (2) of the Act states that a member of the Police Force is an inspector under the principal Act, and section 14 of the principal Act provides that the Minister shall issue an identity card to every person appointed as an inspector. It is not considered necessary that police officers should be issued with identity cards for the purpose of this Act and, in any event, it is doubtful if, having regard to the wording of the said section 13 (2), police officers are "appointed" as inspectors under the Act. New subsection (2) is therefore inserted in the principal Act to remove any doubts in this respect.

Clause 4 amends section 40 of the principal Act by striking out the passage "fauna reserve, fauna sanctuary or game reserve" in subsection (2) thereof. The existence of this passage in that subsection has had the effect of preventing the Minister from granting permits to members of the Australian Bird Banding Scheme to attach bands to birds in a fauna reserve, fauna sanctuary or game reserve, since "taking" in the subsection would include a taking for bird banding purposes. This is considered by the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization Bird Banding Scheme as placing an undesirable restriction on the part that South Australia can contribute to Australian ornithology generally. The Government agrees that the restriction in subsection (2) is undesirable in this respect. If the Minister does not wish the holder of a permit under section 40 to take fauna from a fauna reserve, fauna sanctuary or game reserve he has power under section 68 of the principal Act to insert a condition to this effect. The striking out of the abovementioned passage would also enable land owners who have a fauna reserve or sanctuary or game reserve on their land to be granted permits to destroy pest fauna on these areas, which they are at present precluded from doing by reason of the existence of these words in subsection (2).

Clause 5 amends section 69 of the principal Act. This section deals with a prohibition on the transfer of licences or permits. It includes a provision that the Minister may make an endorsement on any licence or permit permitting persons other than the holder of the permit to take or sell aminals, birds or eggs under the permit or exercise any other rights given by the licence or permit. Except for permits issued under section 40 (1) (*c*) of the principal Act, there is no difficulty in obtaining the name of a person for endorsement as required by this section. But a holder of a permit under section 40 (1) (*c*) at the time of his application may not know the name of the person who will be destroying the pest fauna. For example, casual labour may be used to destroy pest fauna such as kangaroos. Provision is therefore considered necessary for permits issued under that paragraph to be issued without Ministerial endorsement thereon as required by section 69 with regard to permits granted under other provisions of the Act. In commending this Bill to the House, I should like to point out that representations of a deputation introduced by the former Minister of Agriculture, the member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman), who was interested in this Bill, were considered by my officers, who thought they had much merit.

Mr. FERGUSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

IMPOUNDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In 1962, the Impounding Act was amended in several respects. Among others, there was the insertion of a new section 15a to provide that cattle could be conveyed to the nearest pound in a suitable vehicle. It is now proposed to add a subsection to section 15a to enable recovery of the cost of such transport. The South-Eastern Local Government Association made a request some time ago for such an amendment, particularly in relation to bulls.

There are many cattle in the district, and bulls are, from time to time, found straying. Difficulty is experienced in driving them to the pound, to say nothing of the danger to lives and damaged property. One council has authorized a ranger to engage transport and has been bearing the cost itself. Landholders prefer to make their stock yards and loading ramps available for loading bulls to avoid damage to their fencing and other property. The Government considers that the cost of transport should be paid by the owner and that the amendment should not be limited to the transport of bulls. The new subsection accordingly makes a general provision in relation to all cattle.

Mr. HEASLIP secured the adjournment of the debate.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RAILWAYS COMMISSIONER'S ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is twofold. Clause 4 inserts into the principal Act a new section 95a which will empower the Minister to request the Commissioner at any time to propose in writing a scheme for effecting an increase of income or a decrease of expenditure, or for carrying out any matter of general policy. If the Minister approves of the scheme he may direct the Commissioner to carry it out. If he does not approve of the scheme he is empowered to transmit to the Commissioner a proposition of his own.

Under the Act, as it now stands, section 95 leaves the carriage and conveyance of passengers and goods to the discretion of the Commissioner. He may use any particular railway line as he thinks fit and the frequency of service is a matter for him to determine. Although the Government does not suggest that every minor alteration to a railway schedule should be the responsibility of anyone other than the Commissioner, it does feel that the Minister in charge of railways should have some powers in this respect. New section 95a (which is based upon a similar provision in the Commonwealth and Victorian Acts) so provides. Subclause (2) provides that where any direction of the Minister adversely affects the accounts of the railways, the Commissioner shall so inform the Minister and the amount of any consequential loss is to be paid out of moneys to be provided by Parliament.

The other matter is dealt with in clauses 5, 6 and 3. Under the present Act the fares and charges for the carriage of passengers and goods are prescribed by by-law made by the Commissioner under section 133. Although such by-laws are subject to confirmation by the Governor and disallowance by Parliament, the initiation of by-laws in respect of fares and freights lies with the Commissioner and, if the Government desired any increase or decrease in fares or rates, it could do nothing unless the Commissioner decided to act. The Government considers that the matter of fares and freight rates should be the prerogative of the Government and not of the Commissioner. Clause 5 accordingly provides for the Governor to make regulations fixing such fares and freight rates and clause 6 removes this power from the powers of the Commissioner to make by-laws.

Mr. QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

REGISTRATION OF DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It deals with two separate matters. The first is the position of Aborigines under the principal Act which, by section 36, entitles every full-blooded Aboriginal to keep two, but not more, unregistered dogs. As honourable members know, it is the policy of the Government that there shall be no discrimination as between Aborigines and other members of the community and it follows that Aborigines should not be in a privileged position in matters such as this. Accordingly clause 3 amends section 36 by providing that only until June 30, 1966, Aborigines may keep two unregistered dogs. After that date such dogs will require registration. The other clauses, introduced on the recommendation of the Local Government Advisory Committee, increase certain fees fixed some time ago and now considered to be too low.

Clause 4 increases the fee for late registration from 5s. to 10s. Additionally, it makes a drafting alteration in the Second Schedule to make it clear when the increased fee becomes payable. The present wording appears to have given rise to some doubts. Clause 5 raises the fees payable by the owner of a stray dog which has been siezed. The fees payable by the owner when he claims the dog are raised from 5s. to 10s. for the first period of 24 hours after seizure and for subsequent periods of 24 hours from 1s. to 3s.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ALSATIAN DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to provide that the fee payable for the registration of an Alsatian dog (which is fixed at £2) shall be increased by 10s. if not paid within 21 days of the due date of registration. Some years ago provision was made in the Registration of Dogs Act for a late registration fee, but no corresponding amendment was made to the Alsatian Dogs Act. Clause 3 makes the required amendment, the amount of the fee being the same as that proposed in another Bill before the House relating to dogs other than Alsatians.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is twofold. Clauses 4, 5 and 7 remove from sections 30, 32 and 94 of the principal Act references to maximum fares within trust-controlled areas and clause 6 makes an amendment regarding suitability of roads within those areas. Before explaining the effect of the clauses which I have mentioned, I refer to clause 3, which merely makes a drafting amendment to the interpretation section of the principal Act following the enactment of the Road Traffic Act, 1961, as amended to date.

I deal now with clause 4. Section 30 of the principal Act gives the trust, in effect, exclusive rights, either by itself of through licensees, to carry passengers paying individual fares by bus within a certain area in and around the metropolitan area if the fares payable do not exceed 2s. 6d. each way. By proclamation the area under the control of the trust will be extended as from October 1 to include Salisbury, Elizabeth and part of Munno Para. The effect of section 30 as it now stands and the proclamation would be that, if a private bus operator charged fares in excess of 2s. 6d. each way for a journey between Adelaide and Elizabeth, he would be outside the licensing powers of the trust. It has accordingly been decided to remove the limit upon fares chargeable in respect of bus services within the extended area, so that the trust will have complete control over the omnibus service, irrespective of the fare charged, and the amendment made by clause 4 will so provide. Clauses 5 and 7 make consequential amendments.

With regard to clause 6, I refer to section 33 of the principal Act, which places a statutory obligation on the trust to ensure the suitability of roads for bus services unless so used before October 9, 1928. With the extension of the area to be brought under trust control, which I have already mentioned, it is clearly reasonable to apply the same principle, that is, that the obligation of the trust regarding suitability should not apply to roads in an extended area which were used by buses before the date on which a new area is prescribed. Clause 6 so provides.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

BUILDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Building Act, 1923-1964, to provide that building inspectors be required to possess a certificate of competency before being permitted to carry out their duties with councils. The Local Government Officers Association is seeking such legislation, since it is considered desirable that council officers should hold some qualifications if they are engaged in work where specialist knowledge is required. In many instances, it should be mentioned in this connection, a council does not employ a full-time building surveyor but engages a part-time consultant to do the work. The result is that the greater part of the administration is left to a building inspector. Further, it is to be observed that clerks, engineers, building surveyors, overseers and health inspectors are required to hold certificates of competency, and it is felt that building inspectors should likewise have such certificates.

The Government accepts the recommendation of the Local Government Officers Association that building inspectors should be properly qualified and hold certificates of competency. The amendment proposed accordingly extends the regulation-making power given under section 83 (1) (*j*) of the Building Act so as to include building inspectors. This paragraph

enables regulations to be made prescribing qualifications for building surveyors. The examining body for building inspectors will, it is proposed, be the same body as for building surveyors. The amendment also ensures continuity of employment for building inspectors employed by councils who may not have the necessary qualification at the time the regulations come into force. Clause 3 gives effect to these proposals. I commend the Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GENERAL).

Second reading.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of unconnected amendments which, after due consideration, have been recommended by the Local Government Advisory Committee, and I shall deal with the amendments in the order in which they appear in the Bill. The first amendment is effected by clause 3 dealing with properties which are exempted from rating. The exemption in the case of councils assessing under the annual values method is defined in subparagraph (*d*) of paragraph (1) of the definition of "rateable property" as "any land or church, chapel or building used exclusively for public worship". This differs from the definition of the exemption in the case of councils which base their assessments on land values, where the corresponding subparagraph (*d*) of paragraph (2) refers to "land solely used for religious purposes". It will be seen that where the annual value method is used the exemption is narrower because the land, church, chapel or building must be used exclusively for public worship. It is considered that this variation was not intended, and accordingly the exemption will, in the case of annual value assessments, now read "any land, church, chapel, or buildings solely used for religious purposes", thus making the exemptions in both cases the same.

The next amendment is dealt with in clause 4 (*a*). Section 52 (1) (*d*) disqualifies from membership of a council a person directly or indirectly participating or interested in a contract with or employment under the council. Doubts have been expressed as to the meaning of the word "indirectly"; in particular, the question has been raised whether the wife of an employee of a council is disqualified. The Local Government Advisory Committee is of the opinion that it is undesirable for the spouse of a councillor to be employed by the council. The amendment makes express provision disqualifying the spouse of a council employee. I deal with clause 4 (*b*) in connection with clauses 11 and 12.

Clause 4 (*c*) amends section 52 (3) (*h*1) of the principal Act which provides that a person is not disqualified from membership of the council by reason of his being interested in any contract for the supply of goods or services to the council on terms similar to those ordinarily applied to members of the public. This could mean that a councillor might not supply goods or services to a council at a reduced rate. It is considered desirable to remove doubts on this question by adding after the words "terms similar to" the words "or more favourable than". This will make it clear that a councillor may, without becoming disqualified, supply goods or services to the council at reduced rates. I deal with clause 5 in connection with clauses 11 and 12.

Clause 6 inserts a new section 163de which will empower the Local Government Officers' Classification Board to consolidate determinations from time to time. While the board makes a new determination at intervals of up to three or four years, its determinations are varied from time to time and become difficult to follow. If the board consolidates a determination it is, in effect, a new determination, and officers have the right to appeal even though wages and conditions are not altered. The new clause will provide that the board may consolidate its determinations from time to time without the possibility of appeal. Clause 7 makes a consequential amendment.

Clauses 8 and 9 repeal those provisions of the Local Government Act which require the exhibition of copies of the assessment book for inspection by ratepayers at places other than the council office. Section 177 provides that in the case of assessments based upon annual value, one copy of the assessment must be exhibited at a convenient place, and, where the district is divided into wards, at a convenient place in respect of each ward. However, the Minister may exempt metropolitan districts from the requirement for a copy of the assessment to be exhibited in respect of each ward. A request was received for the powers of the Minister in this respect to be extended to other councils. In the view of the Local Government Advisory Committee, subsections (2) and (3) of section 177 are not now required, as

transport is more readily available to ratepayers today than formerly. Similar provisions regarding copies of the assessment are provided for the case where it is based upon land value. Accordingly clauses 8 and 9 repeal subsections (2) and (3) in both section 177 and section 186.

Section 233a of the principal Act, dealing with minimum rates, provides for adjoining properties owned by the same owner and occupied by the same occupier to be regarded as one ratable property for the purpose of the payment of minimum rates. Provision is not made for the case where a property has a road, railway line, waterway or easement running through it. This could happen, for example, as a result of a compulsory acquisition, and means that what was ordinarily one property, would become two, and the owner liable for the minimum rate in respect of each. Accordingly, by clause 10, a new subsection (3) is inserted in section 233a providing that in such an event, the property is to be considered as one. Clauses 11 and 12 will permit councils to insure members against death or injury arising out of or in the course of their council duties. It is considered reasonable that councils should have this power. Clauses 4 (*b*) and 5 make consequential amendments to provide that a council member will not be disqualified or debarred from voting on any question concerning this insurance.

Clause 13 amends section 319 of the principal Act dealing with road moieties. Subsection (11) limits the total amount payable by a ratepayer under the section to 10s. a foot. This has been interpreted to mean that a council is not required to deduct any amounts already paid either under the Acts repealed by the Local Government Act or under any other section of the Local Government Act. Until 1948, kerbing was included in section 328 (which deals with footway moieties). In 1948 kerbing was taken out of section 328 and put into section 319. Consequently, any amounts paid for kerbing by ratepayers before 1948 need not be taken into account for the purposes of section 319, and a council is at liberty, notwithstanding any payment before 1948, to charge up to the full limit of 10s. a foot. This was not intended, and the object of clause 13 is to make it clear that earlier amounts paid must be taken into account. Clause 14 raises the amount which councils may recover from owners of property abutting on footways from 1s. 6d. to 3s. a foot. The Local Government Advisory Committee considers that there is justification for the increase.

Clause 15 inserts a new section 403a into the principal Act to enable a controlling authority carrying out functions on behalf of two or more councils, under Part XIX of the Act, to borrow money on overdraft. Specifically, I refer to a joint scheme involving Salisbury, Elizabeth and Munno Para for the control of the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Clearly the revenue of such a controlling authority might fluctuate during the course of a financial year, and borrowing on overdraft would be a convenient way of providing working capital. Clause 16 inserts a new section 530c to enable councils to establish sewerage effluent schemes. In 1963, an amendment was made to section 435 empowering the Minister to approve such schemes, and several councils in country areas have taken advantage of the amendment. The schemes have proved of undoubted benefit to the towns concerned. However, it is considered desirable to make more effective provision for such schemes. For example, it is desirable that in planning such a scheme regard should be had to provision for effluent which could come from vacant land on which building might take place in the future.

The new section makes a special provision which may be summarized as follows: Any proposed scheme must be discussed with the Central Board of Health and the Engineer-in-Chief and submitted in writing, giving details to the Minister. At the same time written notice must be given to the owners of all the land concerned. Owners will have 21 days in which to raise objections to the scheme. The council is to consider such objections, and may abandon the scheme or proceed with it with or without modifications. The Minister may also propose modifications. If the Minister is of the opinion that the scheme will substantially benefit the area concerned he may authorize it, in which event notice will be published in the *Government Gazette*. The council may then carry the scheme into effect and recover the capital and maintenance costs from all the ratepayers concerned by way of a special rate or rates. It is also provided in the new section that owners of buildings are to provide effluent drains connecting with the scheme. In default of so providing, the council may itself do so and recover the cost.

Clause 17 amends the by-law-making powers of councils by including the control of surf boards and the control of escaping irrigation water. Paragraph (29a) of section 667 refers to motor boats, water skis and other like

equipment, and the view has been expressed that this does not include surf boards. The control of surf boards is considered to be as necessary as the control of water skis. Paragraph (*b*) of clause 17 empowers councils to regulate control or prohibit the escape of water used for irrigation purposes, on to or under streets and roads. This is desirable, as irrigation water being thrown from large sprays constitutes a danger to passing vehicles. Clause 18 is designed to enable a court of summary jurisdiction imposing a fine for overcharging by vehicles plying for hire, to order repayment of the excess. While councils have wide powers regarding the licensing of taxi-cabs and such vehicles, they are not able to provide by by-law that on conviction a court can order repayment of the excess fare. New section 686b makes direct provision for the court to make such an order. Clauses 19 and 20 add to the list of authorized witnesses for postal voting, persons having authority to administer oaths, and will enable persons to vote while overseas.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Amending the Nurses Registration Act, 1920-1964, it has two principal objects, namely: (*a*) to change the constitution of the Nurses Registration Board and to increase the number of members of that board from seven to 10 members; and (*b*) to allow former mental nurses, that is, persons who are qualified to be registered as such before the commencement of the amendment Act of 1963, to be registered on both the Psychiatric Nurses Register and the Mental Deficiency Nurses Register—the two new registers.

Clause 4 amends section 5 of the principal Act and has the effect of enabling the Minister to nominate two members one of whom shall be the Director of Mental Health or any person nominated by him (at present the Minister has power to nominate one member only) and of enabling the Royal Australian Nursing Federation (South Australian Branch) to appoint five members, one of whom shall be a registered psychiatric nurse or registered mental deficiency nurse elected by members who are registered psychiatric nurses or registered mental deficiency nurses, and another of whom will be a person enrolled as a mothercraft nurse, as a nurse aide, or as a dental nurse (at present the Royal Australian Nursing Federation (South Australian Branch) can nominate only three members). It will be noted that the provision enabling the Royal British Nurses Association to nominate a member has been deleted. The reason for this is that this association has for practical purposes ceased to exist.

The reason for the Government's proposing this amendment is to give direct representation on the board to psychiatric and mental deficiency nurses so that their interests, needs and problems, particularly with regard to the standards of examinations of nurses set by the board and the course of training conducted by the board, may be more adequately considered. The Government also accepts that it is desirable that persons enrolled as mothercraft nurses, nurse aides, or dental nurses should also be represented on the board.

Clause 5 makes a consequential amendment to section 10 of the principal Act by increasing the quorum from four to six. The second amendment, relating to former mental nurses, may be explained as follows: On April 2 of last year (which is defined as the relevant day) when the principal provisions of the amending Act of 1963 came into operation, mental nursing was divided into two branches—psychiatric nursing and mental deficiency nursing. That Act provided for two separate registers to be kept (one for each branch) and further provided that the existing mental nurses would be required to elect as to which register they would be placed on. Honourable members may recall that when the Bill for that Act was introduced in 1963 it was stated that the training of mental nurses was inadequate in comparison with the greatly enlarged course of training in psychiatric and mental deficiency nursing which was then proposed to be introduced.

However, the Nurses Registration Board has drawn attention to the fact that the certificates held by the mental nurses certify their proficiency in both psychiatric and mental deficiency nursing and has recommended that they should be entitled to be placed on both the new registers. The Government considers that to restrict the former mental nurses to one register would be to deprive them of qualifications duly granted to them, and therefore approves of the recommendation of the board. The appropriate amendment is made by clause 6 which inserts four new subsections in section 19 of the principal Act. The new subsections provide that the former mental nurses

will be entered on both registers without fee with effect from the relevant day (except in the case of a former mental nurse who, though qualified, was not in fact registered as such, in which case the appropriate fee will become payable). New subsection (6) makes special provision for nurses who commenced their courses before the relevant day but finished afterwards and who have been granted a certificate in the old form relating to both psychiatric and mental deficiency nursing. This particular class of nurse is now closed and future trainees will qualify in either one or the other of the two new branches of mental nursing.

Clause 3, as a consequential measure upon clause 6, deletes the definition of "the former mental nurses register" in section 4 of the principal Act. Clause 7 effects a minor revision of section 26 of the principal Act. The retention fee is now fixed by regulation at 10s. The reference to 5s. in the section is therefore misleading and is deleted. Clauses 8, 9, 10 and 11 are all consequential upon clause 6; clause 8 repeals section 33p of the principal Act which provides for an election by former mental nurses as to which of the two new registers they were to be registered on. This section has become redundant, any election now being unnecessary by virtue of clause 6. For the same reason clauses 9 and 10 remove from sections 38 and 40 of the principal Act provisions designed to permit former mental nurses to practise until they are required to make the election, and clause 11 makes consequential amendments upon clauses 4 and 6.

Mrs. STEELE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. Frank Walsh, for the Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to revise the law relating to the curatorship of convicts' estates. The principal amendment is made by paragraph (*a*) of clause 5 which deletes the definition "convict" from section 329 of the principal Act and replaces it with a definition of "prisoner", a term more in keeping with modern usage. "Prisoner" is defined as a person undergoing imprisonment but who is not in prison on remand for trial or sentence. The old term "convict" was limited to persons convicted of felony. The effect of this amendment is that all prisoners (whether convicted of felony or some lesser crime) will have their property placed under the control of a curator as provided by Part X of the principal Act. It is intended that if the prisoner's estate is less than £500 the Comptroller of Prisons will be appointed curator; if the estate is greater than £500 the curator will be the Public Trustee or, if the prisoner so desires, some other person.

Consequentially upon the new definition of "prisoner", the term "convict", wherever it occurs in the principal Act, is replaced by "prisoner" (clauses 3, 4, 5 (*b*), 6 (*a*) and (*c*), 7 (*b*) and 9). Clause 6 (*b*) amends section 331 of the principal Act so as to clarify the position relating to prisoners' earnings by excluding them from the curatorship provided for by Part X. It is provided by regulations under the Prisons Act that prisoners' earnings remain under the control of the Comptroller of Prisons. Clause 7 (*a*) amends section 333 of the principal Act relating to the remuneration of curators by giving the Governor power to direct that in certain cases no remuneration will be payable. In most cases an officer of the Public Service, the Comptroller of Prisons, will be curator and the question of remuneration provided for by section 333 will not arise.

Clause 8 inserts new section 338a in the principal Act enabling the curator to make payments out of a prisoner's property for his support or maintenance while he is released on probation or on licence. Subsection (2) of the new section provides that such payments shall be made upon the recommendation of the Chief Probation Officer. In a recent case where a prisoner was released on licence it was clearly desirable that the curator should have such powers in order to assist in the rehabilitation of the prisoner.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to grant benefits of continuity of service to employees of private hospitals who are engaged by the Group Laundry and Central Linen Service of the Hospitals Department so that, for the purpose of recreation leave, sick leave and long service leave they may regard their employment as continuous with their employment at their former hospitals. The Group Laundry and Central Linen Service is being established as a matter of Government

policy and will result in a number of employees of private hospitals that join the scheme becoming redundant because those hospitals will close their laundries. The Government has decided that employees engaged from approved hospitals should be entitled to benefits of continuity of service in like manner as employees who are engaged from public hospitals.

Clause 3 of the Bill inserts new section 76aa in the principal Act, which by virtue of subsection (1) thereof will apply only to employees engaged from hospitals approved by the Chief Secretary. It is proposed that only private hospitals that receive maintenance or capital grants will be approved for this purpose. Subsection (2) provides for benefits of continuity of service for the purposes of sections 74 and 75 of the principal Act relating to recreation leave, sick leave and long service leave. This provision is modelled on section 76 of the principal Act relating to employees transferred from the Commonwealth Public Service. Subsection (3) of the new section provides that, in determining the leave entitlements of a transferred employee, the Public Service Commissioner shall take into account the period of his former employment, the amount of leave taken in that period and any credits of leave accumulated by the employee during that period. By virtue of subsection (4), the new section will be deemed to have come into operation on November 1, 1965, as the employees to whom the Bill applies may be engaged at any time thereafter.

Mr. SHANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY (Minister of Education): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1964. There has been no major review of the Road Traffic Act for some time and the Road Traffic Board considers that the amendments proposed by this Bill are required to make the operation of the Act more effective having regard to changing conditions in traffic on the roads in this State. The principal object of the board in proposing these amendments is to bring the Act to some extent into line with the National Road Traffic Code so far as is practicable and desirable for conditions in this State. The Government accepts the proposals of the Road Traffic Board as being desirable and necessary, particularly with regard to the safety of persons in vehicles and on the roads. After these introductory comments, I shall deal with each clause in numerical order and give as much detail as may be necessary for honourable members to appreciate the reasons for proposing the amendments.

Clause 3 amends in two ways section 5 of the principal Act. Signs, lines and marks are painted on roads to regulate the movement of traffic which either turns left or proceeds straight ahead. For the better regulation of traffic it is necessary to delete the reference to turning in the definition and insert the wider concept of regulating or guiding traffic. In addition, the board considers that the marking of lines on roads (such as parking lines) should require the approval of the board before being placed on roads. The alteration to the definition will bring "lines" within the meaning of "traffic control device". The other amendment inserts in section 5 a new definition. There is no definition in the Act of "footpath". The suggested definition is substantially the same as the definition under the National Road Traffic Code, and its inclusion in the Act would facilitate interpretation of the term as used in sections 61 and 82 (1) (*c*) of the principal Act in regard to the driving and standing of vehicles on footpaths.

Clause 4 amends section 21 of the principal Act. The use of the passage in this section "or a portion of a road used by children going to or coming from a school" in the location of school signs leads to confusion and is deleted. When the presence of a school is not evident from the road on which motorists are travelling, is is extremely difficult to detect whether children in the vicinity are going to or coming from a school, or are merely using the road for other purposes. The situation could arise where a school could be a half-mile from an area where school signs are requested for children crossing in the area. If there are no other schools in the vicinity it would be difficult for motorists to realize that these children are actually going to the school in question, especially if the time is outside normal school times. Such crossings as described are covered by "Children" signs. Clause 5 amends section 22 of the principal Act. This amendment will allow the painting of "straight ahead" direction arrows on laned approaches near intersections. Whilst the principal Act provides for the making of "turn-arrows", no

provision is made for arrows pointing straight ahead.

Clause 6 amends section 31 of the principal Act. The board has power to order the removal of any false traffic sign or light likely to increase the risk of accident on any road. With regard to signs and advertisements, this power is restricted to those from which light is projected. A number of authorities exercise limited control over the erection of advertising signs, but this control is not fully effective, as no one authority has overall responsibility. The board has received reports that traffic hazards are being created at intersections where the presence of advertising signs restricts visibility. In existing legislation there is inadequate authority to control the erection of undesirable signs that may have an adverse effect on traffic safety. The proposed amendment will enable the Road Traffic Board to order the removal of any advertising sign that creates a hazard to traffic. It is intended that this provision shall override other legislation. By clause 7 a new section 31a is enacted and inserted in the principal Act. As one-way streets are one of the most important forms of traffic control, it is considered that provision should be made to enable the board to control their adoption by councils; otherwise, dangerous situations could arise. In the past some councils have not given sufficient attention to the necessary measures required to ensure the safety of one-way traffic operations. Provision is made for an appeal to the Minister where the board refuses to consent to a one-way carriageway.

Clause 8 amends section 40 of the principal Act to confer the same exemption upon fire engines registered under the Bush Fires Act, 1960, as is conferred upon fire engines used by the Fire Brigades Board or fire engines registered under the Fire Brigades Act, from the provisions of the Act relating to such matters as speed limits, etc., when a fire engine is being driven to the scene of a fire. Clause 9 amends section 43 of the principal Act by inserting a new paragraph in subsection (3). The Police Department is concerned at the absence of legislation in this State which would require the driver of a vehicle involved in an accident to assist another person who may be injured as a result of an accident.

The National Road Traffic Code, on which the various States are recommended to base their legislation, stipulates that a motorist involved in an accident shall "immediately render such assistance as he can" and "as soon as practicable and if possible at the scene of the accident produce his driver's licence and give his correct name and address". New South Wales, Victoria and Western Australia have legislation along these lines. The purpose behind this proposed amendment is not only to ensure that an injured person receives assistance, but also to lead to the identification of the other party involved, for the amendment places an onus on him to remain in the vicinity and give such assistance to the injured party as he can. The Police Accident Investigation Squad is concerned with the prevalence of accidents in which a person is injured, but the other party concerned in the accident does not remain at the scene and make any attempt to assist injured persons.

Clause 10 inserts a new section 45a in the principal Act. This section is necessary to prevent busy intersections from becoming blocked by vehicles that are unable to proceed because the roadway ahead is in turn blocked. It frequently occurs that traffic in a street is unnecessarily blocked at an inersection by motorists who have stopped on the intersecting road at the intersection. This proposed amendment is similar to the provision in the National Road Traffic Code. Clause 11 amends section 47 of the principal Act and provides that a certificate purporting to be signed by a Government Analyst certifying the proportion of alcohol or any drug found in a specimen of any blood shall be *prima facie* evidence of that fact. If this amendment is accepted the result would be that frequent appearances in court of the Government Analyst to testify as to the result of his analysis would become unnecessary unless the evidence is challenged by the defence.

Clause 12 amends section 53 of the principal Act. Mobile cranes and other heavy vehicles are becoming bigger and faster and are in ever-increasing numbers on the road. Most of them are far in excess of the three tons minimum requirement under section 53 of the principal Act, but because they cannot be brought within the definition of "commercial motor vehicle" no action can be taken to enforce the speed limits under this section. Large mobile cranes with long dangerous booms often travel at dangerous speeds having regard to the size, weight and stopping power of these vehicles. The vehicles also cause undue damage to the roadways. The amendment accordingly provides that a commercial service vehicle includes a mobile crane and such motor vehicle or class of motor vehicle as may be prescribed by regulation.

Clause 13 amends section 63 of the principal Act and provides that, subject to section 64 (which deals with "give-way signs") of this Act, when a vehicle has entered or is approaching an intersection from a carriageway, and there is danger of a collision with a vehicle which has entered or is approaching the intersection from another carriageway, the driver who has the other vehicle on his right shall give way to the driver of that other vehicle. A penalty of £50 is provided. The wording of this section is substantially the same as the wording used in the National Code. The wording of subsection (5) of section 63 of the principal Act causes confusion to motorists and is deleted. Clause 14 inserts a new section 74a in the principal Act. Many instances occur where turning lights on vehicles are left operating after the vehicle has completed its manoeuvre. This often occurs because the driver is unaware that the light has not been automatically switched off. The amendment provides that a driver must see that the light is out after completion of the manoeuvre. Similar provision is contained in the National Code. A maximum penalty of £25 is imposed for an infringement of this provision.

Clause 15 amends section 78 of the principal Act. The existing wording of this subsection makes its interpretation difficult as a driver could stop his vehicle at any distance before reaching the stop line or carriageway boundary and claim that he has complied with the Act. In order that stop signs may have the desired effect with regard to road safety, it is necessary that the vehicle stops at a safe position where the driver has a view of traffic approaching on his right. The board considers that the safe position is at the nearer boundary of the intersecting carriageway or at a stop line which has been located by the board's engineers.

Clause 16 amends section 78a of the principal Act. This amendment is most desirable in order that motorists should use the correct traffic lanes at laned-approaches to intersections. It is current practice to mark the respective lanes with arrows to indicate left turn, right turn or straight ahead traffic movements. Clause 17 amends section 82 of the principal Act by making a minor drafting amendment thereto.

Clause 18 amends section 83 of the principal Act. This amendment is desirable to enable effective policing, otherwise dangerous situations must arise or accidents occur before any action can be taken against the driver concerned. Clause 19 repeals subsection (1) of section 88 of the principal Act and inserts a new subsection. More pedestrians are killed on roads than any other type of road user. Hitchhikers are becoming a real problem and they cause many hazardous situations by not walking on the footpath, or if there is no footpath by walking with their backs to traffic. If a person is compelled to walk on a carriageway he should always face the traffic which may approach him along the side of the carriageway on which he is walking in order that he may take evasive action should the driver not see him in time. The section in its present form is unworkable as far as pedestrians walking on a divided road are concerned, because it requires them to walk in the same direction as the traffic, and what is more, on the same side which carries the faster, overtaking, stream of traffic.

Clause 20 amends section 106 of the principal Act. The Railways Commissioner has requested that provision be made in the Act to cover damage to railway tracks at level crossings caused by low-loaders, graders and similar types of vehicles. He states that there is an increasing incidence of such damage and that action of a deterrent nature can only be taken after the event. Section 106 relates to damage to roads, bridges, culverts and certain other roadside appurtenances, but does not include railway tracks. Clause 21 makes a minor drafting amendment to section 132 of the principal Act.

Clause 22 inserts a new section 138a in the principal Act and provides that no vehicle which has its steering on the left hand side shall be registered after January 1, 1966, unless the board thinks there are reasonable grounds for allowing such a vehicle to be used on the roads in this State, for example, if a motor vehicle is brought from overseas for temporary use in South Australia. This proposal was approved by the Transport Advisory Council and adopted by the Premiers' Conference in 1949. All other States except South Australia, A.C.T. and Northern Territory have implemented this proposal in their legislation. These other States have placed a complete ban on left-hand drive vehicles with certain exceptions for special types of commercial vehicles. This inconsistency in the legislation of the various States has produced administrative problems for persons residing in States outside South Australia who have acquired such vehicles, and on being refused registration in their own State, attempt to get the vehicle registered here.

If successful they then drive the vehicle with a South Australian registration to their home State. Though such owners could be prosecuted in their own States, the authorities have difficulty in proving their case, just as we have difficulty in refusing to register such vehicles here. In an effort to confine such registrations to South Australia we adopt measures of inspecting vehicles to see that the equipment complies with the requirements of our Road Traffic Act and questioning the owners to ascertain if they are *bona fide* residents here. Inspection is a pre-requisite to registration in most States other than South Australia, and it is arguable that there is no power to inspect such vehicles here. There is no power for the Registrar to refuse such a registration fee for a resident of South Australia even if he knows or suspects that a vehicle does not measure up to the requirements of the Road Traffic Act. The net result if that the other States are not happy that South Australia has not adopted these recommendations described above, not only because their own residents circumvent the prohibition against using such vehicles in their own States, but also because South Australian residents frequently drive such vehicles into other States. The recommendations to refuse registration were probably made in the interests of safety on the roads, for, in overtaking another vehicle in particular, the driver of a left-hand drive vehicle has to move his vehicle further to the right of the road to obtain a clear view of approaching traffic. It is for these reasons that it is considered by the Government that the present proposals should be given legislative effect in this State.

Clause 23 repeals and re-enacts subsections (2) and (3) of section 141 of the principal Act. Section 141 of the principal Act restricts the width of a vehicle and its load to 8ft. other than for agricultural machines and motor bodies, which are specifically excluded. The board may grant permits for the carriage of loads in excess of 8ft., and this is done only when the load is indivisible. A condition of a permit is that vehicles may not operate over metropolitan roads during hours of peak traffic, and complaints have been received from individuals who are required to observe this condition that the carriage of motor bodies is not restricted in any way. An inquiry has been received from a motor body firm for the board's views on the transport of motor bodies during hours of darkness. This firm proposes to increase production during night shifts, and requests advice of the conditions under which the board considers such movements can be made.

Although it is doubtful whether the board has any jurisdiction in the matter so far as motor bodies are concerned, it is pointed out that, because of the dangers involved, permits are never issued for carriage of other wide loads during the hours of darkness. The board is opposed to such practice and is supported by the Police Traffic Division, with which the matter has been discussed. The regulations under the Act require that all vehicles in excess of 7ft. and every articulated vehicle must be equipped with clearance lamps mounted on the outer edges of the vehicle or load, and all vehicles are required to be fitted with reflectors. Even assuming that loads of motor bodies could be permitted on the roads at night, it is considered impracticable to mount clearance lamps and reflectors on such loads in the correct position where adequate warning would be given to other motorists. In view of the expansion of the motor body building industry in this State, the number of loads of bodies transported by road is likely to increase substantially, with the subsequent greater risk of accidents. If one firm is permitted to transport motor bodies at night, similar requests can be expected from other firms, and the development of such a practice would be undesirable. South Australia is the only State that exempts motor bodies from the width provision of road traffic legislation.

It is now common practice to carry motor bodies side by side longitudinally, and this results in a greater width of load than when the bodies were loaded transversely. Side-by-side loading was probably not contemplated when the legislation was framed, and the practice would seem to be contrary to the intention of the Act. Traffic volumes are considerably greater now and the increasing number of wide loads seriously impairs the capacity of our roads, causes congestion and could lead to greater accident risk. The Government, therefore, proposes to amend the principal Act to restrict the carriage of motor bodies and agricultural machines to the hours of daylight only. The section is further amended by increasing the total width of a vehicle from 8ft. 9in. where there is a mirror or device projecting from each side of the vehicle to 9ft. and by adding to the provision the qualification that the mirror or device must be 5ft. or more about the level of the ground.

Clause 24 amends section 144 of the principal Act. Under present legislation regarding axle weights a prosecution can succeed only

against the driver, unless the owner admits the offence. The driver could be acting under instructions from the owner and thereby committing an offence, but the owner may escape prosecution. It is desirable that the owner and any person in the vehicle who is in charge of the driver be made liable for such an offence.

Clause 25 amends section 146 of the principal Act. The amendment limits the load that may be carried on the front axle of a vehicle other than a trailer to 6½ tons (unless the board otherwise approves) and the weight on any other axle shall not exceed 8 tons.

Clause 26 amends section 159 of the principal Act. Cases have arisen recently where passenger buses for which safety certificates have not been given have been involved in accidents. The proposed amendment should act as a deterrent against using such vehicles without a safety certificate.

Clause 27 amends section 162 of the principal Act. Long projecting loads are a serious hazard, and it is most desirable that the projecting portion be adequately marked.

Clause 28 amends section 162a of the principal Act. It is essential that each seat belt have at least two anchorages, otherwise it will be of little value. The board did not have the opportunity of commenting on the seat belt legislation before it was enacted; otherwise, this amendment would have been suggested at the time. In order that two anchorages were provided for each seat belt, it was necessary for the board to prepare a lengthy and cumbersome specification. If the amendment is accepted, the board will prepare a more concise and simpler specification. The amendment will not affect the motorist in any way, but it will simplify the interpretation of the legislation and specification.

Clause 29 amends section 168 of the principal Act. Under this section, a court has the power to disqualify a person from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for a fixed period or until further order. In addition the court "may if it thinks fit order that the person so disqualified shall not at the end of the period of disqualification or upon the removal of the disqualification be granted a driver's licence until he passes a driving test as prescribed by section 79a of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1963". This section also provides that "Where an order is made requiring a person disqualified under this section to pass a driving test before being granted a driver's licence, his disqualification shall continue until the expiration or removal of the disqualification". A person ordered to pass a driving test under this section remains disqualified until the period expires and he passes the test or, in the case of an order "until further order", until his licence is restored by the court, and no provision seems to have been made to enable a police officer to test such a person on a road. It is true that the test could be held on private property (for example, a paddock) but this type of test would not indicate whether the person had the ability to drive on main thoroughfares and in congested traffic conditions. An amendment to the section is desirable to provide that such a person, whilst undergoing a driving test ordered under this section, shall be deemed to be a licensed driver and that any disqualification ordered by a court shall, for the purposes of the test, be suspended.

Clause 30 amends section 169 of the principal Act by adding a new subsection (2a). Section 168 provides that where a court orders that a defendant be disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence it may order that the disqualification may take effect from a day or hour subsequent to the making of the order. No such power exists in section 169 which provides for a person to be disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence where he is convicted a second time within three years. On occasions this causes hardship to a person who is disqualified. Clause 31 amends section 175 of the principal Act. This amendment provides convenient proof for prosecutions, otherwise it would be necessary to produce the S.A.A. Road Signs Code in order to prove the specifications.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 3. Page 784.)

Mr. HALL (Gouger): This is obviously one of the bigger Bills with which we are confronted, and, as the member for Mitcham suggests, that is why I have been given the responsibility of examining this complicated measure! As the Premier outlined in his second reading explanation, the Bill provides for the permissible annual subscription of practising physiotherapists to be raised from three guineas to six guineas, and for non-practising physiotherapists, for the first time, to pay an annual fee of £1 11s. 6d. The second reading explanation states that the

reason for the proposed increase in fees is that the administration costs of the Physiotherapists Board have risen substantially since 1946 when the fees were last increased. I have been disappointed at the general rise in fees provided for in other legislation introduced by the Government but I cannot quarrel with the increase provided for in this Bill because the reasons given seem to be simple, and I am sure there is ample justification for this increase.

However, I question the sense behind increasing fees in guineas when on February 14 decimal currency will be introduced. It is all very well for the member for Mitcham who obviously charges guineas for services he renders in his profession, and thus gets extra shillings from his clients, but surely it is unwise to fix fees in guineas at this stage. The Government should examine this matter. It would be easy for the Premier to amend the Bill to provide for the fees to be paid in dollars rather than guineas.

Mr. Millhouse: Why change it?

Mr. HALL: That interjection is ridiculous because when decimal currency is introduced dollars and cents will have to be paid by the physiotherapists. Surely no-one would want the fee to be $12.60c. The fee could be reduced to $12 and the fee of one and a half guineas for non-practising physiotherapists could be $3.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I had not intended to speak on this debate until the member for Gouger dragged me in by his slighting reference to guineas. The guinea is a good old tradition and one which I am sorry to see die.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Have you ever seen one?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, but I have certainly counted in guineas many times, and I can assure honourable members that the extra shillings on the end are very welcome when one has a wife and starving children to feed! I am indeed sorry to see the guinea disappear. I point out that the equivalent of 10 guineas will be $21, and that is not a bad multiple. We shall have to charge in multiples of 10 in future. I had not had my attention drawn to the Bill until the member for Gouger was about to speak, and then I found that it hits at my pocket to the extent of one and a half guineas a year, because I am married to a non-practising physiotherapist. At least, she only practises on me. I can see no reason why I should not get some value out of her professional training. Up to date she has remained on the register and has not had to pay anything, but now I see that it will cost me one and a half guineas a year, and I wonder why it is necessary to make this charge.

The second reading explanation was commendably brief: in fact, too brief. No facts or figures were given to support the imposition of this charge, and I hope that when the Premier replies he will explain to me why I (and no doubt many other husbands, as well as non-practising physiotherapists otherwise situated) will have to pay this fee in future when no such fee has been demanded in the past. The Bill more than doubles the potential income of the board because it raises the scale of fees for the registration of physiotherapists from three guineas to six guineas, and then it adds the fee that has not been charged previously. I do not think we should do this without some further inquiry and without some figures and calculations to back up the necessity for doing this. I hope the Premier will be prepared to give this information either when he replies or when we are in Committee.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): When this Bill was first mooted probably not much thought had been given to the decimal currency equivalents. However, this matter can be mentioned without the necessity to ridicule everybody, and I do not see why people could not be a little bit more moderate in the language they use. I thought the honourable member would have realized that all these matters were being taken care of in the Decimal Currency Bill. However, in view of the matter that has been raised, I am prepared to consult with the Parliamentary Draftsman—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is out of order in mentioning the Parliamentary Draftsman.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will try to get a little further information. When we get into Committee I will suggest that instead of using the term "£6 6s." we use the term "£6 5s." until decimal currency is introduced, when it will become $12.50.

Mr. Millhouse: What about my query regarding fees payable by non-practising physiotherapists?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I refer the honourable member to the second reading explanation, which states:

The reason for this proposed increase of fees is that the administration costs of the Physiotherapists Board have risen substantially since 1946 when the fees were last raised.

These administration costs include legal fees, stationery, postages and the annual remuneration of the registrar. Non-practising physiotherapists share with practising physiotherapists the protection of the board and other benefits, and it is considered fair and equitable that those who wish to remain on the register should bear the financial burden equally.

If a person does not wish to remain on the register, he or she is not obliged to do so. I think my second reading explanation sets out the position fairly. However, in view of the agreement arrived at earlier, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

PISTOL LICENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2139.)

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): This is a short Bill. Its chief purpose is to increase the fee for the grant or renewal of a pistol licence from 2s. 6d. to £1. It also increases the fee for the registration of a pistol dealer from £1 to £5. A special provision in the Bill is that where two or more licences are held by members of a pistol club and that club has the approval of the Commissioner of Police, a reduced fee will be payable for the grant or renewal of each licence after the first one. The existing fees have not been altered since 1929 when the principal Act was passed, and in fact the Act has never been amended in any way. The Premier, in his second reading explanation, said that the increases were occasioned by the fall in the value of money since 1929. I think money was fairly cheap in 1929.

Mr. Shannon: People never had any money; there was a depression.

Mr. RODDA: Then it is strange that these pistol licences had any value at all. The proposed fees will ensure an adequate return to the Police Department for its administration of the legislation. The Bill has only four clauses, and consequently it is not a formidable piece of legislation. Pistol shooting has rapidly gained popularity in this State. There are three pistol clubs in the South-East—at Mount Gambier, Millicent and Naracoorte—and I understand that about 30 clubs are affiliated to the South Australian Revolver and Pistol Association. Some clubs have as many as 20 pistols. Most shooters have four pistols, although many of them have 10. Great care is taken in accepting people as members: every person who seeks to join a pistol club is screened first by the club, then by the South Australian Revolver and Pistol Association, and finally by the Police Department, and some persons have been refused membership because they have not been able to pass the screening. The provision for a reduced fee for every subsequent licence after the first is commendable, for it helps the sport and those who participate in it. I support the Bill and commend it to the House.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I was under the impression that this was a very simple and non-controversial Bill. However, while it is a simple Bill I find that clause 4 is controversial, for it states:

Subsection (2) of section 10 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the words "one pound" therein and inserting in lieu thereof the words "five pounds".

This clause refers to the fee payable for the registration of a pistol dealer. A pistol dealer with a shop in the city may do hundreds and possibly thousands of pounds worth of trade in a year, in which case £5 may be a rational and sensible figure. However, there are pistol clubs throughout the State, and many of them have an official pistol dealer amongst their members. In one case that I know of the dealer would trade very few weapons in a year: he is associated with a club in order to assist the members of that club, and no doubt he makes a little money for himself. He has to have a licence but his profit for the year is negligible. He provides a service to the other club members, but in the past he has paid only £1 a year. Surely the £5 fee should apply to a person carrying on a business in premises or who has some distinguishing feature that establishes him as a substantial dealer. The person who provides a service to club members now has to pay about 2s. a week to do this. He may make a little profit while doing it, but why should we penalize the minority that is helping clubs? This is an honourable sport, and the customer will suffer because this man will not be able to afford £5 a year.

Mr. Rodda: Is he dealing to help the clubs?

Mr. HALL: If he makes £5 a year he will be lucky, yet we are going to charge him £5 for the privilege of selling bits and pieces to the clubs and helping the members. This is a real imposition on a club that often has about five or six enthusiastic members forming the backbone, and with a dozen to 30 other members. The dealer who helps this club is not in it for profit.

Mr. Casey: Do you know of cases such as this?

Mr. HALL: I know of one, but other clubs have dealers.

Mr. Casey: They have dealers' licences?

Mr. HALL: They have to have such a licence if they trade in pistols or pistol parts. A person with a shop in the city or associated with a shop can be charged this sum, but for one who has no such shop it is too much.

Mr. Casey: He is competing against the gunsmith.

Mr. HALL: Surely the honourable member is not against competition.

Mr. Casey: It depends how he carries on.

Mr. Rodda: Can a sliding scale be suggested?

Mr. HALL: I should like time to think of an amendment that will apply the £5 fee only to a gun shop, but I oppose clause 4 in its present form.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): In my second reading explanation I said:

Clause 4 amends section 10 (2) of the principal Act relating to the registration of pistol dealers. The existing fees were fixed in 1929 when the principal Act was passed. Since then the principal Act has not been amended. The increases are occasioned by the fall in value of money since 1929 and will ensure to the Police Department a more adequate return for the cost of the administration of the principal Act.

It is not much good trying to select individual cases of people wishing to have a pistol licence. In all cases they are screened through the Police Department. Many people wish to obtain pistols, although it is obvious that they should not be granted a licence before they know the value of them. Many people become imbued with the idea that if they have to take cash home at night it is necessary to have a pistol in their possession. Sometimes they cannot get this money to the bank, or they have a better way of keeping it in the house, but they want a licence to carry a pistol. I have suggested to people that instead of joining a pistol club they join a rifle club for their sporting activity and have a weapon that can be registered. The member for Gouger is complaining about the cost of £5 and quotes a case well known to him. However, it is going to be difficult to police this sort of thing, as members of the Police Force cannot chase all and sundry to inquire about pistol licences. A person who applies for a dealer's licence should be associated with a pistol club, as we must have reasonable control over these matters. This legislation was introduced and approved in another place, and I thought that it had been given reasonable consideration. In consequence of the agreement arranged earlier this evening, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

EMPLOYEES REGISTRY OFFICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2140.)

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): This Bill has been dealt with by the House of Review which, in its wisdom, did not amend it. I support the Bill, because it is definite in its provisions, which are clearly set out and easily followed. This is somewhat different from some contentious legislation which has been vague in its wording. It is a sign of the present good times that there are now 21 licensed registry offices in South Australia compared with three in 1953. This indicates the happy state of the economy of South Australia with as many vacancies as there are people looking for employment, and with a consequent need for more registry offices. It is necessary to bring the Act up to date and to make it easier to administer. The prinicipal Act requires an applicant for a licence to obtain the signatures of six persons in the municipality in which the registry office is situated. The applicant who may be living on the outskirts of the municipality may not have the necessary contacts, thereby experiencing difficulty in obtaining those signatures. The Bill facilitates that procedure.

In the past a licence has been issued to an individual only, but business organizations will now be able to obtain one through their managers. The Bill effects a desirable amendment in prohibiting the transfer of a licence. In taking over a company or registry office at present, the person concerned has to lodge a fresh application, having obtained the required character reference. It is interesting to note that the section relating to a registry office's not having an interest in a lodging house has been repealed. A question was asked in another place as to the reason for this action and, although no answer was given, perhaps it is because of the improved moral standards of today. The original Act was enacted in 1915 when there may have been interesting sidelines to a lodging house. The increase in fees from 10s. to £5 is considerable but perhaps warranted in view of the changing circumstances in the 50 years since the Act came into force.

My only complaint about the Bill relates to the definition of metropolitan area. Whereas that definition originally related merely to House of Assembly districts, as drawn in 1915, the definition is now to correspond with the one appearing in the Industrial Code, 1920-63, and to include metropolitan districts as well as an area extending to the Para River. So many definitions of the metropolitan area exist that it would be much more satisfactory to make it uniform. The present definition in the Bill precludes Gawler and Elizabeth but, as it may eventually be necessary to establish a registry office at Elizabeth, that area may later be included by proclamation.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): The honourable member has referred to an alteration in boundaries, which, I think took place merely to make the provision more definite, as well as to extend the application of the Act. I doubt whether the honourable member wishes me to dwell on the prohibition of lodging houses for, as he himself has said, he has had some experience in the world. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ARCHITECTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2141.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This is a simple Bill, to which no opposition is raised. Basically, it seeks to provide greater uniformity in the registration of architects and to provide greater protection for that profession. This, of course, conforms to the legal and medical professions, as well as others. Whilst uniformity is highly desirable in many spheres, we should endeavour to be realistic and not take it to its extreme. To see the absurdity to which this practice can be misapplied, I noticed the other day, while driving along Prospect Road, that the proprietor of a motor garage displayed a sign calling himself a "doctor of motors". The main clause of the Bill specifies that no person other than persons registered under the Act may use the word "architect" or "architectural" in connection with the title of his business, calling or profession, which seems to be desirable.

However, I have endeavoured to ascertain whether this provision may affect some people carrying on various businesses, who have registered a business name, and who are trading in various categories not necessarily connected with architecture. Taking samples from the directory, I found that a number of organizations possessed such names as Architectural Products, Architectural Models and Printing, Architectural Woodwork and Joinery Manufacturers Institute of South Australia Inc., Adelaide Architectural Designers Pty. Ltd., Architectural Engineers, and Architectural Design and Supervision. In addition, I noticed a publication called *Building and Architecture*. Apparently, these are companies and firms, large or small, dealing with products used in the building industry, and we should not in any way upset their livelihood. On the other hand, we should maintain the status and dignity of the architectural profession. I believe this matter is caught quite simply in clause 3 (1) (*b*), which exempts from the provisions a person using the title or description of an architectural draftsman, if his sole or principal occupation is that of an architectural draftsman. Naturally, in relation to many of the names I have mentioned (and this is no reflection on the businesses concerned, because I do not know of them) I should imagine that in some phase of their work they would employ an architectural draftsman. So it appears they will not be penalized but somebody may be carrying out fabrication or timber work who is not an architectural draftsman. The purpose of this Bill is not to catch those people.

Mr. Hudson: Does the prohibition contained in this Bill apply to companies using the word "architectural" in their names?

Mr. COUMBE: Not the company, but individual members of a firm have to be registered as architects and, if they combine as a firm, they have to be registered under the Registration of Business Names Act.

Mr. Hudson: You mentioned some firms using "architectural" in their names. They would not come under clause 3?

Mr. COUMBE: I do not think they will, but I trust that the provisions of this Bill will not in any way hamper legitimate businesses not containing architects or architectural draftsmen from carrying on business because of the prohibition of the use of the word "architectural", in certain circumstances.

Mr. Hudson: Clause 3 (1) begins with the words "A person".

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. It may be that one of those firms I have just mentioned started up as a one-man business, which may have grown. I mention that to point out this difficulty. I do not think it will matter; this clause appears to be all right. The second

main provision of the Bill deals with registration and residential qualifications. This provision is necessary because today there are practising in this State many architects who may reside in another State, and *vice versa*. We see examples of work done in other States by architects from Adelaide. A fine modern building was opened yesterday in Canberra, the headquarters of a famous Party in this country. It was designed by one of our leading South Australian architects. Clause 5 deals with the examinations conducted for registration. It appears that this provision is necessary. We have in South Australia two main centres of architecture—the University of Adelaide and the South Australian Institute of Technology. Graduates from those two places become members of the South Australian Chapter of the Royal Australian Institute of Architects. This clause facilitates examinations and the setting of fees. Altogether, this Bill is a step forward in facilitating the administration of the Act. Therefore, there is no opposition to it, and I support the second reading.

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

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The managers having proceeded to the conference at 7.45 p.m., they returned at 10.5 p.m. The recommendations were:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments Nos. 1 to 6, but make the following amendments in lieu thereof and that the House of Assembly agree thereto:

Clause 10. Page 3, line 1—after "amended" insert "(*a*)"; line 4—after "respectively" insert "; (*b*) by inserting therein after paragraph (*a*) thereof the following paragraph—

'(*a*1) who is of the age of twenty-five years or over; and' ".

HAWKERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2141).

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): This short Bill arises from regulations that were sought by local government bodies for the control of itinerant hawkers coming into country towns, but their ideas of penalties or charges were somewhat exaggerated. The Bill was introduced in another place, which amended it and tidied things up. It amends section 20 of the Hawkers Act and fixes at £4 a day the charge for a visiting hawker. That means that he will pay only £4 for any day on which he is in the area. Councils were adopting other attitudes and the charges were excessive. In addition, there is provision for a penalty of £5 for any breach, and that is reasonable.

The Second Schedule has been altered in a simple way, in that all the charges in that schedule have been doubled. For example, it will provide a fee of £8 for a licence for a full year to hawk with a four-wheeled vehicle drawn by horses or other animals. The highest fee charged will be £20 for a licence to hawk with a ship, boat, or other conveyance on the River Murray and the lakes connected therewith and other inland waters connected with the river or lakes. There can be no disagreement with these conditions. The charges are reasonable and the argument about what a council can and cannot do has been cleared up. I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

[*Sitting suspended from* 10.14 *to* 10.29 *p.m.*]

JURIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The effect of the amendment now made by the Legislative Council is to bring the South Australian Juries Act into line with the qualifications provided in the Tasmanian Act. The new qualification is that a juror, to be qualified, must be of the age of 25 years. As amended, section 11 of the Juries Act will now read:

Every person residing in South Australia who is enrolled on the roll of electors entitled to vote at the election of members of the House of Assembly and who is of the age of 25 years or over and who is not above the age of 65 years shall, subject to the exceptions in this Act mentioned, be qualified and liable to serve as a juror.

I think that this is a reasonable compromise and that, in all the circumstances, it is a wise decision on the part of the managers of this House that we should agree to the proposals of the Legislative Council.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This is a form of compromise which, I must confess, did not occur to me before the conference began. I do not reflect on it because I realize that without a compromise we would have lost the Bill and we do not want to do that. However, I wonder if there is an administrative difficulty

in ascertaining people's ages. I realize the upper limit has been 65 years for some time so it must be done, but I ask the Attorney-General whether this aspect has been considered and just how it will work out.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have considered this. I must confess that it will provide some headaches for the Sheriff but, as things stand, the enrolment cards must be examined to see that those on the jury list are not over 65 years. The date of birth is on the enrolment card, and therefore I think it is a reasonably simple matter. In those circumstances I believe the extra examination will not provide too much extra work.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.36 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 11, at 2 p.m.