HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, November 17, 1965.

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

EIGHT MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT (DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

QUESTIONS

HOUSING FINANCE.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Premier additional information regarding finance for housing in this State during the present financial year?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The following table sets out the figures supplied by the Bureau of Census and Statistics for private and Government dwellings for four quarters ending September 30, 1965. These figures relate to completions and do not show any significant change in the private sector. However, it could well be that the number of commencements in the private sector is showing a somewhat greater decline. However, since the first three-quarters of this calendar year have already passed, it would seem that the number of completions in the private sector this year will not differ significantly from the completions last year.

House Completions.

Quarter to—	Private.	Government.	Total.
December 31, 1964 .	2,105	895	3,000
March 31, 1965 ..	1,800	593	2,393
June 30, 1965 . ..	1,888	864	2,752
September 30, 1965*	1.885	900	2,785
Total to September 30, 1965	7,678	3,252	10,930

(Trust percentage to total, 29.75 per cent.)

Year to September 30, 1964	7,985	2,799	10,784

(Trust percentage to total, 25.96 per cent.)

* Estimate only.

There has not been any significant shortage of building materials for quite some time. Housing Trust building contractors report that building labour in Adelaide is easier to obtain now than it was, say, six months ago. On the other hand, this easing does not seem to apply in the main industrial areas in the country, for example, Whyalla.

BALAKLAVA SWIMMING POOL.

Mr. HALL: During the debate on the Estimates earlier this session, I drew attention to the fact that the sum allocated in this year's Budget for subsidies towards the cost of swimming pools and sundries was £15,692, a reduction of £7,786 on an actual expenditure of £23,478 last year. In drawing this matter to the Treasurer's attention, I said:

I am alarmed at the £7,786 reduction in subsidies towards swimming pools and sundries. The reduction is the same as the increase in subsidies to municipal authorities for development, and I wonder whether policy is involved, as otherwise it is a great coincidence. I am conscious of the need for swimming pools, particularly in the country, and I am grateful to the previous Government for subsidies made available to my home town. Balaklava is collecting money to build a pool to serve not only people in the town but the 500 children attending nearby schools. As I am associated with and have encouraged this effort, I should like the Treasurer to explain the reduction.

In reply, the Treasurer said that subsidies were provided for swimming pools and went on to enumerate towns that had been provided with a subsidy in this year's Budget. He then said:

This shows how competent Mr. Pollnitz is. When the member for Gouger is ready to apply he should discuss the matter with Mr. Pollnitz, or with Mr. Brooks, if he has an immediate request. If the application meets the requirements of the department, I am sure he will not be denied assistance.

I think the Treasurer was then referring to the committee associated with the proposed building of a swimming pool at Balaklava rather than to me individually. However, this morning the secretary of the Balaklava swimming pool committee told me that this committee had been refused a subsidy this financial year to begin building a pool at Balaklava, and that it had been told that nothing more could be done through the Tourist Bureau because the funds had been exhausted. Consequently, the secretary rang me to see whether I could help him. I told him the funds had been drastically cut this year, but that the Treasurer had said that if an application met the technical requirements of the department he was sure assistance would not be denied. At the time I did not go on to criticize this reduction, because I accepted the Treasurer's remark to me that this sum had been put on the Estimates and that further assistance would be made available if the technical requirements of a swimming pool were met. I am disappointed to find that the Balaklava people have been refused a subsidy, on the legitimate grounds (from the Tourist Bureau's point of view) that no funds were available. Does the

Treasurer intend to make further money available for this pool if all the technical requirements are met?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The matter will be examined. In the circumstances there was at least an opportunity for the committee to make representations to the Director of the Tourist Bureau prior to the introduction of the last Budget. Of course, the matter may now have to wait to be considered until the next review. I am willing to have the matter examined to see whether anything further can be done.

GOSSE PRIMARY SCHOOL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My question relates to the proposed primary school at the township of Gosse on Kangaroo Island about which there has been considerable discussion. I understand that the Minister of Education recently wrote to the representatives of the residents to ascertain their wishes prior to planning this school. A meeting was held a week or so ago, and I should like to know whether the Minister has now heard anything from the local residents regarding this school.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I wrote to the representatives of the parents who had been anxious to get a primary school at Gosse, the opening of which would require some students to leave Parndana Area School. In writing to the committee recently, I asked whether the parents would reconsider their request for a primary school at Gosse because I thought it would not be to the educational advantage of the children to leave the Parndana Area School, which is particularly well equipped and has excellent facilities. The students would be attending a much smaller school where there would not be the same degree of competition and association with other students. However, I have had a reply this week from the parents concerned to say that they still wish to have a primary school at Gosse, and I am now considering the matter.

WINE GRAPE PRICES.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government intended to introduce legislation in respect of a sultana regulating board, and the Minister said that this would not happen because the Government was awaiting the findings of the Royal Commission on the grapegrowing industry. Can the Minister say whether the Government intends to introduce statutory control in respect of prices of wine grapes as fixed by the Prices Commissioner this year in order to protect the interests of grapegrowers for the 1965-66 vintage?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This question should have been directed to the Premier as Minister in charge of the Prices Department, but, with his permission, I shall answer the honourable member. It is true that I said the Government did not intend to introduce a sultana control board as it was awaiting the report of the Royal Commission. This also applies with regard to fixing prices for next year's vintage. The House and the honourable member were informed on similar lines by the former Government, when it said that it was easy to fix a minimum price, although this is contrary to the present method whereby the Prices Commissioner fixes the maximum price. As the fixing of a minimum price does not guarantee that buyers will purchase the crop, it does not overcome the difficulty. We hope that something will be done, and that the report of the Royal Commission or advice will be available to assist in respect to next season's vintage.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question relates to wine grape prices, a subject of special interest for me because I represent growers at Watervale and Cadell, and a few growers on the northern fringe of the Barossa Valley. I am informed that the agreement that had been worked out by the previous Prices Commissioner (Mr. Murphy) will now be scrapped by certain winemaking interests, and that this will mean that the price structure upon which wine grapegrowers depend for their ultimate return for grapes will be jeopardized. Will the Premier say what he intends to do about this matter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: A Royal Commission has been appointed to inquire and to make recommendations concerning the grapegrowing industry in this State. It has been carrying on this work for many weeks. When the Commission was appointed it was expected that a report would be ready by September. The last information given to me by the Chairman of the Commission, however, was to the effect that he hoped a report would be ready by early December, but I do not know exactly when.

HIGHBURY AREA SEWERAGE.

Mrs. BYRNE: In May this year, I asked the Minister of Works whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department had immediate plans for sewering the Highbury-Dernancourt area near Hope Valley reservoir, and the Minister said the matter was being considered by the Public Works Committee, which would tender a report. A report was tendered on

June 15 to the effect that the committee was satisfied that it was desirable that the proposed extension of sewers in the Highbury area should be undertaken to meet the requirements of the area, which was developing rapidly, and to prevent pollution of water in the Hope Valley reservoir. The committee recommended the construction of a sewerage system at Highbury at an estimated cost of £195,700. Can the Minister of Works say what progress has been made?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: To the best of my knowledge preliminary work only has taken place up to the present, but as I have not the complete details I shall call for a report for the honourable member.

HILLS TRAFFIC.

Mr. SHANNON: Has the Minister of Education a reply from the Minister of Roads to my recent question about the use by high-loaded heavy transport of the deviation in Wilpena Terrace in the Aldgate area?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that the Highways Department was not aware of the formation of the Mount Lofty Ranges Association, until a letter was received from it on October 27, 1965. A report on the queries raised in its letter was completed on November 8 and forwarded to it on November 9. High loads have been deviated around the Aldgate railway over-pass *via* Churinga Road and Pine Avenue for many years. As the bridges were becoming unsafe not only for high loads but also for normal traffic, a decision was made to replace them. Tenders were called in the middle of October and closed on November 2.

Wilpena Terrace will be used as a temporary deviation for high loads while the bridges are being re-constructed. It is not as satisfactory a deviation as *via* Churinga Road and Pine Avenue because it would not be used by traffic travelling to Mylor, Strathalbyn, etc.; it traverses the level crossing on the main Melbourne railway line which is not equipped with flashing light protection, grades are worse for heavy vehicles, and the junction with the main road on the Stirling end would be hazardous for north-bound traffic. During the re-construction of the bridges, no clearing beyond that necessary for traffic safety will be done.

SALT INDUSTRY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: For some years this State has been negotiating with various authorities in the hope of establishing a large salt industry in the North, where evaporation and seawater conditions are particularly favourable for the production of a large-scale salt industry. Following the Premier's announcement that the Government was prepared to provide certain harbour facilities if a suitable industry were available, will the Premier say whether any further negotiations have taken place, and whether such an industry is likely to be established?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Since I last reported on this matter, I have received no representations, although I left the door completely open for those interested in this matter, and I was prepared to offer any reasonable assistance to help establish such an industry. If it is possible to communicate with a certain gentleman interested in the project, I shall take up that matter.

REIDY PARK SCHOOL.

Mr. BURDON: As I understand that tenders were recently called for the construction of a new infants school adjacent to the Reidy Park Primary School, will the Minister of Education say when a tender is likely to be accepted and when construction of the school will commence?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member in regard to those matters.

SCHOOL SUBSIDIES.

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on November 4 relating to school subsidies, particularly to a subsidy asked for by the Magill Demonstration School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have obtained a report concerning the three main points raised. The first complaint was that upon making a claim for an approval of a subsidy no acknowledgment was made by the Education Department until the approval was granted. Acknowledgment of subsidy applications is not forwarded, as under normal conditions any application that is in order is dealt with, and approvals posted within 14 days. In the case of requests requiring further investigation, such as building projects, there is normally correspondence on the subject to the committee within 14 days. The department receives between 4,000 and 5,000 applications annually, and there does not appear to be any point in an official acknowledgment immediately upon receipt of the application. The next point was that in 1965 many schools had not had any reply to their lodgment of the necessary approval of subsidy forms. Applications received since the beginning of September, when the financial position was realized, have

been processed on a quota system, while a large number of other applications are being held awaiting clarification of the method to ensure equitable distribution of subsidy funds available.

I should like to say here, in answer to the honourable member, that a public statement regarding this method will be made within two or three days. If all applications being held were immediately processed, total funds would be exhausted within a month. For this reason many schools have not yet had a reply to applications for subsidy. The next point that was raised was that, when the Treasurer of the Magill Demonstration School Committee asked by telephone when the approval might be given, he was informed that not until next year could approval be given to the £150 subsidy required for library books, school aids, and sporting equipment, and that approvals were being given only for claims of subsidies up to £50, and that all schools were being treated alike. My officer reports that he can find no evidence that any officer of the department advised the treasurer that approval for £150 subsidy would not be given until next year. As a matter of fact, the school has not lodged a claim for a £150 subsidy. It is also not correct that approvals are being given for claims of subsidy up to £50, as they are being processed in accordance with merit.

The next point was that upon this information the application was reduced from £150 to £50 about two months ago and that still no approval had been received. We are processing further applications, including three for Magill Demonstration School in the November quota, namely, (1) sporting equipment and teaching aids (£500) reduced to £100 at the headmaster's request; (2) sewing machine, £40; and (3) general and sports equipment, £250. (They are the totals in each case.) The reduction from £150 to £50 probably refers to the £500 for sporting equipment and teaching aids reduced to £50. It is normal procedure to request such a reduction when blanket approval is requested for so large a sum.

LOTTERIES REFERENDUM.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Both last Thursday and again yesterday, I asked the Premier and the Attorney-General whether they would table the Crown Law opinion which, on October 14, the Premier undertook to supply at the request of the Leader of the Opposition. It was not available yesterday, but the Attorney-General undertook to table the opinion today. Will he either read the opinion out to the House now, or table it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not wish to go over the explanation that the honourable member gave prior to asking his question. With great respect to him, I think there were certain errors in the explanation, but I shall give the House the opinion that I undertook yesterday to give. The amendment to the Referendum (State Lotteries) Bill accepted by Parliament after a conference of managers of the two Houses provided that for the purposes of section 14 of the Act it should be a valid and sufficient reason for failure to vote that the elector had a conscientious objection to voting at the referendum. By subsection (4) of that section the returning officer may be satisfied before the poll that an elector has such a valid and sufficient reason, in which case he will not send a query to the elector after the poll as to why he has not voted. If the returning officer has not been so satisfied before the poll he will send a query to the elector who must then by subsection (11) state a valid and sufficient reason for not voting. A conscientious objection to voting must still be valid: that is, an elector must clearly be alleging a genuine ground of conscience in order to provide a reason for not voting. If the returning officer is not satisfied that the elector's ground is made out the matter would be forwarded to the Attorney for prosecution. I have obtained the views of the Crown Solicitor in this matter. The only matters he is able to point to as being certainly within the term "conscientious objection" are as follows:

> Any sincere and genuinely held personal conviction that the act of voting at all at this referendum is repugnant to the elector's moral sense; that such an act is offensive to or contrary to his moral, ethical or religious principles, beliefs or scruples.

I agree with that view, and with the Crown Solicitor's further view expressed to me as follows:

> I find it difficult to conceive why such a conviction regarding the act of voting should be held but, if the returning officer is satisfied of its existence, then in my view the phrase includes it.

This material was made available to the returning officer when he made his public statement and I table the opinion.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Attorney-General has quoted from the Crown Solicitor's opinion. Under the Standing Orders I ask that that opinion be tabled.

The SPEAKER: There is no Standing Order governing this matter. I understand there is reference by Erskine May regarding the practice in the House of Commons. I should appreciate an opportunity to examine the statement with a view to giving a ruling later. I am unable to give a final ruling at this stage. I understand that the Attorney is tabling the statement he read.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker; I am tabling the document I read.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker. You have said you will give an opinion on this matter later on. I respectfully point out that the referendum is now only three days away and it is fairly important (if I may suggest with respect) that we have a ruling soon or it will be too late. Can you say when you will be able to give this ruling?

The SPEAKER: I intend to give it later this day. I want an opportunity to examine the statement and to refresh my memory on practice overseas.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take it from the tenor of the answers given by the Attorney-General in the House yesterday that this is his opinion or, at least, that he takes the responsibility for it. From that it follows that he must have directed his own mind to these matters. I was disappointed that, in his opinion, the Attorney-General did not deal with the question of proving a case against an elector who may be prosecuted for not voting at the referendum. The Attorney-General said that a prosecution would follow in certain circumstances, but it seems to me that it would be exceedingly difficult to prove a case against an elector who alleged that he had a conscientious objection to voting. If the Attorney-General has directed his mind to this matter, can he say whether the Crown would have difficulty in proving a case in these circumstances because of the escape clause that was inserted in the Bill as a result of the conference?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think the Crown will have any great difficulty in proving a case where the returning officer has not been satisfied that a valid ground of conscience has been made out for not voting. However, I hope the honourable member is not seeking by his question to encourage voters to think that it will be sufficient for them, in answer to any query, simply to say, "I have a conscientious objection," because, if he is encouraging them to do that, I can only suggest that he will put those voters to much inconvenience in due course.

Mr. Millhouse: Are you threatening people now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not threatening anybody, but it is our duty to carry out the provisions of the Act, and from what has been said in the House and from what the Returning Officer has said publicly, I hope the public will be sufficiently apprised of the fact that this is an election in which voting is compulsory.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In reply to my question about voting at the lottery referendum, the Attorney-General suggested that the implication behind my second question to him was an encouragement to people not to vote in the referendum. I desire to point out, Sir, that there was no such implication behind my question. In my opinion, however, it would be exceedingly difficult for the Crown to prove a case against an elector who did not vote. I regretted that the Attorney-General did not canvass this matter in the opinion which he has now presented to the House; I hoped that he would do so orally. I still regret that, when he answered my question and touched on this matter, he did not go into it as fully as I had hoped he would.

Mr. RODDA: At lunchtime today I received a telegram from a Mr. Hudson of Naracoorte which stated: "Kindly inquire *re* public obligation on referendum." The Premier told me yesterday that he did not intend to comment on the referendum prior to its being held. I assure him that there is real concern throughout the State about the lack of information on this matter, because the question is rather vague. When I rang Mr. Hudson a few minutes ago, he told me that the people in the South-East would like more information on the matter. Will the Premier, as the Leader of the Government, make a public statement on the Government's attitude to this lottery?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am endeavouring to have a certain statement published in tomorrow morning's newspaper.

Mrs. STEELE: A report from a newspaper dated September 3, referring to this year's Budget speech, stated:

Provision is made in the Budget for spending £35,140 on fees and wages to conduct the proposed referendum for a State lottery. This is nearly £5,000 more than the amount listed as the cost of the last State election. This

figure results from the fact that all State polling booths will have to be manned for a referendum. This is not necessarily so at an election where some seats may be uncontested. Because the line on the Estimates was for fees for elections and referenda and so covers more than the lottery referendum to be conducted next Saturday, and also because it does not refer to printing and other allied costs, can the Premier say whether the original estimate has proved to be accurate, or has it been necessary to revise that figure in the light of subsequent events? Can the Premier say what is the estimated cost of the referendum to be held next Saturday?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If it is possible to obtain that information by tomorrow I shall try to obtain it. If not, I shall get it as soon as possible.

EYRE PENINSULA POWER LINE.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Will the Minister of Works obtain a report for me on progress being made on supplying power from Port Augusta to Port Lincoln *via* Rudall, and when it is likely to be linked up with the Polda-Lock water scheme and, incidentally, with the township of Lock and that district?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member.

METROPOLITAN DRAINAGE.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of last week regarding the proposed metropolitan drainage committee and, in particular, regarding the joint plan of the municipalities of Enfield, Prospect and Hindmarsh?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: My colleague, the Minister of Local Government, states that the drainage proposed for Enfield, Prospect and Hindmarsh would come within the scope of the suggested metropolitan drainage scheme. A draft Bill to give effect to proposals for an overall scheme is now being prepared by the Parliamentary Draftsman for the consideration of Cabinet.

MURRAY RIVER.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the summer levels in Lake Alexandrina?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The River Murray Waters Agreement provides for minimum monthly flows to South Australia. Section 49 of the Act states:

Such quantities being the provisions for irrigation equivalent to a regulated supply of 67,000 acre feet per month during nine months and for domestic and stock supply losses by evaporation and percolation in Lake Victoria and like losses and lockage in the river from Lake Victoria to the river mouth (but not including Lakes Alexandrina and Albert).

This is the reason why the Commonwealth, New South Wales and Victoria agreed to amend the agreement to provide for construction of the barrages to prevent the ingress of sea-water and to each meet one-quarter of the cost of this work. The normal level upstream of the barrage is R.L. 109.50, although of course the strength and direction of the winds cause variations in the levels in the river and the lakes. This year the flow to South Australia will be a little below normal, following the proclamation of restrictions by the River Murray Commission, and it has been calculated that the level will fall to R.L. 108.25 by the end of next autumn, this being 1ft. 3in. below normal. During the serious drought in 1944-45 the level fell to R.L. 107.25, that is, 2ft. 3in. below normal, but the water in the river and lakes remained useable throughout the year. With the high summer evaporation losses some fall in the water level is unavoidable in dry years and this does cause some inconvenience to irrigators. However, the main point is that the barrages have and do achieve their prime purpose of assuring that the water in the lakes and lower river remains fresh under these adverse conditions.

MOUNT GAMBIER BUILDING.

Mr. BURDON: Recently I received a letter from the Town Clerk of the Mount Gambier Corporation regarding a dilapidated building on the corner of North Terrace and Penola Road in Mount Gambier. The council on various occasions has taken up with the Highways Department the question of the removal of this building, which is the department's property. I have received from the council two photographs that I shall make available to the Attorney-General. The council has tried to keep this area tidy but, because of large concrete blocks on the area, it has not been able to do so. This corner is almost in the centre of the city and is an eye-sore to anybody entering or leaving it. However, the important thing is that the building is very dangerous to children who play there. Will the Attorney-General, in the interests of the safety of children in Mount Gambier, arrange for his department to take speedy action to see that this building is removed as quickly as possible?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly have the honourable member's request examined, but I am not certain what powers my officers

have to ensure the removal of the building. There are, however, various courses which I may be able to advise the honourable member are open to the council in this matter to obtain the desired result. I will certainly look at the matter and advise him on it.

SUPERPHOSPHATE.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yesterday the *Advertiser*, I think on the front page, had this comment to make on the proposed merger and formation of a holding company which involved other companies and Cresco Fertilizers Limited:

The purchase of Cresco issued shares will require an outlay of £3,937,907. The plan envisages that the former Cresco shareholders will then re-invest £1,644,337 in shares in the new holding company. That will leave them with £2,293,570 to pocket as a profit from the deal.

Earlier I read in the press that the shareholders were delighted, and one can well imagine their delight. Also, on the financial page of the *Advertiser* yesterday there was a report headed "A further leap of 1s. 4d. to 47s. 6d. in Adelaide Chemical Company's shares, and 1s. to 47s. in the shares of Wallaroo-Mount Lyell Co." All these shares are 20s. shares. Today the *Advertiser's* financial page reported that Cresco shares yesterday jumped a further 7s. 6d. to a figure of 90s. Also, the directors of the company have intimated to prospective shareholders that a 10 per cent dividend on the new capital will be maintained. Yesterday I asked the Premier a question on superphosphate prices and, *inter alia*, he had this to say:

A further increase was proposed—

that would be, I assume, an increase over the one which had been announced—

but the Prices Commissioner made suggestions to assist this industry in its future expansion. My information discloses that because of the previous Government's actions in grinding down all the time, we were left to a certain extent with the proposed increases.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the manipulation of the financial affairs of this company, the fact that the company's prospects have enabled investors to take out profits of £2,293,570 (which profits are apparently to be withdrawn from this company's operations and replaced by other investment capital), and the fact that the associated company's 20s. shares are quoted at 47s. or better, what does the Premier mean when he says that the previous Government ground down this industry? Will the Premier instruct the Prices Commissioner that he should not accept as a legitimate factor in his price determinations the cost to the company of these huge profits withdrawn by shareholders and replaced by other investment capital, so that farmers and other consumers are not required to pay a loaded price for this essential requirement because of this factor?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Certain phases of this question imply that I particularly was introducing some measure of which I had no knowledge. I have here a copy of a letter which I think may answer some questions in relation to the "grinding down". This letter from Cresco Fertilizers Limited states:

We wish to record a strong protest against the decision in respect to the increases in prices for superphosphate for the remainder of the current year.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: What is the date of that letter?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: November 11, 1965. I have this letter because certain other matters have been discussed. It continues:

Taking into consideration the sales since July 1, 1965, at the old price, the increases will barely match costs for this year and they will provide no relief from the harsh decision of the previous year. We understood from your department that we could expect this relief. It appears that the savings in freight and cartage to our customers through decentralization have been completely overlooked as the price increase over the two years is less than the increase in Victoria despite the advantage the Victorian manufacturers have through centralization of the industry. We repeat our assertion that a flourishing fertilizer industry is essential to the advancement of primary industry and without adequate profits we cannot expand and diversify to meet the full requirements of agriculture. It is because the Government of South Australia has failed to recognize this need that we are in the position of having to accept foreign assistance to facilitate the company's future expansion to the growing need for improved fertilizers.

This letter was signed by the General Manager. I reported to Parliament yesterday, in answer to a question, that there had been an increase in certain fundamental costs over which this Government had no control. I am not an authority on what percentage of the materials used is associated with this product, but I am sure the honourable member will appreciate that a thorough examination has been made by the Prices Commissioner. This examination was carried out for at least two weeks when I reported to Cabinet that I could not, in fairness, accept the recommendation for a price increase. The matter was returned to the Prices Commissioner for re-examination, and it was considered at an interview between the Commissioner and me. In fact, the Prices Commissioner was invited to attend a special Cabinet meeting at which

he explained fully that he had done the best he could. It is not the fault of the Prices Commissioner that he has had to make this recommendation after a thorough investigation. We have to appreciate that this Government has no control over the cost of new bags, unless we make a subsidy available.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I did not bring that into it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I assure honourable members that this matter has been fully investigated and that I am not going to question the authority or decision of the Prices Commissioner. He investigated fully and, if additional costs of materials or ingredients are involved, the total cost must obviously increase as a result of these additional costs. There seems to be no advantage to the company as a result of this decision. The suggested takeover proposals have not helped the position. The Government has no authority that I know of to force the company to do certain things, and if the law allows for a takeover and the bids offered are accepted, then the Government can do nothing about it. The increased price of superphosphate this year has been extensively investigated at my request, so that I see no real purpose in asking the Prices Commissioner to further investigate this matter. I believe there was a suggestion of a coverage of about 1s. 7d. or 1s. 9d. a ton associated with the cost of wages. I do not think that was included when another reduction was made on the request of Cabinet that was conveyed to the Prices Commissioner.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I refer to the Premier's statement that the present position arises out of the grinding down earlier by the previous Government. First, can the Premier show anywhere in the docket where the previous Government did not honour the recommendations of the Prices Commissioner? Secondly, will he table the docket and show that fact? If he will not do that, will he unreservedly withdraw the remark, which has no foundation whatsoever?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I shall be pleased to have the docket examined. If I have given wrong information to the House, I shall be the first to withdraw the remark. I will not attempt to obtain the docket today, but I shall report to Parliament on the matter in due course.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In the course of the Premier's statement yesterday he said that the price of sulphur overseas had increased steeply by, I think, £4 10s. a ton. My latest information was that contracts for sulphur that had been in existence in Australia for some time were running out and could not be replaced with new contracts, except by agreement on increased prices. I was informed that the cost of elemental sulphur would rise substantially. Can the Premier say whether action has been taken to step up the production of pyrites at Nairne to minimize as much as possible the quantity of sulphur coming into South Australia, to provide relief to primary producers concerned, and to save imports into this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I said that the landed cost of sulphur had increased by £4 10s. a ton, or by, I think, 33⅓ per cent. I have received no representations concerning the production of pyrites, but I will endeavour to obtain information relating to the company concerned and to ascertain whether production can be increased.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I appreciate the information the Premier has given to the House with regard to the costs of various components in the manufacture of superphosphate, for instance, the cost of sulphur. From his answer I assume that the Prices Commissioner has taken the costs of raw materials and applied them in the appropriate ratio to the quantities of the components in the finished product, and has based his determination as to the increase on an examination of these two factors. However, a third factor of great significance is that the quantity of superphosphate used in South Australia has, over the last three or four years, increased substantially. For example, the annual output of the Cresco company's works at Port Lincoln, which, until about four years ago, averaged 80,000 tons to 90,000 tons, has in the last two years jumped to 130,000 tons, and last year it was (from memory) 147,000 tons. Similarly, superphosphate works on the mainland have increased their output markedly. Will the Premier say whether, in examining this matter, he has satisfied himself that the Prices Commissioner has taken all these factors into account, particularly the increase in output by all the companies concerned which, of course, has materially reduced the unit cost of their product?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Many questions were asked of the Prices Commissioner at a specially convened meeting of Cabinet, and the Commissioner was able to answer effectively all questions put to him. From my own investigation of the position I was confident that the Commissioner had considered the matter exhaustively. About 600,000 tons of

superphosphate is expected to be produced this year, and this should be taken into account. Provision has also been made for a concession of 10s. a ton on superphosphate if it is taken at a certain time of the year. I am prepared to ask the Commissioner whether anything further can be done about the cost structure. At the same time I emphasize that the take-over moves necessitated an exhaustive inquiry by my colleagues and me.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That fact has not affected my attitude.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It has affected mine. I have held on to some pretty warm political potatoes in my time but this is rather a hot one, and we were mindful of this fact. Because of the dry spell we are not in a happy position; the poor season may affect the use of superphosphate. All the matters I have mentioned made for an exhaustive inquiry, and naturally the talk of a take-over bid was regarded as a hot potato. I considered what could occur as a result of the dry spell. I think members will appreciate that not many questions were missed in this inquiry. I assure honourable members that had it not been for these two matters there probably would not have been any need for further investigation regarding the price recommended by the Prices Commissioner. I do not reflect on the present or the previous staff: I merely say that the present Commissioner is amply qualified to examine any facet of the question.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Premier promised to get some supplementary information for my colleague, the member for Flinders, regarding the price of superphosphate and the method of fixing that price. For many years the Prices Department has resisted requests for an increase in the price of superphosphate because it has considered that capital expansion should be provided by capital investment and not through a price increase to make a profit that would not only enable the paying of a dividend but also the building of a factory. I notice from the letter that the Premier quoted, which was the "grinding down" letter, that it was stated that we had not provided any sum in the price of superphosphate for capital investment. Can the Premier say whether the new policy is to provide for capital investment out of profit, with the price fixed to enable capital investment to be effected?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am sure that the Leader knows full well whether, under the previous Administration, it was the Prices Commissioner or the Government that set the policy in these matters. I had thought that these companies were almost completely bankrupt until I examined the position further. To the best of my knowledge, there is no suggestion that the price structure contains any such provision for expansion with a consequent burden to the consumer. We were not in the position to agree to allow the manufacturers anything to enable them to make a further capital investment in their plants. There is no question of a policy on our part to provide for a capital expansion ingredient in the price of superphosphate.

CORNSACKS.

Mr. McANANEY: As the cost of new cornsacks is higher this year, and as I understand that the price of raw jute is 10 per cent to 15 per cent lower than it was last year, will the Premier obtain from the Prices Commissioner the reason for this higher price?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If it is possible to obtain that information, I shall ask for it.

PARAFIELD GARDENS ESTATE.

Mr. HALL: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked recently concerning the delay in occupation of houses at Parafield Gardens, because of the lack of service connections?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Services at Parafield Gardens are well under way and house connections are being carried out. No delay in completion is expected, and some houses will be occupied by Christmas.

TRANSPORT CO-ORDINATION.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on November 10 concerning varying charges up to 2c a ton-mile under the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I gave a second reading explanation of the Bill, and since then the Leader of the Opposition has secured the adjournment of the debate. I have already provided for certain amendments to the measure.

AGINCOURT BORE SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I have asked many questions about the Agincourt Bore school and the Minister of Education has said in his replies that the matter has been referred to the Public Buildings Department so that that department can get on with the specifications and drawings for the new building. He has also said that it has not been finally decided when building is likely to start. Some time has elapsed since I asked my previous question on this matter and, as no progress has been made by the Public

Buildings Department regarding specifications and drawings, will the Minister say when building is likely to start?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: A few days ago a question was asked in another place about this matter and the latest information obtainable from the Public Buildings Department was given in answer to that question. I cannot retail that information from memory, but it is detailed on page 2618 of *Hansard*.

NARACOORTE BRIDGE.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to my recent question regarding the Naracoorte bridge?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that the Highways Department accepted responsibility for the bridge in the town over the Naracoorte Creek on the Bordertown to Port MacDonnell main road and, in addition, provided another bridge over the creek slightly downstream of the Graham Terrace crossing when constructing the Stewart Terrace to Penola Road bypass. Graham Terrace is no longer an important traffic route as far as this department is concerned. The corporation has been advised that if it wishes to replace the bridge the Commissioner of Highways is only prepared to recommend assistance to the extent of 25 per cent of the cost. The Graham Terrace bridge is in a bad condition and has been subject to a 3-ton load limit for more than seven years. Congestion in Graham Terrace will always occur, whilst sales are held in this location, as there is insufficient room to manoeuvre large modern transports and accommodate parked cars in this street.

VIRGINIA WATER BASIN.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from the Minister of Mines to a question I asked on October 5 concerning the imposition of controls over the underground water basin at Virginia?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I regret to say that my colleague has not yet furnished that information, but now that the honourable member has raised the matter again I will ask my colleague for an early reply.

BERRI EVAPORATION BASIN.

Mr. CURREN: On August 18, 1964, I asked the then Minister of Irrigation to take action to overcome the offensive odours arising from the Berri evaporation basin at certain times of the year. I was informed that tests would be carried out by officers of the Sewage Treatment Division of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and that these tests would be extended over a considerable period. Will the Minister of Irrigation obtain a report on how far these tests have been carried out and what result, if any, has been obtained?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

MILANG WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. McANANEY: Early in October I forwarded to the Minister of Works a petition signed by, I think, every Milang resident, some of whom were most irate about the refusal to grant them further use of lake water: they had to use water from the Strathalbyn reservoir. Will the Minister of Works give an early reply to that petition?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I thank the honourable member for raising the matter again. I will inquire with the object of getting an early reply.

TEENAGE DRIVERS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked some time ago regarding teenage drivers?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The question of the susceptibility of teenage drivers to road traffic accidents has been receiving the consideration of many people for a long time and although statistics have been produced to "prove" and "disprove" the claim that young drivers cause the most accidents, it is difficult to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion on this point. This matter has been aptly raised by the honourable member at an opportune time, as road safety generally is causing so much concern that the Australian Automobile Association, which is holding its annual conference in Perth from November 19 to November 24, 1965, has included a one-day symposium on the subject "Are the Australian systems of driver licensing adequate?" I suggest that the outcome of this symposium might indicate some useful approach to the problem.

LOTTERIES REFERENDUM.

The SPEAKER: I refer to the point of order raised by the Leader of the Opposition earlier this afternoon, concerning the answer given by the honourable the Attorney-General on the subject of "conscientious objection"

referred to in the Referendum (State Lotteries) Act, 1965. At the outset, I point out that the House of Assembly has no specific Standing Order dealing with the subject raised, and by operation of our Standing Order No. 1 resort is had to the House of Commons practice. The latitude allowed by the Chair here in respect of questions asked without notice has caused me some thought in recent days, and I consider that shortly I will have to ask the House for its co-operation in adhering more strictly to the provisions set out in Standing Orders.

The latitude allowed by the Chair here in questions without notice asked by honourable members is exemplified in this case and in a couple of others today, because Erskine May (17th edition, p. 353) lists in the category of inadmissible questions a question "seeking an expression of opinion on a question of law such as an interpretation of a Statute". I have given the benefit of any doubt on that to the members asking questions, because I want to preserve the right of all members to ask questions, and I am anxious that we should follow the procedure established in this House, where there is precedent just as much as in the House of Commons. To the best of my knowledge there is no specific rule which deals with the content of a Ministerial reply to a question asked in the House. The House of Commons principle relating to citing documents not before the House has application in debate. Under the heading of "Maintenance of Order during Debate", Erskine May, pp. 458, 459, states, *inter alia*:

(1) A Minister of the Crown is not at liberty to read or quote from a despatch or other State paper not before the House unless he be prepared to lay it upon the Table.

(2) A Minister who summarizes a correspondence but does not actually quote from it is not bound to lay it upon the Table.

(3) The opinions of the law officers of the Crown being confidential are not usually laid before Parliament or cited in debate, and their production has frequently been refused, but if a Minister deems it expedient that such opinions should be made known for the information of the House, he is entitled to cite them in debate.

I hold that in his reply today the honourable the Attorney-General paraphrased certain views of the Crown Solicitor, and I am aware of no Parliamentary authority which obliges the Attorney-General to table such views.

SUPERANNUATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 16. Page 2819.)

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): Many people enjoying benefits under this scheme will be considerably disappointed with the small increase of only 2 per cent to 3 per cent. I spent much time in the metropolitan area about six months ago and noticed that this was a burning question among retired civil servants who were expecting substantial increases in their pensions. This Bill will disappoint them. Certain increases are to be paid to persons receiving benefits but, upon the pensioner's death, these benefits do not pass to the widow. This is unfair and unjust, and the Bill could be improved with respect to this aspect, so that the benefits can pass to the widow.

It is regretted that no actuary is to be appointed to the board. I understand that no actuary is available, and I hope that when one is available he will be appointed by the Government to the board. I noticed in a New Zealand newspaper recently that there was a shortage of actuaries in that country. It is disappointing that in our modern age we do not have enough trained accountants and actuaries to do the necessary work of keeping accurate records. I support the second reading.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): To clarify some of the real problems referred to by honourable members, I quote from a letter I have received from the secretary of the Government Superannuation Committee, dated August 23, which states:

Your letter of August 11 in which you set out your proposed submissions to Cabinet following the deputation from my committee has been received. I have been directed by the committee to thank you for the courteous hearing members received and the adjustments which you are prepared to make in the Under Treasurer's report. The committee considers that they satisfy and make some significant advances in the provisions of the Superannuation Act. In view of the "open door" policy which you have adopted, the committee would like to seek a review in the light of trends elsewhere from time to time not less frequently than every two years.

That letter was signed by the secretary, Mr. E. R. Speed. The question concerning the retiring age of males being reduced from 65 to 60 with the right of early retirement, was also considered at this meeting, but the members of the committee considered that the

matter should be further examined before the committee made a final commitment. The same applied to the retiring age for the female section. There is an earlier retiring age for females. It was explained briefly that it would be possible in respect of those entitled to long service leave, and retiring, say, three years earlier than normal, for the whole of their long service leave payment made in a lump sum to be invested to provide for that earlier retirement. I admit that I was surprised to know that that would be the position. I considered that a further investigation was required not only by the committee but also by the Government. The committee, itself, sympathized with the proposition, but still considered an investigation necessary. Consequently, this is one of the matters being held in abeyance. The appointment of the Public Actuary has caused much concern in this State. Prior to the death of the officer of the fund qualified in this respect, an officer with similar qualifications had been employed in the Australian Mutual and Provident Society who, I understand, has now been transferred elsewhere. As a result, there is no Public Actuary at present in this State. Whether the provision relating to a Public Actuary has stemmed from the appointment of the late Mr. Stuckey in the early days of the fund, I am not sure. Regarding superannuation, I realize that only a small increase in the benefits to be paid may be involved. Using a simple example, I point out that an entitlement of £6 a week (£1 for each unit) may increase to £6 4s.

I point out, too, that in regard to the 70 to 30 per cent proportion, certain officers (albeit only a few) are receiving entitlement at a higher rate than 70 per cent. The committee considered that, by widening the proportion, the greater equity that arose would meet the circumstances, and its decision was unanimous. I assure the House that the members of the committee are competent and capable officers. Complete agreement was reached with the committee, the other officers involved, and me at the deputation that was held, and a satisfactory result obtained before this measure was introduced. Consequently, I ask the House to accept the Bill as it has been introduced.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Constitution of board."

Mr. COUMBE: This clause seeks to repeal section 8 (3), which provides that an actuary shall be a member of the board. I point out that the section contains a proviso stating:

One of the members of the board shall be the actuary, provided that if there is in the State no competent actuary available and willing to act as a member of the board this subsection shall have no effect.

That is an escape provision under which no requirement for an actuary to be a member of the board exists, if a competent and willing officer is not available. Does the Treasurer wish to persist with this clause?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): This matter has been considered, and I do not think I betray any confidence when I point out that Mr. White (Secretary to the Premier, and also now the Chairman of the board) has personally assured me that, in the event of an actuary in this State desiring to be a member of the board (and if it is necessary to have such a member), an invitation will be extended to that person to join the board. My advisers consider that we can dispense with the relevant provision in the Act, on the understanding that, in the event of a qualified person being available, he will be invited to become a member of the board.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 to 7 passed.

Clause 8—"Provisions applicable after February 1, 1966."

Mr. COUMBE: As new section 75c contains 18 subsections, I ask that the Committee consider them *seriatim*.

The CHAIRMAN: Unless any honourable member has an objection, we shall consider the clause as a whole.

Mr. COUMBE: I wish to refer to new section 75c (8).

The CHAIRMAN: Before the honourable member proceeds, has any member any query about the Committee proceeding with new section 75c (8)?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Any member can make queries at any time until the clause is completed, unless the subsections are taken *seriatim*.

Mr. COUMBE: I move:

In new section 75c (8) after "Such difference shall" to strike out "not".

It is desirable to provide an increased pension for retired public servants, but under the Bill no extra pension will be paid. It is true that a person who has contributed in the past at a rate above the proposed 30 per cent will get a small credit. As I am prevented from moving an amendment to provide for an increase to be made in the payment to pensioners, I have moved my amendment so that the final part of the new section will read as follows:

Such difference shall be deemed to be part of the pension of the pensioner for the purpose of determining any pension payable to his widow upon his death.

My amendment will not achieve what I want and what I believe should be done but, as I cannot achieve anything directly for the pensioner, I am trying to preserve a pensioner's right to have money that would have gone to him go to his widow. The Bill provides for a certain sum to be paid to a pensioner, who complies with the conditions laid down, on his retirement. However, if he dies a month after his retirement this money reverts to the fund. Normally the pensioner and his family would have had that benefit. I ask honourable members to support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: I have examined the effect of the amendment proposed by the member for Torrens. I am reliably informed, and I agree, that it involves an effective appropriation of revenue and, as such, it must be recommended by the Governor and can be moved only by a Minister of the Crown. Therefore, I rule the amendment as moved by the honourable member to be out or order.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That the Chairman's ruling be disagreed to, on the ground that the amendment merely provides for the just distribution of money already provided by the pensioner.

The Speaker having resumed the Chair:

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to report that during the discussion on the Bill the honourable member for Torrens moved an amendment in new section 75c (8), to strike out "not". I gave the following ruling:

I have examined the effect of the amendment proposed by the honourable member for Torrens. I am reliably informed (and I agree) that the amendment involves an effective appropriation of revenue, and as such it must be recommended by the Governor and it can be moved only by a Minister of the Crown. Therefore, I rule the amendment out of order.

The honourable the Leader of the Opposition, in moving that my ruling be disagreed to, supplied the following reason:

The amendment merely provides for a just distribution of moneys already provided by the pensioner and does not provide an appropriation.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the Chairman's ruling in this matter. I believe that the amendment not only provides for the distribution of pensioners' money but involves an additional contribution from the Government, and in those circumstances a message would be necessary from His Excellency the Governor for appropriation. In addition, it is not in order for such an amendment to be moved by other than a Minister of the Crown.

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

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to. Mr. Speaker, obviously this is not an appropriation in any sense of the word. The Bill provided for an appropriation of money to meet certain requirements arising out of the proposed new distribution regarding the obligations of the Government and of the public servant in providing for superannuation. This new basis provides for the Government in future to provide 70 per cent of the pension and for the public servant to provide 30 per cent. Certain persons have paid more than 30 per cent. so they are in credit in the fund. In other words, the fund is at present holding certain moneys which belong to the public servant, and, in fact, the Bill acknowledges that fact. It provides that the pensioner who has paid more than the 30 per cent shall have his money refunded to him, and that provision is quite equitable. However, the Bill says that in the event of his death that money, which belongs to him, shall not be refunded to his wife. The amendment provides not for an appropriation but for a refund of money that has been overpaid. If we cannot move an amendment to provide for a widow to get that, this Parliament becomes a travesty. That money belongs not to the Crown or the Superannuation Department but to the pensioner, yet the Bill provides that, when he dies, his widow is to be deprived of it. All that is provided in this amendment (this so-called appropriation that is infringing the rules of Parliament) is that the right of the pensioner passes automatically to the widow.

In these circumstances, I say that if the Standing Order does not permit this amendment it is time it was altered. It seems pointless bringing the Bill into the House if members cannot move this type of amendment. The Government has admitted that where the pensioner has overpaid money he has a right to get it back. I point out that this money is superfluous to the fund, and probably in only about 20 cases a year would it have to be paid out to a widow. In these circumstances I am forced to say, Mr. Speaker, that I believe your ruling to be absolutely wrong.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the motion. I pointed out earlier that a private member could not alter or amend the Bill in any way except as I moved a few moments ago, because he cannot move to increase an

appropriation. That fact is appreciated. It is only by moving an amendment to delete the word "not" that we are able to give some relief in this regard. All we are thinking of is to give to the widow of a contributor the money that he had contributed during his service and which he would have received had he continued to live and become a pensioner. That is just, and we disagree to your ruling, Sir, because it is the only way under this Bill to get redress for these persons, and the only way we can amend the Bill in any form.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): The case that the member for Torrens has outlined is not exactly on all fours with what the Leader had previously said about the nature of this subsection. The reason for your ruling, Sir, is clear when one reads the subsection, because it refers to an increase in the Government contribution which is different from the one made under the previous legislation. Therefore, it requires a greater appropriation.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Bill already provides for the increase to 70 per cent and we are not intending to alter that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes you are.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: No we are not.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This subsection specifically provides that in these cases the increase shall be to 70 per cent. It states:

In respect of every pensioner who ceased to be a contributor before the thirty-first day of January, One thousand nine hundred and sixty-six and who is receiving a pension on that day and in respect of whose pension the contribution by the Government to the Fund is less than seventy per centum of such pension, the contribution by the Government to the Fund shall after the said thirty-first day of January, One thousand nine hundred and sixty-six be an amount equal to seventy per centum of such pension and the difference between the total of the contributions made by the Government before and after the said thirty-first day of January, One thousand nine hundred and sixty-six shall be paid thereafter to the pensioner in addition to his pension.

In other words, the money is paid by the Government to the fund and the fund pays the extra to the pensioner. Without this section there would not be an increased payment to the fund and the increased payment would not be made to the pensioner. This provision applies to the pensioner and not to his widow. If members seek to apply it to a widow, they are adding a class of person not provided for in the extra appropriation.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It is not an extra appropriation by the Government. It is a return from the fund of amounts already paid.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The extra amount would have to be paid into the fund and this subsection increases the amount the Government is paying. The words are perfectly clear and I cannot see how they can be interpreted otherwise.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I reluctantly oppose your ruling, Sir, because I know you are well advised. After considering the effect of this subsection I agree with my Leader. If the following words were struck out it would not affect the appropriation by the Government:

Such difference shall not be deemed to be part of the pension of the pensioner for the purpose of determining any pension payable to his widow upon his death.

I cannot understand why we should introduce this pettifogging thing to pinch a widow of a few shillings. The pensioner has been a contributor the whole of his working life and this seems to be a way of avoiding giving something that the husband has contributed to for many years. I have some doubt about what the Attorney-General said about the extra appropriation, and am disappointed with this subsection.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I understand that we are now concerned with the ruling that you, Mr. Speaker, have given, and I rise to support that ruling. I would not have arisen, had it not been for what seems to be a complication that has arisen in connection with the benefits of widows whose late husbands were members of the fund. Complete agreement was reached on this matter at the conferences in which Government officers participated. The committee was in complete harmony with the proposal to increase the benefit for widows from 60 to 65 per cent. The Government agreed to that proposal and, in accordance with the message received from His Excellency, we are not prepared to go beyond what is provided. That message was accepted without qualification but now, at the eleventh hour, this motion is moved, and the Government is asked to approach His Excellency for a further appropriation. If complete agreement had not originally been reached, some justification may have existed for the motion, but I point out that the committee, appointed to represent the contributors to the fund, completely agreed with the proposal. I support your ruling, Sir.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): With great respect to the Treasurer, I think that what he has said entirely begs the question. We are saying that an appropriation is not required, but that is not the matter to which the Treasurer addressed himself at all. I know it is difficult for a private member and a junior practitioner to go against a ruling given by the Speaker and backed up by a silk, but I am afraid I must do that in this case, and say that I entirely support the reasoning of the Leader in moving to disagree with your ruling, Sir. I suggest that, if we think about the effect of this amendment, we shall see that it does not involve any further appropriation, because it does not involve any further payment by the Government at all. What will be the effect of this sentence in the provision if the amendment is made? It will mean that a slightly higher payment will be made to a widow. But where will that payment come from? It will come out of the Superannuation Fund.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: To which the widow's late husband has been contributing!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, all his working life. It is only when a further payment has to be made by the Government that an appropriation is required, as well as a message from the Governor. That would not be implied by by the amendment. We are only moving that some further payment be made to a widow out of the fund. Surely it is obvious that the fund is separate from the moneys of the Crown. It is only when further payments by the Crown are required that we are precluded from moving an amendment, because that has to be done by message and by a Minister, but that is not the case here. I entirely back up what has been said by the Leader in moving to disagree to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot accept what has been said by the Attorney-General.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I oppose the motion. I think it is rather ironical that we should be debating a motion like this when, for the last few minutes, you, Sir, have shown amazing latitude, I think, to speakers who have supported the motion. Indeed, most of what they have said has been completely irrelevant to the matter before the Chair. I shall not fall into that state myself, but shall get to what I think is the kernel of the situation. The Bill provides for an extra appropriation, subject to a condition, and that is that it does not include widows. The amendment removes the condition, and therefore increases the appropriation to cover a provision not included in the Bill. The Governor's message covered appropriation for the purpose of the Bill, for example, appropriation subject to a condition. That is the whole crux of the matter, and it has nothing whatsoever to do with the extraneous matter that members who are supporting the motion have been advancing for the last quarter of an hour.

Mr. Millhouse: You tell us where any appropriation will be required if this amendment goes through!

Mr. JENNINGS: It is perfectly clear. The Governor's message covered appropriation for the purpose of this Bill; the appropriation is subject to a condition. It is absolutely clear why we should uphold your ruling, Sir.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I do not agree with the remarks of the member for Enfield, but uphold what the Leader has said. I should like to hear the argument against the motion. I point out that 70 per cent of the contribution is to be made by the Government and 30 per cent by the contributor, but that contributions in excess of that 30 per cent have been made (although to what extent I am not aware). The Bill provides that whilst the contributor is alive he will receive what he has paid in excess of his rate of contribution. If he lived for 20 years after retirement, he would receive that excess until he had fully recovered it. When he dies that dies with him. It has been accepted in the past that £2,800 life insurance was exempt from all tolls, the reason being that it was accepted as a dual sacrifice on the part of a husband and wife to contribute to a common end. That principle cannot be separated from contributions to the Superannuation Fund. The Bill takes from a husband and wife moneys due to the husband. This is not appropriation, which has to do with the 70 per cent paid by the Government and has nothing to do with the 30 per cent paid by contributors. Why is the widow not entitled to have what her husband would have had because of his overpayment? She should receive it. I support the Leader's motion.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I support the Speaker's ruling. I think all members would agree that I would be one of the first to support the amendment if it were in order because I sympathize with it. However, when a member accepts the position of Speaker or Deputy Speaker he must also accept the responsibility that goes with it.

Mr. Millhouse: Would you be willing to use your influence to get a message from His Excellency the Governor?

Mr. LAWN: I intend to deal with that point. The member for Mitcham previously said that a message from His Excellency had already been received. However, the ruling involves two points, the second point being that an amendment such as this must be introduced by a Minister. If honourable members opposite can get a Minister to agree to move the amendment, then it will be in order. What I am saying on this question is undoubtedly correct. In the period from 1962 to 1964 Bills, which had been accepted by previous Speakers and provided ultimately for the introduction of an Appropriation Bill but did not in themselves involve an appropriation, were ruled out of order by the then Speaker (Hon. T. C. Stott). He ruled out of order two Bills, one introduced by the Opposition and the other by the Government, and he gave the same ground for his ruling as the ground given today. I would be one of the first to instigate action to help the Opposition if that were possible but we are up against the Standing Orders which provide that, first, a message must come from His Excellency and, secondly, that a Bill or amendment must be introduced by a Minister.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): A message from His Execllency the Governor was received on this Bill, which was introduced by a Minister and thus complied with the Standing Orders. The member for Adelaide referred to rulings I gave on money Bills. I ruled one Bill out of order on the ground that it could be introduced only by a Minister. I ruled a Government Bill out of order because no message had been received from His Excellency. This situation is different because the clause it is sought to amend is part of a Bill which was introduced by a Minister and which complies with the Standing Orders. Now another member has moved to amend that clause. The question is whether the amendment is out of order. By striking out the word "not", does it make a greater appropriation of funds from the revenue of the State? I am a little confused about this because I am not sure whether or not this appropriates money.

Mr. Ryan: You are having two bob each way.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: No, I am sincerely confused about whether this amendment means an appropriation of money from the Crown. If the amendment clearly meant an appropriation of money I should not hesitate to say it was out of order. However, I cannot say that, for I do not believe the amendment provides an appropriation.

Mr. Ryan: In other words, you are putting your own interpretation on it now.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: If the honourable member can give me a better legal interpretation on it I shall be glad to have it.

Mr. Ryan: You are confused, yet you are not confused. What are you?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I am confused on whether or not it amounts to an appropriation.

Mr. Ryan: Then you go on and say that you do not think it is an appropriation.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I said that I do not know whether it is. Subsection (8) states:

In respect of every pensioner who ceased to be a contributor before January 31, 1966, and who is receiving a pension on that day and in respect of whose pension the contribution by the Government to the fund is less than 70 per centum of such pension, the contribution by the Government to the fund shall after the said January 31, 1966, be an amount equal to 70 per centum of such pension and the difference between the total of the contributions made by the Government before and after the said January 31, 1966, shall be paid thereafter to the pensioner in addition to his pension. Such difference shall not be deemed to be part of the pension of the pensioner for the purpose of determining any pension payable to his widow upon his death.

That is what confuses me.

Mr. Hudson: Does the additional payment made to the pensioner require appropriation?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I am inclined to think that it does not but, frankly, I admit that I do not know whether it does or not.

Mr. Hudson: Isn't it a good case for saying that if you are in doubt you should support the Speaker?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I should like a little more time to study the question. However, we are not able to ask that progress be reported in order to get a further interpretation.

Mr. Hudson: When in doubt, shouldn't we uphold the authority of the House in the form of the Speaker?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I have always been a firm believer in the rights of private members in this House, and I am a little concerned that if we endorse this ruling we may reach the stage when no private member will be able to move any amendment at all in a money Bill. I should not like to see any curtailment of the right of any private member to move an amendment to a Bill. I appreciate the Standing Orders regarding money Bills, but I point out that we are now discussing not a money Bill but an amendment to a clause, and in my view there is a big difference. A Speaker may rule out a Bill because it has

not been properly introduced, but so far as I know no Speaker has ever ruled out an amendment to a money clause. I should like to study this matter further, but at the moment my view is that this amendment does not appropriate any money. In fact, in the event of the death of the contributor the money goes back into the fund at the expense of the widow. If any honourable member can convince me that that is not so, I may have to change my mind on the matter, but at the moment I rather think that this amendment does not appropriate any money.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think probably I can clear up some of the doubts expressed by the previous speaker, and perhaps I can also clear up some of the problems before the House in this matter. Mr. Speaker, if an amendment such as this was moved in connection with the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund your ruling would be absolutely right, because that fund is run by the Government. However, the Superannuation Fund is run not by the Government but by a board. The board invests its money, and it pays to a pensioner a certain amount, with the Government also paying to the pensioner a certain amount. The Government does not pay any money into the Superanuation Fund, and it never has done so. The Superannuation Fund is completely separate from the Goverment; its money are invested by the board; and it carries on its affairs. From time to time, the Government actuary examines the fund, and if there is a surplus some extra benefit to the public servant is usually recommended by the board. If, however, the fund is shown to be deficient, the board makes some recommendations regarding putting the fund in order. I make it clear that this fund is a fund established by public servants and run completely outside of the Government. The Government merely contributes portion of the pension, and under this Bill that proportion is increased to 70 per cent. This future contribution will apply to all pensioners, and it will apply to the pension the widow receives because under the Bill she will automatically receive a bigger pension.

What we are discussing now is something with which the Government has no connection whatever. The fund belongs to the contributors, and certain contributors have paid into it more than this Bill provides they should have paid in. The Bill provides that that surplus money shall be paid back to them. This money has been paid by contributors into a pension fund, and the Bill provides that it shall be repaid to them but it is not to be paid to the widow of the pensioner. This provision will not add ¼d. to the Government's contribution of 70 per cent, as that is fixed. The board at present has, by virtue of this Bill, a surplus to the credit of certain contributors who have paid more than they should have paid under the Bill. But for some reason, the money shall go back to a pensioner but not to a pensioner's widow. This is not a provision for the appropriation of money, as no Government expenditure is involved. This is a superannuation fund owned by contributors, and it now has certain moneys in it because people under the formula provided by the Bill are in credit in that fund.

They could have received a lump sum, but the method provided by the Bill is that it shall go back by payments in addition to the ordinary pension. This will not cost the Government anything. Supposing a public servant retired and he was £200 in credit in the fund. If he died tomorrow his wife would be deprived of that, but if he lived for, say, six years that amount would be given to him. I cannot understand how anyone can say that that is an appropriation of public money. This Bill is to control the distribution of certain moneys in the Superannuation Fund but there is no suggestion of extra payments by the Treasurer. I should have thought that the Minister would have said that the Government was prepared to move this amendment to enable justice to be done. Your ruling, Sir, is based on a misconception. If this had referred to the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund it would have been correct, because the Government makes up, is responsible for, and pays out certain moneys. But here the fund provides 30 per cent and the Government 70 per cent. The Government will continue to provide the appropriate proportion to the widow, but she is being deprived of a credit that her husband had in the fund, and which is not Government money. Your ruling, Sir, is not based on the knowledge of the circumstances, and I regret that I have to disagree to it.

Mr. McKee: You said the Government had to make this money up.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government does not have to do that.

Mr. McKee: If the fund is decreased it does.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No it does not: that is a misconception. If the fund is insolvent, the Public Actuary requests that additional contributions come from contributors, and if the fund is more than solvent the board makes adjustments for additional

benefits. The Government is responsible for 70 per cent of the pension that is not provided by the fund, and that will not be altered by this amendment. The widow of a pensioner should not be denied the credit in the fund because the husband died before he had drawn it. I would agree with what the Attorney-General said if he had been referring to the Parliamentary Superannuation Fund. Periodically, the Public Actuary reports on the state of the fund and it is sometimes necessary to put in additional money. The Attorney-General would be correct if this was a Government fund paying a pension, but the Government pays only 70 per cent here. There is no suggestion that that will not be paid to the widow, but what will not be paid to her is the credit that her husband had paid into the fund and had there when he died. His credit in the fund dies with him. I cannot see the justice of that. I do not know how the provision got into the Bill at all. I ask the House not to accept the ruling, which I consider was made on the assumption that the Government is responsible for the fund, whereas the contributors only are responsible for it.

The SPEAKER: Standing Order No. 283 clearly provides that every Bill which authorizes expenditure of money shall be founded upon resolution of a Committee of the whole House submitted by a Minister. That applies to every Bill. One of the difficult decisions I had to make was whether this amendment could be regarded in the same light as a Bill. I have had recourse to previous procedure in this House and have found that the House has always accepted that the same principle applies to an amendment as applies to a Bill.

The Leader of the Opposition was kind enough to inform me yesterday that he had in mind moving this amendment, and because it has been my desire to protect at all times the rights of private members to move amendments, having had 30 years' experience of trying to move similar amendments myself, I have had investigations made as to whether this amendment does involve additional Government expenditure. The Chair cannot be concerned at this stage with the justice, wisdom or merits of this provision, but we are concerned with the machinery of Parliament and are charged with the responsibility of administering the Standing Orders as they are printed and in accordance with acknowledged custom.

So that I could be on safe ground, for my own protection, and for the purpose of protecting, as far as possible, the rights of private members to move this, I have had inquiries made outside this House of the best authorities I could consult, and their response to me is that unquestionably this amendment does involve additional Government expenditure. The whole basis of this disagreement with the Chairman's ruling and the Speaker's ruling revolves around that point. It is perfectly clear that, if it involves Government expenditure, the ruling is correct. If it does not involve Government expenditure, then I agree that the Leader of the Opposition is correct, but I have checked this with the best authority available to me, including people who administer some of these funds, and the advice in every case is that this amendment undoubtedly involves expenditure of Government money, and on that basis I have ruled that it is not competent to be moved by other than a Minister.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (18).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Brookman and Teusner. Noes.—Messrs. Clark and Hughes.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

In Committee.

Clause 8—"Provisions applicable after February 1, 1966."

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

In new section 75c (2) to strike out "as from the first day of February, One thousand nine hundred and sixty-six".

The amendment is to remove some words that might be misconstrued. The purpose of new section 75c is to make provisions apply on and after February 1, 1966. As drafted, subsections (2) and (5) could be argued to mean that, if a male contributor died, say, in 1967, his widow would be entitled to a pension at the new higher rate retrospective to February 1, 1966, which is clearly not intended. Otherwise, a pensioner and his wife could both receive a pension at the same time during the pensioner's lifetime. It is purely a drafting amendment, and I ask the Committee to accept it.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

In new section 75c (5) to strike out "as from the first day of February, One thousand nine hundred and sixty-six".

This is to correct another drafting error.

Amendment carried.

Mr. COUMBE: I move:

In new section 75c (8) to strike out all words after "in addition to his pension".

The effect of this amendment will be to remove the following words:

Such difference shall not be deemed to be part of the pension of the pensioner for the purpose of determining any pension payable to his widow upon his death.

This should not bring up the objection that you, Mr. Chairman, raised to a previous amendment, as taking out these words does not affect the appropriation in this Bill and there will be no further charge on the Crown.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Torrens has moved, in effect, an amendment similar to the amendment he moved earlier, and I have no alternative but to rule it out of order.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Before you give a ruling on that, Mr. Chairman, I point out that the previous amendment made it obligatory on the fund to make certain payments, but this amendment does not do that. If it has any effect at all, it merely establishes the position that anyone who has a right can exercise it. The previous provision prevented people from exercising a right they might have had. We are not expressing any view on whether they have a right, although we believe they have and members opposite do not believe they have. All this amendment does is leave the clause silent on the matter. I do not know that it can be called an appropriation when it does not do anything; it merely leaves the law to what would be decided in common equity.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will give the ruling again, but before doing so let me clear it up. From line 26 onwards the new subsection provides:

. . . the contribution by the Government to the Fund shall after the said thirty-first day of January, One thousand nine hundred and sixty-six be an amount equal to seventy per centum of such pension and the difference between the total of the contributions made by the Government before and after the said thirty-first day of January, One thousand nine hundred and sixty-six shall be paid thereafter to the pensioner in addition to his pension.

There is a provision for an increase or for the payment of a difference. The words proposed to be struck out provide that this shall not be deemed to be part of the pension, and the honourable member for Torrens has moved that those words be struck out. That deletes the provision that fixes the date for the cessation of that difference to be paid. I have no alternative but to rule the amendment out of order.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Before you make a definite ruling, Mr. Chairman, I ask you to consider what is involved if your ruling stands. It will mean that not even one word can be struck out of a financial provision in a Bill. It will make the work of the Committee a complete travesty. Your ruling automatically means that no money Bill in future can be amended in any way whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN: That is not correct.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I seriously ask you to examine your ruling. We do not seek to allow just any person to have a right to the entitlement. The person concerned would still have to establish his right if, indeed, he had one. We previously tried to reverse the relevant wording, but we are not even trying to do that now. It seems that the powers that be desire to refuse a widow the right to claim a sum of money paid into the pension fund by her late husband. You, Mr. Chairman, for many years have insisted that members should have the right to move amendments.

Mr. McKee: He was never successful though.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not know why the Treasurer, himself, does not move this amendment. It would apply only to a few cases, but it is so obviously fair and just that it should have been included in the original Bill.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I repeat that when the Bill was introduced complete agreement had been reached by the committee as to its provisions. The entitlement for a widow was increased from 60 to 65 per cent. The Opposition now seeks to impose further expenditure on the Government. We cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. COUMBE: We appreciate the Treasurer's comments regarding the help and assistance the Government has received from the committee, as well as the fact that unanimity existed between him and the committee. However, that still does not mean we have to accept the committee's recommendations. Neither does it preclude any honourable member from seeking to improve a recommendation made by any committee, however efficient it may be. We seek only to improve the lot of a certain type of pensioner or his widow, and we are in no

way causing an appropriation that you, Mr. Chairman, would rule out of order. We believe the amendment imposes no charge on the Government.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The widow may not even receive the benefit.

Mr. COUMBE: No. This is a sincere effort to circumvent your previous ruling, Sir, and so to provide this benefit. I ask the Committee to agree to the amendment.

Mr. SHANNON: I find it difficult to believe that members of the superannuation committee would go out of their way to penalize their wives and bar them from a benefit that they themselves may enjoy during their lifetime.

Mr. McKee: You can't understand it, because that situation doesn't exist.

Mr. SHANNON: I cannot believe that members of the committee would be parties to such an anomaly.

Mr. McKee: You just want to have an argument!

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Onkaparinga.

Mr. SHANNON: As a married man, I can understand that the members of the committee would desire to provide for their wives if and when they became widows. It will not be a costly matter for the Government to accept the amendment, because I believe that, in the final analysis, the fund will carry the extra cost involved. No extra contributions will be required by passing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Will the honourable member take his seat. While this discussion has been taking place I have consulted with the Speaker on the amendment moved by the member for Torrens, and the Speaker agrees that a doubt exists as to its admissibility. Consequently, he suggests (and I agree with him) that it be left to the Committee to decide, and I rule the amendment in order.

Mr. SHANNON: That is a little ray of light in a very dark afternoon: we are to be permitted to carry out our function of examining the legislation on its merits and expressing our views. Much legislation introduced this session has had to be nearly re-written by the Government, only because it has been too hurried. Sufficient time has not been devoted to it before its reaching Parliament. This is another such case. These Bills are not being scrutinized as they should be.

Mrs. STEELE: I am interested that honourable members are interested in widows. I am amazed that there has been so much ado about the small amount involved in trying to get this concession for pensioners' widows and am surprised that the Treasurer should have said that these amendments were agreed to by the Government Superannuation Fund Committee, that it accepted this clause. I have a number of pensioners and pensioners' widows in my district. They will be interested by the comments made on this part of the Bill and to learn that the Government is loath to grant them this small concession. I hope the amendment will be accepted by the Committee, because it is in the interests of widows of pensioners.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I heartily support the amendment, which I am glad can now be voted on. It is a good amendment, which merely strikes out the "demption" (I suppose one can call it) from this provision. This will help widows. It will not mean any further payment by the Government, because the difference will be made up by the Superannuation Fund. If there is any principle at all to which we should stick as members of this Committee and by which the Government should be guided, it is that of generosity to widows, to women who have been unfortunate enough to be deprived of their husbands and to have to carry on on their own. For that reason above all this is a good amendment: there is no reason to go further than that in supporting it. I hope that the milk of human kindness is flowing on the front bench opposite and that the Ministers will support this amendment. It is a generous move.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (17).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Tuesner and Brookman. Noes—Messrs. Clark and Hughes.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (9 and 10) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

In Committee.

(Continued from November 16. Page 2861.)

Clause 13—"Penalty for offences in reference to receipts."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I ask the Treasurer not to insist on this clause as I believe it is the most objectionable clause in the Bill. By extending the requirement for receipts the Government is doing a serious disservice to industry and commerce in the State. The provisions in the Bill with regard to receipts make the position farcical. The Treasurer said that this part of the Bill was not designed to produce revenue. He said that the section of the Bill dealing with cheques would provide revenue and that part of the Bill has been agreed to by the Committee. In view of this I ask the Treasurer to ensure the passage of the Bill by striking out this clause which, in my opinion, would ultimately be prejudicial to the community.

Mr. HALL: I support the Leader's request. Bookkeeping is not easy for a primary producer although in most cases the books are kept fairly well. This provision will mean that another group of papers will need to be kept and this will be a personal restriction. Many non-commercial businesses and many businesses run by individuals that do not employ accountants to carry out this type of work will be affected.

Mr. HEASLIP: I also support the Leader's amendment, because a clause such as this will do nothing but result in increased costs. If we are going to progress in South Australia as we have progressed, we must keep our costs down. In my opinion, there is no need for the compulsory issue and retention of receipts. The Treasurer stated in his second reading explanation that he did not expect any material increase in revenue from duty on receipts, and therefore it seems to me to be foolish to retain a provision that will involve additional labour and cost.

Mr. McANANEY: This clause would involve additional cost and labour. I see no sense in keeping a receipt for two years. What check would there be on whether or not a receipt had been sent out? A person to whom a receipt is sent is not obliged to keep it, and the person who issues it merely has to say that he sent it out. It seems farcical to retain a clause such as this. How it can be enforced, I do not know. In addition, much inconvenience would be involved in having to hold stocks of stamps of varying values.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): The Government does not intend to agree to what has been suggested. Much has been said about the question of receipts. Receipts are often given without question, with stamps on them, in respect of accounts of £2 and over. The question of hardship has been mentioned. This matter has been considered by Cabinet at some length. As I have already indicated, the Government is providing for this stamp duty to apply only to accounts of £5 and over ($10 and over), and we consider that is reasonable.

On the question of keeping receipts, I think the position regarding most business houses has been somewhat exaggerated. At one time I was associated with a small business concern; I used to affix stamps to receipts, but I recall that there were duplicate receipts to which I could refer. I feel certain that all business houses retain duplicate receipts. Although more modern methods are employed today, that same principle would apply. The duplicate receipt will not show the stamp itself, but as a duty stamp has to be defaced there would be some imprint upon the duplicate receipt that is retained. As I pointed out earlier, the old practice of forwarding receipts went overboard somewhat with the increase in postage to a minimum of 5d. I believe the Government is justified in retaining this clause, and I ask the Committee to accept it as it stands. I am prepared to report back to this Parliament in 12 months' time, when members can judge for themselves whether the Government has been right or wrong in the matter.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am sorry that the Treasurer cannot bear with us in this request, for he indicated earlier that no substantial amount of revenue would be derived by these means. This matter involves considerable expense to the community. What the Treasurer will collect from this source will be the smallest part of the money involved in this innovation. I am sure he will realize that, with the high charges for first-class mail, city business houses will be involved in considerable expense. This clause will cut across all established business procedures, thus causing inconvenience to every type of industry. Apparently we are no longer interested in the conventions of any particular industry, and established procedures are now to be completely disregarded and submerged in the new proposals.

I very much regret the attitude adopted by the Treasurer, who told us that he was prepared to have another look at this matter in 12 months' time.

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

Mrs. STEELE: I cannot help feeling that the more I read these subsections the more I wonder, if this Bill is passed in its present form, whether the electors of South Australia will ask, with some justification, if the members of this Parliament are responsible people. Of course, they will not wonder about the Government—their worst fears would be confirmed. If anyone outside the House read the two subsections of clause 13 they should be excused for thinking that this was an excerpt from some Gilbert and Sullivan opera. In 1614 there was a Parliament known as the Addled Parliament. It was so called because it sat for two months without passing a Bill: perhaps we are getting to that stage at present. In this year of grace of 1965, this Parliament may go down to posterity and be known as the Addled Parliament of 1965, because of the addled thinking of Government members. We know that Governments have to produce revenue, but this legislation is revising what is an established, proved, and accepted practice that has been operating now for years, not only in South Australia but elsewhere in Australia. I am not urging the Government to consider its reputation, because soon it will not have one to speak of, but this Bill will antagonize everyone, both the giver and receiver of money alike, and for this reason I hope the Bill will not be supported in the House.

Mr. SHANNON: The Postmaster-General's Department will be the major winner in extra revenue as it will receive the money from the stamps on letters posted with the cheque and also when the receipt is posted. The holding of a receipt for two years means nothing. What will be the *modus operandi* of policing this provision?

From the point of view of permanence of the record of payment of money, the cheque is much better than the receipt, because cheques are kept by the banks for six years, whereas receipts are flimsy pieces of paper that may or may not be available when they are wanted. I place receipts that I receive in a drawer and when the drawer becomes overloaded (and I think the honourable member for Enfield has the correct term for this) I shorthand them into the waste paper basket. This clause does not make it an offence to throw away a receipt, so policing will be so difficult that it will be impracticable. I know the Government's intention is to raise funds, but its taxation measures should be capable of being policed.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I have sat here for the last few days listening to eloquent and rambunctious speeches from the Opposition about the idiocy of the Government's financial measures. We heard in a speech from the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) this evening about how addled and completely idiotic this proposal was. We were told strongly that we would go down in history as being a Parliament similar to the Addled Parliament in the 17th century and a portent to the remainder of this country and, indeed, the whole Commonwealth. Apparently the burden of the argument about this provision is that it will place extraordinary difficulties in the way of business, that it is an unreasonable provision, and that business will go down under the weight of it because it will add greatly to the cost of business in South Australia. I am an interested, if not an avid, reader of the propaganda of the Party opposite. It tends federally to talk not so much about developments in South Australia (that is done only by the local branch of the Liberal Party) but about the booming State of great development which has a wonderful future and which has a government that is really going ahead—Western Australia. In that State the Brand Government is apparently showing the way, in rugged individualism and free enterprise, in the development of the marvellous potential. It is interesting that Western Australia which, according to the Liberal Party's Commonwealth office, is going ahead much more quickly than South Australia (or any other State in Australia) has had this particular provision that we are proposing to write into our Act on its Statute Books since 1922.

Mr. Millhouse: How well does it work?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It works sufficiently well that the Brand Government re-enacted it in 1962. Let me read what section 99 (1) of the Western Australian Stamp Duties Act provides:

> If any person (*a*) gives any receipt liable to duty and not duly stamped; or (*b*) in any case where a receipt would be liable to duty refuses to give a receipt duly stamped; —

and that, of course, is similar to our provision—

> or (*c*) upon a payment to the amount of £1—

which was altered to £5 in 1962 by the Brand Government, just as we are providing here at the moment—

or upwards gives a receipt for a sum not amounting to £5, or separates or divides the amount paid with intent to evade duty, he shall be liable to a penalty. . . .

Subsection (2) states:

If upon payment of an amount—

which was originally £1 but was altered by the Brand Government in 1962 to £5—

of £5 or upwards in any case where a receipt would be liable to duty, the person who receives the payment does not give or tender to the person who makes the payment a receipt in writing duly stamped, the person who receives such payment shall be guilty of an offence. . .

So Western Australians have to make out the receipt and stamp it. That has been their law since 1922, and it has not so unduly burdened the commercial life of the State. Indeed, the citizens of Western Australia have staggered on under a series of apparently addled Governments (according to the member for Burnside, and according to the Commonwealth Branch of the Liberal Party) tolerably well-governed during that period. A similar provision exists in the States of Victoria and New South Wales. The Liberal Governments in both those States seem not to have seen fit to remove from their Stamp Duties Act the provision now being written into our Act. Strangely enough, the rate of industrial growth in both those States far exceeds the rate of industrial growth ever achieved in this State under the Playford Government.

Mr. Heaslip: Where did you get that information?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: From the Commonwealth Statistician. If the honourable member wishes to see the *Commonwealth Year Book*, he will see this clearly stated. In fact, if he is interested in the details of this matter, he will see that they were set forth by the Employers Federation in considerable detail to the Conciliation and Arbitration Commission in the last differential basic wage case in its hearing in Adelaide, supported by Crown counsel instructed by the Playford Government. I really cannot think that honourable members opposite are particularly fussed about this, but that they are making the kind of noise they have been making for some time, without any great basis for doing so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney-General has made quite a witty and clever little speech in the last five minutes, but it leaves me entirely unimpressed.

Mr. Shannon: You aren't even secretly amused.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No. I could not care less what they do in Western Australia, Victoria or New South Wales. We are talking about South Australia. I remind the honourable and learned Attorney-General that we are South Australians and that this is the South Australian Parliament. We happen to be trying to legislate (although the Government is hampering us) for this State. We all know that the Party opposite, of which the Attorney-General is a leading light, does not believe in the federal system of Government, but we do. This provision is absurd. I intend to oppose it and do not care two hoots what happens in other States.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We are capable of taking the enlightening example of your colleague.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not call the example "enlightening" in this case. I regret that I did not hear the speech of the member for Burnside but I was going to refer to the Addled Parliament, anyway. The Addled Parliament met in 1614, and its record would be no worse than the record of this Parliament if this is an example of the sort of legislation we are going to pass. The only reason for this measure is gathering in more revenue through stamp duties by obliging a receipt to be given in every case. That is just too silly. This will cost the community far more than the Government can hope to get out of it. It will be an inconvenience and nuisance to everybody. How will it be policed? Honourable members should oppose this clause as strongly as possible.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Had it not been for the intervention of the Attorney-General, I should not have spoken again. I should have thought it would be more appropriate for the Attorney-General, instead of citing Western Australia, New South Wales and Victoria as a background for imposing this peculiar legislation on South Australia, to go to the shopping area of Glenelg, Norwood, Goodwood, or Unley, and ask the people there what they thought about this provision. Although the Treasurer said in his second reading explanation that little revenue was involved in this provision, I believe it is designed to obtain revenue for the Government. The objection all logical people have to the clause is that for every £1 that the Government receives from it, the cost to commercial and rural communities in the State will probably be not less than £3. Surely one of the important considerations for a Government when it is imposing tax is to ensure not only that it obtains revenue but also that it does not seriously inconvenience or increase the

costs of the public. A similar proposition to this was put up to me many years ago when I was Treasurer (and we were pretty hard up at the time), but I turned it down flat. The clause involves the public in extra expense at a time when costs are already increasing and when business activities are facing problems. One needs only to look at the balance of payments position over the last two years to understand some of these problems.

The Treasurer said that he was prepared to observe this measure in practice for a year and then to have another look at it, but I think it would be better to delay it for a year. When he said that he would look at it again in a year's time it showed that he intends to experiment. I cannot understand the reasoning that dominates the Treasury benches now. The Government looks around Australia until it finds a State that has a certain tax a little higher than a tax here and then it uses that as an iron-clad reason for increasing this State's tax. Our conditions are not the same as those in Western Australia or New South Wales or Victoria. We in this State have a much more difficult economic problem to overcome in order to go ahead. New South Wales and Victoria are more heavily populated States, with their own home markets, and we have to sell our commodities in competition with those States on their home markets. Western Australia probably has the greatest amount of natural wealth of any State in the Commonwealth, for it has boundless resources of iron ore and minerals of various types, as well as enormous land areas enjoying a high rainfall. Incidentally, I notice that Western Australia was not brought into comparison last night when we were discussing succession duties. That was an entirely different matter!

I ask the member for Glenelg (who is a great advocate of this sort of taxation and never misses an opportunity, when there is a Bill before Parliament, to advocate more taxation) to go down to Glenelg and ask the people there what they think of this clause. I invite the members for Chaffey, Mount Gambier and Millicent and any other members to consult the people in the big towns in their district about what they think of this provision. I think those members will come to the conclusion that what the Treasurer has said is correct: that we will experiment with this legislation, but we will not experiment with it this year; we will leave it until some other time when the economic position is much more stable than it is at present. I hope the Committee will not accept this clause. I am sure the members I have mentioned have not been in close contact with their districts, otherwise they would not be supporting this.

Mr. HUDSON: One thing we can be confident of is that the Leader of the Opposition can always be goaded into getting to his feet. I have already met the shopkeepers in my district, and I have been staggered by the number that have said to me, "Look at these receipts that we have received without duty stamps on them." In one case, only one of the firms that had issued a receipt to the shopkeeper concerned had placed a duty stamp on the receipt; the rest of them evaded it. This particular shopkeeper and one or two others pointed out to me that this was a possible source of revenue, and that is the only evidence that I have at the present time about the way shopkeepers feel on this matter. I point out to the member for Mitcham that there is nothing in this legislation that requires receipts to be given. Receipts must be written out, but they do not have to be handed over to the person who makes the payment, and they do not have to be sent.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Not unless they are demanded.

Mr. HUDSON: That is so, and if they are not demanded they stay in the book.

Mr. Millhouse: What is the purpose of keeping a receipt with a stamp on it in the book?

Mr. HUDSON: How many firms do not keep records of payments they have? What is the purpose of levying duty on receipts that are sent and not on those that stay in the book? What is the distinction? I am amazed that whenever an expenditure item is being discussed the Leader of the Opposition always says that the Government is not spending enough, but when we are trying to get more revenue in order to spend enough, the Leader of the Opposition then says that it is a scandal, it is shocking, and it should not be done. As I have said before, the Leader cannot add up.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: If he can, he does not try.

Mr. HUDSON: Firms keep receipts even without the provision of this legislation, and if duplicate receipts are in the book they can be inspected and an assessment can be made of the duty that would have to be paid on the receipts in a particular book. A check can be made to find out the amount of stamp duty that has been paid. If the member for Onkaparinga had thought about that, he would have realized that that could be done.

Mr. Shannon: Have you tried to work out how you would relate a particular receipt to a particular transaction in a retail store?

Mr. HUDSON: There is an amount on the receipt, and this can be checked against the payment.

Mr. Shannon: Do you know the number of items going through a retail store daily?

Mr. HUDSON: There is a problem about those things, but the member for Onkaparinga knows that if a retail store writes a receipt for an amount over £5, although that amount may be made up of different items, the receipt is dutiable under the legislation. Who is the honourable member kidding? There would be a greater opportunity to inspect and check on possible evasion of this duty than there is under the present law, and under the present law evasion is rife.

Mr. HEASLIP: The Attorney-General is advocating uniformity: because someone in another State does it we have to do it. Why should we have to do it if it is done by Western Australia? Apparently if New South Wales does it so do we. I oppose uniformity, but apparently the Labor Party is wholeheartedly in favour of uniformity for uniformity's sake. We have had this type of thing in other legislation. Because other States' charges are higher we have to do the same. That is not the way South Australia has progressed in the past. We have progressed because we have kept down our costs. Evidently, the Attorney-General forgets that South Australia is the driest and least arable State in the Commonwealth and that most of it has an annual rainfall of less than 10in.

It is ridiculous to say that we can compete with other States. Western Australia, with its huge area, has mineral resources and has a wheat crop this year of more than 100,000,000 bushels. New South Wales also has a huge area, and a higher rainfall than South Australia. We must remember that people go broke when they try to keep up with their neighbours who have more money. That has happened in South Australia. Despite the lack of resources, before the change of Government here we had more savings per capita than any other State in the Commonwealth and we were taking more migrants than any other State. The member for Glenelg is an authority on everything, the valuation of land and everything else, but he has never lived in the country.

Mr. Freebairn: He has never been in business, either.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know about that.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: He has his feet on the land, just as you have.

Mr. HEASLIP: If the Minister of Education is trying to compare a man in King William Street with a man in the country, putting up with all the disadvantages of the country, he does not know what he is talking about.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The Minister of Education has done more hard work on the land than you have.

Mr. HEASLIP: He may have, but if the member for Glenelg went to the country, about which he calls himself a specialist, for just one weekend and put up with some of the disabilities suffered by country people all the year round, he would know more about the subject. The Minister of Education does not know what he is talking about in saying that a man standing on his two feet in King William Street is a man on the land.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If you let us get some money we could build the silo you want.

Mr. HEASLIP: But you will take it from the people in the country.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Over 60 per cent of the people in this State live in the city.

Mr. HEASLIP: I represent people in the country and I do not like to see them being fleeced. Without the primary producer there could not be secondary industries in any country in the world, and this clause will mean an added cost to both primary and secondary production. We must compete with the larger States, and all these extra charges will make competition difficult. When we reach that stage, secondary industries will cease to operate.

Mr. QUIRKE: States collect taxation in the form of stamp duties or in some other way and, conditions being as they are, we cannot object to that. However, anyone with the slightest idea of running a business would not attempt to collect this tax in this way, as at least 50 per cent of the potential tax will not be collected. The responsibility of collecting this tax is placed on the people selling goods. Also, every employer has to collect payroll tax, and this work in a big business necessitates the employment of additional staff. The purchaser will inevitably have to pay the tax; business firms will not. Every firm has numbered dockets that can be easily registered for stamp duty purposes; the duplicate docket books can be presented for taxation and the one cheque paid for the taxation due on that

book. Would the Government be prepared to do that sort of thing? It would be a simple matter that would save on customs, excise and other charges. I venture to assert, though, that if the Government undertook that scheme it would give the game away completely, because it would cost too much to collect the tax.

Industries will be burdened with the collection of tax that will be passed on to the consumer. If the Government is so bent on collecting this tax, let it collect the tax itself. I do not object to paying a few pence to the Government if it requires it, but why should the cost of collecting such taxes always be on the consumer? What do we do with duty on cheques? Every company takes its cheque books along to the stamp duties office, where the stamps are impressed on the cheque forms and an account paid according to the number of impressions placed on the cheques. The public does not pay individually for a silly duty stamp. We pay a lump sum that is added on to the value of the cheque book. Why not collect the tax in that way? That is the right and proper way, for it is more or less foolproof. With registered numbers, cheque books can be produced for assessment, and the account paid accordingly. What is the alternative? Some big stores favour a pneumatic service for sending the customers' money upstairs and bringing back the receipts and the change. Other large stores have cash registers. The assistants, who are already running around like scalded cats, have to stop, make an entry in a docket, and put a stamp on it. The balance shows on every cash register and the stamps issued have to be compared with the money recorded in the docket books.

Mr. McANANEY: The Attorney-General said that South Australia was lagging behind other States in industrial development. There was practically no such development in South Australia 30 years ago. From the 1 per cent or 2 per cent that we had of the industrial development in Australia in those days we have now reached 9.28 per cent, so from scratch we have almost caught up to the Australian average. We are well above the average in primary production, which is about 10.5 per cent. The average for the numbers of houses in Australia is 10.52 per cent, while South Australia's average is 11.55. State expenditure on education, health, hospitals and charities is £523 in South Australia, the Australian average being £516. Our taxation rate is £123 (for both State and Commonwealth tax) per head, whereas the Australian average is £164. Under a Liberal Government the State of Western Australia has progressed tremendously. It matters not, however, what provisions operate in respect of stamp duty in Western Australia, Siberia or Timbuctoo.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order! I ask the honourable member to link his remarks to clause 13. He referred to the remark of the Attorney-General, and the Attorney-General was comparing the stamp duty as contained in clause 13 with the Act that operates in Western Australia. I have been lenient with the honourable member for Stirling but he must now come back to clause 13.

Mr. McANANEY: This measure would mean much work to accomplish very little. I oppose it.

The Committee divided on the clause:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Broomhill, Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

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

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Clark and Hughes. Noes—Messrs. Brookman and Teusner.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 14—"Repeal of heading to and sections 91 to 105 inclusive of principal Act."

Mr. SHANNON: It seems to me that a money-hungry Government such as this is passing up a golden opportunity by repealing these sections in respect of amusements duty. There could be no evasions here, and there would be no difficulty in policing such provisions. These sections deal with something that in our social life can be classified more or less as a luxury, for people who can afford to go to public entertainment these days can well afford to pay tax. Apparently this Government is not interested in seeking revenue from sources which can well afford to provide it.

I am aware that taxing amusements is unpopular with some people. In my judgment, racing is a form of amusement, entertainment and relaxation, and I would have thought that a Government seeking revenue would have been pursuing the sport of racing rather than relieving it of any possible impost. It seems that the Government is more concerned with

seeking revenue from the people in industrious business concerns who are trying to do something to promote the welfare of the general community. If anyone can tell me that there is anything in the amusement world that is any great benefit to the rank and file of the community, I want to hear about it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why do we have a Festival of Arts?

Mr. SHANNON: I am prepared to tax that.

Mr. Hudson: Would you tax people going to the football or the cricket?

Mr. SHANNON: Yes, definitely, proportionately to their enjoyment. Those are the sort of things we can afford to tax. It is not a matter of compulsion but one of taxing a source that does not harm the State's economy. We have loaded the impact of raising funds for Government purposes on to things which have a bearing on the welfare of all sections of the community. During the Second World War racing was banned, a decision that was unpopular with a section of the people. However, for the purposes of the economy of the State and to enable essential services to be carried on, it was desirable. Admittedly this was a wartime measure. If money is required to carry on the Government of the State we should consider the fields best able to carry the burden with the least effect on and embarrassment to business interests, which have to compete with Victoria and New South Wales, our major competitors. We have to take our goods to their markets and still compete with them. We should be trying to preserve any margin we have, and this is why we are on the wrong track about duty stamp tax.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The definition of "amusement" in the Act includes many things. It is many years since an amusement tax operated in this State, and it is not the intention of the Government, and never was, to re-introduce a system of tax on amusements, particularly in relation to the list as shown in the Act. I disagree with the opinion of the member for Onkaparinga that there should be a tax on amusements of any description. He referred to the Festival of Arts. Guarantors are involved in the holding of this festival and, if it were taxed, the attendances would not be so great as they were at the last festival when no amusement tax operated. We have gone further on this occasion and have said that there will be more free entertainment at the Festival of Arts. If we endeavoured to impose tax on the festival, it would be a failure before it began. We intend to take the provisions concerning amusement duty out of the legislation, and I therefore commend the clause to honourable members.

Mr. SHANNON: A strange line of reasoning is being adopted on this matter. The Commonwealth Government, the major taxing authority in Australia, applies its energies to excise duty on what are called luxury items. It has applied duty savagely on items such as alcoholic liquor and cigarettes. I point out that it is strange for a Government to start taxing essentials and to let luxury items go scot free. The people who go to amusements have money to spend. They would not go if they did not. Hence, I make no apology for my suggestion that the policy of the present Government in regard to the imposition of taxes in advancing its programme is badly founded.

Clause passed.

Clause 15—"Amendment of Second Schedule to principal Act."

Mr. COUMBE: I refer to paragraph (*g*), which I understand is aimed at deleting item 5 from the exemption list in the schedule. This item refers to receipts for money withdrawn by any depositor from the Savings Bank. Such withdrawals are now exempt from stamp duty, but this clause removes them from the exemption. Can the Treasurer explain this?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: As I understand it, these are still exempt, as a receipt will not be required for moneys withdrawn by any depositor from the Savings Bank.

Mr. SHANNON: Paragraph (*e*) sets out a graduated scale of stamp duty on receipts. I should like to know whether the Eastern States and Western Australia have graduated scales or whether they have a standard tax on all receipts. It will be a simple matter for a clerk working under pressure to place the wrong stamp on a receipt, which, unfortunately, is an offence. Does this variation apply in any of the other States referred to by the Attorney-General?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Replying, first, to the member for Onkaparinga, so far as I know, no graduated scale exists in the other States.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I think Victoria has a graduated scale.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We were unable to establish the Victorian situation. Western Australia does not have a graduated scale. On the other hand, I really do not think that the scale provided in the Bill will place any undue impost on transactions of the kind that

are set forth. In reply to the member for Torrens, the striking out of item 5 is a consequential amendment on the alteration to item 3. Item 3 states:

Receipt for money deposited in any bank in current account and not as a fixed deposit for any period.

As amended, it will read:

Receipt for money deposited in or withdrawn from any bank other than money deposited in any bank as a fixed deposit for any period.

Therefore, the exemption is widened.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Under the heading "Letter of Allotment", honourable members will see that the duty under the Bill has risen from 1c to 5c, which is completely out of line with the increases provided in other sections of the Bill. I am informed that letters of allotment are normally connected with the allotment of shares, and are frequently merely an intimation of a small parcel of shares being allotted. However, when the shares are paid for, they are subject to the ordinary receipt charges.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It is proposed that they pay only 6d.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: At present people are paying 1d.; under the new provision they will pay 5c.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: For a letter of allotment.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am informed that this is frequently a minor transaction but, in any case, the transaction pays the receipt, so it is a double charge. Why is this charge so out of line with the others? Precisely what does this refer to?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I agree that the present Act provides for 1d. on this type of transaction.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: In any case, it is not a transaction: it is only the intimation of a transaction. The transaction is made after that.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is the allotment of any share or part of any share in a company or proposed company or scrip certificate. I am no authority on shares but it appears to me that 1d. has been fixed as a nominal fee. We are changing over to decimal currency. How can we charge anything much less than 6d., which is equivalent to 5c? If we go much below that, where shall we finish? By any comparison of figures, I cannot see that this will be a hardship on anybody.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am at a loss to understand the Treasurer's statement that we cannot get much less than 5c. We can print a stamp of whatever denomination is required. We do not put a coin on the document—we put a stamp on it, and that stamp can be of any denomination we like. So it could be 2c just as easily as it could be 5c. I have had this represented to me as being an onerous charge, particularly as it will be duplicated by the receipt that still has to be given on the transaction.

Mr. SHANNON: The point that the Leader is trying to drive home is that this 5c charge will apply upon either a modest or a large transaction. It has no relation whatever to the final stamp that a particular transaction attracts. A 5c tax on a document could be a heavily increased impost. I notice in paragraph (*h*) the unusual word "menial" is used. I am surprised that we use this early Victorian language to describe a certain section of the community. It struck me on the raw when I saw it. I do not like talking about people as menials. This is more evidence of the lack of careful oversight by the Government of legislation prepared for consideration by this Chamber.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: This word has been in the Act since the time of Queen Victoria, and we are taking it out.

Mr. SHANNON: Honourable members opposite are becoming hot under the collar when I point out their shortcomings.

Mr. Jennings: How can it be because of our shortcomings?

Mr. SHANNON: The Government had an opportunity to redraft the Bill. However, with many of these measures the Government is taking them *en bloc*. A Bill is introduced and then a string of amendments by the Government appears on the file.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Is the honourable member well, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: I am not responsible for whether the honourable member is well or whether he understands the clause.

Mr. SHANNON: I am amused at the vociferous denials coming from the Treasury benches about this word appearing in the Bill. After all, the Government was responsible for putting this Bill on the file.

Mr. COUMBE: I should like some information about the application of paragraph (*e*). I examined the exemption list for hire-purchase transactions and mortgages. Stamp duty is levied on the original payment. Therefore, if a person makes a payment of £5 a month on a house or motor car does this mean, as

the application of the duty stamp is mandatory, that every instalment paid by that person must have attached to it a duty stamp?

Mr. McANANEY: I have received a letter about stamp duties as they apply to education fees. The letter deals with private schools but the same circumstances would probably apply to university students where term fees for some courses would be at least £50 and a 1s. duty stamp would have to be used each term.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They have duty stamps now.

Mr. McANANEY: On the one hand the Government subsidizes university students and on the other hand it imposes an extra fee; this seems to be robbing Peter to pay Paul. To emphasize that I am not just giving my own personal views, I shall read a section of the letter relating to this matter. It states:

At present the secretary has a very efficient method of issuing accounts for fees, and he does not furnish a receipt unless it is specially asked for. It appears that if the amendment becomes law he will have to write out a receipt in every case and stamp it even if it is not required by the person paying the account. Apart from the direct burden of stamp duty which this will impose upon the school, it will mean that the secretary has to perform wasteful work for which the school must pay. This is an unfair burden to add to those the school already has to bear in struggling to make ends meet.

I think the Government should consider granting an exemption in this matter. A term's fee in a number of courses would amount to more than £50, so with 6,000 students the Government would be collecting about £1,000 a year.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have noticed with some interest that while the Government is so keen on making everybody else write out receipts the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs, for some reason or another, has a place in the sun and is exempt. Can the Minister explain why the special dispensation should apply to him and not to any other Minister, for example, or to any other authority?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What are you referring to?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Item 14b, "Hire-Purchase Agreement made or entered into by the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is quite obvious that the Leader needs considerable enlightenment. He has repeated in the Committee the mistake he made earlier through not doing his homework and reading what is plainly in front of him. This does not exempt the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs from giving receipts at all, for it has nothing to do with receipts. Receipts will still have to be made out. This exemption to which the Leader refers deals not with receipts for payments but with stamps on hire-purchase agreements. These hire-purchase agreements (which are not executed by any other Government department at all) are exempt because in the Aboriginal Affairs Department we advance money on special terms to people who are under special disabilities, and we see no reason in those circumstances why we should go through the motions of passing the money to the Treasury and getting it back again. In these circumstances the Aboriginal Affairs Board recommended that there be a special exemption in relation to these documents. Under the previous Government they were not stamped although they should have been because they were hire-purchase agreements.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The previous Government believed in people having some freedom.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reason they were not stamped was not because they were not liable for stamp duty. The Leader himself imposed stamp duty on hire-purchase agreements, but his officers did not carry out the law. We had an opinion that stated that it would seem that advances from the Aboriginal Affairs Department, on which the previous Government had not paid stamp duty, were liable for it, and consequently this alteration was made.

Mr. QUIRKE: Item 5 "Receipt" in the Second Schedule of the Act provides that a receipt for money withdrawn by any depositor from the Savings Bank is exempted. In the Bill this has been amended. Does it mean that withdrawals are now taxable?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. Paragraph (*g*) is simply consequential on paragraph (*f*) which is now included with exemptions under exemption 3.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (16 to 18) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ELECTRICAL WORKERS AND CONTRACTORS LICENSING BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 9. Page 2696.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I am conscious that this Bill to license electrical workers provides something new in this State and, as such, needs to be treated with sympathy and encouragement. I personally

consider that we ought to do much to make the use of electricity safer than it is at present. However, I have considerable reservation about the Bill. The honourable member for Unley knows the electrical trade and is correct when he says that there are some shocking examples of wiring and additions to wiring throughout the State. I have confirmed that in conversation with other electricians. I think many people who are not competent mess about with wiring, when they should have nothing whatever to do with it. Having said that, I now mention some of the reservations I have about the Bill.

It seems to me that this Bill is going mad in its enthusiasm to try to make everything so safe. It will achieve a certain degree of safety but it will bring in some unpleasant side effects. I shall not deal with what may be termed the lunatic fringe of the measure, but some interesting points have been made by members on this side, one of which is that it is arguable whether only licensed electricians or certain other specific people will be entitled to change the plugs in a motor car. That was pooh-poohed by the member for Unley, but in no way can I read the Bill and believe that that would be allowed. If the Bill says that one cannot change a plug in a motor car unless one is a licensed electrician or mechanic, it should be tidied up; it should not be left to the administrators of the law to say that this is ridiculous and that nothing will be done about it.

Other things referred to by the member for Gouger were more serious. He pointed out that under the Bill a person using an electrical appliance with bare wires showing in the flex would not be entitled to insulate those wires unless he were a licensed electrician, yet on the other hand there is nothing in the Bill to prevent a person from using an appliance that has bare wires. This is another anomaly that has been pointed out effectively by the honourable member, and I think everything he has said is perfectly correct. If a housewife finds that an appliance has bare wires, I believe not only that she should not use it but that she should not insulate the wires. However, although the Bill will stop her from repairing it, it will not stop her from using it, and that is another fault.

One can buy a replacement element for an electric jug in any hardware store. Most people are perfectly capable of removing the old element and putting in a new element that will be perfectly safe. If there is not some provision to allow people to repair appliances, I think there will be many breaches of the law. I realize that some people cannot be trusted to make repairs without making the appliances dangerous.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Some people cannot be trusted to work a lawnmower.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is so, as some people run over the flex or insert a screwdriver into the mower when it is wet, and so on. In some respects the Bill does not do enough and in many respects it is absurdly severe. What I have mentioned mainly concerns housewives. As I am not an electrician, I would not wire my house or make extensions to the wiring. I believe that the bad wiring that now exists in Adelaide may cause much trouble if people tinker with it. On the other hand, the Bill permits an unlicensed person to change light globes and fuses, which I think is reasonable. The member for Unley has said that he would be in favour of permitting only licensed electricians to repair fuse wires, but where would we get with such a provision? The argument may have some merit, though, because, as the honourable member said, if a fuse blows twice some people will use fencing wire to prevent a recurrence. Although I have not witnessed that practice, I have no doubt that many electricians come across such stupidity on the part of householders. But can we stop that sort of practice by passing the Bill? A person who is so determined to repair a fuse that he will use fencing wire will not observe these provisions. More frequent inspections are necessary.

The observance of this legislation will cost money. Indeed, we have seen sufficient measures introduced into the House this session to make South Australia a high-cost State. We shall not continue to enjoy the easier conditions which made South Australia so attractive to industry in the past and which allowed us to establish industries at low cost. Permitting only qualified electricians to repair electrical wiring in every case will increase costs.

Mr. Langley: A ceiling is fixed by the Prices Commissioner.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not complain about increased costs if it means that danger will be averted, so long as the costs are within reason. However, this sort of thing can get out of hand. Electricity has completely revolutionized farming practices. We have witnessed a tremendous spread of mains electricity throughout the State. Any

farm within reach of mains electricity now accepts it; no longer does the farmer say that he thinks he can generate electricity more cheaply with a diesel engine. A farmer takes electricity from the Electricity Trust when he can, because he knows that it is much better and saves on costs in the long run. Electricity on a farm is used for milking machines in dairies, for cleaning animal houses, and for various poultry and other livestock purposes. With the introduction of lot feeding possibly in the next few years, electricity will obviously be required. One can name dozens of instances in which electricity is used in a farm workshop. Electricity is used to extend the laying hours of hens, and for heat for brooding chickens, as well as for feeding systems. Further, I think we have (although I am not sure about this) electric insect traps. They are certainly used in the United States.

Mr. Shannon: They are available in this State.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I thought they would not be long in coming here. Electricity is used also in sorting and grading (eggs, fruit, or any kind of produce), milling and pumping (the latter being one of its heaviest uses) and, of course, refrigeration. That is my list, but there are many other such items.

There is still another use about which I am worried—electric fencing. Everybody knows that the cost of fencing in Australia, which has comparatively large areas, is enormous for any farm in any area. Whether it is a closely settled or an arid area we need fences. We have larger tracts than in other parts of the world where they have heavier summer rainfall and a higher production rate per acre. Fencing is costly. For perhaps 100 years, or at least from the time when galvanized wire was brought into use until about 15 years ago, there was remarkably little progress in the techniques of fencing. It is only in the last 15 to 20 years that people have started to think about and study fencing. It should have been done much earlier. Some people are now completely altering their fencing practices. Without electricity they have reduced the number of posts a mile; they have made them lighter and are using *pinus radiata*, which formerly rotted in the ground within 12 months but which is now rot-proof. People are using lighter wire, better methods of straining and less barbed wire, all of which techniques have come in in the last few years. Also, there have been developments in electric fencing. In the early days, that was used only to control irrigated feed on dairy farms. Cattle being subject to electricity, one wire would probably stop the average dairy herd, and that wire could be moved day by day to strip-graze certain areas of land. Great advances have been made in some places. For instance, New Zealand has developed permanent electric fencing, which operates also in the eastern parts of Australia, and no doubt in South Australia. Electric fencing is used with sometimes up to six wires in a fence, of which two or three are electrified, the rest being negative and return wires. That sort of thing is coming in and reducing the cost of fencing by about 50 per cent, and sometimes more than that.

There are three ways of providing electricity for electric fencing. First, we can have a 6-volt battery, but in that case it needs an energizer, which greatly increases the voltage. The voltage is stepped up tremendously. Under this Bill voltages in excess of 40 volts are all under control. Secondly, we have wind chargers, which do much the same sort of thing except that they have a propeller driven by the wind. The energy is produced in that way instead of coming from a battery. Thirdly, the latest development (and the one that will be most widely used when electric fencing is fully developed) is mains electricity. I have seen fences in Victoria on mains electricity. Not being an electrician, I do not understand the full import of it. These fences are safe to touch but one would not want to do it twice. I have seen fences to which a bull will not go nearer than 6ft. Cows and calves, or sheep and lambs can be weaned across electric fences without any danger of them getting under the fences or through. On one farm I visited even the sheep dogs had learned where the insulators were and what an insulator was, because they would get through the fences between the insulator and the strainer post. Those are the sorts of development that are taking place particularly in Victoria, and the voltages for these developments are far in excess of 40 volts.

I have an article by Mr. R. L. Piesse, who is probably the leading Australian fencing consultant. I think he has done more for modern fencing techniques than has anybody else in Australia, and he says that about 400 volts is desirable for electrifying a stock fence. That does not mean that anybody who touches a fence is electrocuted but high voltages are still used for the best results. I want to know whether a farmer will be allowed, under

the Bill, to go on fixing these things or whether he will have to call in an electrician when he wants to put in an electric fence. If he must call in an electrician then this will raise considerably the cost of that type of fencing; in fact, it might take much of the advantage away. We know that electric fencing still has some disadvantages. For instance, it needs more attention and maintenance than ordinary wire fencing. If a high cost of installation were added to the disadvantages that already exist, I should think that farmers would be very slow in using it.

Mr. Langley: They license electricians in Victoria.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not know the position in Victoria but I know that the people who put up the electric fences I saw in Victoria were not licensed electricians.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: They will have to be licensed under the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No-one will be able to do any of the things I have talked about without having a licensed electrician. This will make electricians about as hard to get as veterinary surgeons are in some country districts. I should like to know what provision there is for licensing people not fully qualified but who know a certain amount about electrical matters. A person can do quickly whatever he is taught to do in the electrical line. It may not be safe for a completely untrained person even to change an element in a hot water jug, but if that person is given 20 minutes' instruction he can do the job perfectly safely. If a person were given a few weeks' concentrated training in wiring a house he could do the job. Weeks and not years of teaching are necessary for this work. This would enable people to do all the wiring they are likely to want to do in ordinary circumstances. I do not know what provisions will be made under the Bill, or whether people who have done short courses will be allowed to have a licence.

Mr. Langley: I would not think so. When lads do their apprenticeship they will go through most of the electrical grades.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I do not doubt that a full apprenticeship would qualify people for a licence. However, it is easy to teach people certain things quickly. They may not know everything that is necessary, but they will know enough to know what is safe and what is not safe.

Mr. Langley: I am not sure that they will.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Anybody knows that to train a surveyor will take years and years. A surveying course takes so long that we are always chronically short of surveyors, and land development has been held up considerably in the past as a result; yet anybody with a slight knowledge of trigonometry and fairly simple mathematics can be taught to use a theodolite and a dumpy level and other surveying instruments within a few weeks, after which he can satisfactorily carry out certain aspects of surveying work. At the same time, so much is involved in the surveying course that it takes years to complete. I believe that principle applies in the training of electricians. If we do not want to make this a high-cost State regarding electricity we should provide for some means of allowing people with a limited knowledge of electricity to operate, for they are not the ones who are going to get into trouble; the ones who will get into trouble or get other people into trouble are the amateurs who have never been taught anything and probably are the types who think they do not need to learn anything. I have seen a number of glaring examples of dangerous wiring by amateurs, so how many more would an electrician see? That does not necessarily apply to a person who has been trained, however briefly, in the electrical profession. Whatever we do, let us not make it necessary for a person to have to undergo years and years of training before he can get a licence to act under this Bill. If we do, it is going to be a very expensive State in which to get any electrical work done.

Mr. Langley: I think the committee will decide that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I take it the honourable member is referring to the committee to be known as the Electrical Workers' and Contractors' Licensing Advisory Committee.

Mr. Shannon: It may be advisory, but that is all it is.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: That is the point: this word "advisory" describes the work of that committee, for it is purely advisory and nothing it can do will force the administering authority (the Electricity Trust) to take any notice of it. The Bill makes it plain that that committee can only advise; it cannot ordain who is to be licensed and who is not. Incidentally, apart from the lethal aspect of electricity, the committee is in a sudden-death occupation, because I see the Bill prescribes that the Governor may, for any cause which appears to him to be sufficient, remove a member from office. There is none of this shilly-shallying that exists with other committees. For instance, in the case of the committee set up under the Potato Marketing Act there is a series

of reasons for which the Governor may remove a member. The same thing applies under the Marketing of Eggs Act. Those Acts set out the misdemeanours which would justify removal from office. However, in this case the Governor has only to say that he does not want a person on the committee, and that person is out. The Governor, of course, means Executive Council.

I think the advisory committee is going to be a pretty weak organization. The trust is the administering authority in this, and I do not object to that aspect of the Bill. However, I think it is odd that the Government should introduce that provision. I thought this Government favoured Ministers being in charge and being responsible to Parliament. In the Maintenance Act, the Minister has been given every conceivable power for the administration of maintenance within the State, but when the Opposition suggested that he had too much power the answer was that the Minister was responsible to Parliament and could be checked. Here, the trust is responsible and, although I favour that, it seems odd. This Bill is peculiar in many ways, and one wonders how the Government could have made so many errors in framing legislation as it has made in this Bill. The reason is that it has been in a hurry to introduce reforms and ideas. Taxation measures have been introduced and have been criticized. It would have been better for the Government to have left these matters until next session so that by then it would have had experience of Parliamentary Government. The obvious advantage of this practice, however, is that it is better to introduce the difficult legislation early, as the next election is some time away.

This Bill contains glaring irregularities, and by chance I found out why it is so peculiar. The Government has not consulted those with whom it would have been expected to consult. The previous Government asked people interested to give advice on legislation. As far as I know, the Government has not consulted the electrical industry to ask for advice on the framing of this Bill. A member of the Electrical Contractors Association told me that the association had not been approached. If that statement is correct, what a fantastic situation! I do not know whether the Electrical Trades Union has been approached. We have a member of the House who is a member of that union, and another who is a member of the association. Perhaps the union has been approached. How can good legislation be introduced if the Government does not get the basic advice in the first place? These people are usually those that do the initial preparation, and the Government considers their ideas and frames them correctly. Apparently the Government has dodged this association, but now it is hearing about the extraordinary irregularities in the Bill. I do not know whether the Government approached the Wireless Institute, a wellknown body, whose views should have been ascertained. Honourable members have had a letter from the institute complaining about provisions in the Bill. When the Government was preparing this new legislation it should have sought advice from experts in this industry. If the Electrical Contractors Association has been consulted, I have been misinformed. On the other hand, if that association has not been consulted, such a failure to consult it was shockingly unwise.

Mr. Langley: Do the electrical contractors want this Bill?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think they would favour the Bill but, at the same time, I know that electrical contractors are surprised at some of the provisions.

Mr. Hurst: Do they want it, or don't they? Are you speaking with their authority?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It would seem elementary common sense to have consulted them in the first place. I will support the several good amendments to be put forward from this side of the House by the members for Rocky River, Gouger, Flinders and Mitcham. I hope that some good will come from the Bill. I want to ensure that wiring is as safe as it can be without putting costs up to a ridiculous extent and without having such extraordinarily stupid provisions in the Bill as to make it illegal for unlicensed persons to change plugs in motor cars. It would be silly to agree to a Bill that did that. It is no good saying that the Act will be administered with common sense. Let us tidy it up now. I desire to ensure particularly that farm costs are not increased by an indiscriminate requirement that licensed electricians must do all electrical work. That would take the attractiveness out of the modern tendency to use electrical fencing and would also raise unnecessarily the cost of many electrical installations on farms.

I also think that people with a small amount of real training should be provided with licences to do certain work. Otherwise, there will be widespread evasions of the law, and in many cases there will be higher costs without any improvements. I shall support the amendments foreshadowed by my colleagues.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I should say at the outset that I am a little disappointed that Orders of the Day have been changed around so that tonight we shall not have the pleasure of hearing members opposite debate the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill, as I know it will be interesting to hear them defend that measure.

Mr. Langley: You may get a surprise very early.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I shall be pleased to hear the member for Unley (Mr. Langley) and the member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) speak on that matter. The member for Unley is trying to distract me. He says that he makes frequent speeches. I have looked up some of his speeches and have found that nearly every one contains some reference to the licensing of electricians. I suggest that this Bill now before us is his crowning triumph, as he has worked for almost four years for such legislation. I hope the Bill that he has caused to be introduced will give him great satisfaction. However, it is a completely garbled piece of legislation, and I am pleased that my colleagues have seen fit to foreshadow several amendments that will make the Bill, if it becomes law, much more rational and realistic. If the measure becomes law, I think the Opposition should be thanked for its not becoming the object of ridicule of society generally.

I support the general principle behind the measure, as I believe the Minister who introduced it did so genuinely in the interests of public safety. As far as public safety is concerned, I support the spirit of the Bill. On November 2 the member for Unley interjected during a speech made by the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) on this subject; this is reported at page 2586 of *Hansard*. I think by then he had seen the light and rather regretted that he had given such general support to the Bill, as he said by interjection, "I am sorry, but this is Labor policy." He was apologizing to the House for this Bill, and to the member for Gouger and the House for the fact that this was Labor policy.

Mr. Hall: It is early in the three-year period for that.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Indeed it is. If this Bill is passed without the amendments being written into it, I think the member for Unley will be sorry when he faces his electors at the next election. It will become known in Unley very quickly that when the people of that district want to make some minor repairs to electrical equipment they will have to trot along to the honourable member's shop.

Mr. Langley: I have not even got a shop.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The people of Unley will really see the light then, and I am sure there will be some reaction against the honourable member at the next election.

Mr. Langley: Get back to the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am doing so, but the honourable member keeps sidetracking me.

Mr. Shannon: This may be a backstop for the member for Unley; if the Bill is passed it won't matter if he loses his seat.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I should not encourage the member for Unley to rely on his electrical business as a backstop, because under the Bill the whole franchise to exercise his trade will depend on the whim of the committee.

Mr. Hall: Do you think he'll pass the test?

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I would not suggest otherwise for a moment, but he will be able to carry on business only at the pleasure of this committee, of which he is so proud—a committee that has no real terms of reference—

Mr. Ferguson: Or authority!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Referring to electrical fatalities in South Australia the Minister, in his second reading explanation, said:

There have been 19 electrical fatalities in South Australia since 1960, many of them due to faulty wiring.

He quoted the following examples:

A workman was killed in a country factory when using an appliance from a power point which had not been earthed; a workman was killed when he came into contact with wires which had not been properly insulated; a woman in a country town was killed when using a washing machine wrongly connected to the supply; a workman in a country town was killed because a power point had been incorrectly wired; and a man was killed in an Adelaide suburb because of a faulty power point.

Nowhere in the Minister's second reading explanation, and nowhere in any speech delivered by a member of the Government subsequently, was mention made of the tradesmen who wired the connections where those fatalities occurred. Nothing was said as to whether the work was performed by unqualified electricians. I ascertained the number of fatalities that occurred in the other States to make a comparison, bearing in mind that the other States have varying degrees of licensing requirements for electricians. Since 1960, 19 fatalities have occurred in South Australia (as the Minister said) because of faulty wiring. In 1960, 34 fatalities of this kind occurred in New South Wales; in Victoria, 15; Queensland, 17; and

South Australia, 7. In 1961, 29 fatalities occurred in New South Wales; 27 in Victoria; 12 in Queensland; and 6 in South Australia. In 1962 (the latest figures that I have), 28 deaths occurred in New South Wales; 17 in Victoria; 10 in Queensland; and only 7 in South Australia. Although I have made allowances for the relative population densities of the States it is obvious that, even though South Australia has no system of licensing electricians, the incidence of electrical fatalities in this State is remarkably low. I suggest that the licensing of electricians in South Australia cannot reasonably be expected to reduce our already low death rate very much, if at all.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If we could reduce it by only one, it would be well worth while.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, it would, but there is no certainty that, if we licensed electricians, the death rate would indeed be reduced by even one. On figures from other States, I doubt it very much. I have had a rather mixed experience with professional electricians. Some five or six years ago the Electricity Trust reticulated a single wire earth return system of power through my home district in the Lower North. The local electricians enjoyed a profitable harvest wiring the farmers' houses. I recall that my neighbour, who lives about a third of a mile from me, had his house wired by a local electrician and, when the trust officer came to connect the power and the hot water service connection was switched on, lo and behold the lights in the sitting room went on as well! This professional electrician (who, we could assume, knew his trade well) had got his wiring mixed and had wired the sitting room lighting into the hot water service circuit. That sort of thing is inexcusable.

Mr. Casey: Perhaps he did that for a reason.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not know that this Bill will correct faults of that kind. I do not know what qualifications that particular electrician had but I suggest that they were at least as good as those of the member for Unley (Mr. Langley)—or perhaps I could put it more widely and say that his qualifications would certainly be no less than those possessed by the average South Australian electrician at present.

Mr. Ryan: He was a "bush" electrician.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Looking at the speeches made by the member for Unley, I find that the requirements that he would insist upon to license electricians are severe. He wants every man to serve three years as an apprentice and then two years with a professional electrician, making five years in all to learn a simple trade.

Mr. Ferguson: Longer than many courses at the university.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Yes, and much less lucrative. The member for Unley wants a three years' apprenticeship followed by two years articled to a professional electrician. I think honourable members will realize how absurd these periods are (five years in all) in terms of reality.

Mr. Ferguson: Even the Electricity Trust would not require that.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: No. Anybody with sufficient initiative to learn this simple trade can enrol at the Goodwood or Thebarton technical schools and learn wiring by attending a class for one night each week for a term. That is all the technical knowledge a person needs for cottage wiring. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SUCCESSION DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (RATES).

In Committee.

(Continued from November 16. Page 2853.)

Clause 7—"Property subject to duty."

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): In the Bill, as printed, we provided for a three-year term for any deed of gift. My proposed amendment is designed to make this provision date from September 1, 1965, so that any gifts made prior to that date will be subject only to the conditions that applied when they were made. The date in the amendment is as near as practicable to the day on which I presented my Budget Speech and, therefore, I think that date is practicable. I hope the amendment meets some of the objections raised by members opposite, and makes the Bill more palatable to them. I do not think it is necessary for me to go into great detail.

Mr. SHANNON: Quite obviously this meets part of the objection raised, for it removes the retrospectivity provision. The duty payable when the estate is aggregated, as it will be under this Bill, is definitely a charge upon the administrator, and therefore he is in an onerous position. I think if the Attorney-General ever had the task of administering an estate he would realize that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I assure you that I administer many of them.

Mr. SHANNON: Then the Minister will have some embarrassing positions to face up to when this Bill becomes law. Section 22, which at present removes the responsibility, is being deleted, and I do not think the Attorney-General has yet grasped the implications that follow from this deletion. I am not a legal man or an expert in this field, so I am resting on my advisers. Honourable members will realize why I have taken a more active interest in this Bill than might have been expected. This amendment does remove some of the obnoxious effects of the Bill, and that is a step in the right direction. It is a sign that the Government is having second thoughts about the implication of what it is proposing, and I hope it will have second thoughts about some of the other matters in the Bill.

The administrator still has an onerous task, and he will have to use his wits (I think that is the only way he can do it) to satisfy the Commissioner of Succession Duties that he will in due course pay the amount that is payable as duty, even if it means leaving the widow destitute. In the cases that I have examined, this could easily occur, because often the parents have passed over the major part of their estate to a child, leaving for themselves only what they think will be sufficient for their own comfort for the balance of their lives. However, perhaps the father does not live for very long. By an unfortunate happening, when the estate is finally valued for succession duties, the whole of the funds which the parents set aside for their needs is required to pay the duties. Incidents like this will happen, and some provision should be made to protect the widow. The impact of aggregating the estate will, in some cases, create hardship for the widow. This matter should be reconsidered by the Government.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.30 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, November 18, at 2 p.m.