

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, February 8, 1966.

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

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT 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.

PETITION: TRANSPORT CONTROL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT presented a petition signed by 77 electors residing in the Ridley and Murray Districts. It urged that no legislation to effect any further control, restriction or discrimination in the use of road transport be passed by the House of Assembly.

Received and read.

QUESTIONS

PARLIAMENTARY BUSINESS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I should like to ask a question of the Premier, who is in charge of the priority of business of the House, in connection with the comprehensive Planning and Development Bill (containing about 60 pages) which was introduced into the House last Thursday. Although members of the Opposition who have been asked to speak to the Bill have been working on the matter over the weekend, they say they could not deal with the Bill immediately because of its implications and because of the interests involved. Will the Premier consider arranging the programme of business so that adequate time will be made available to members to deal with this important Bill?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I do not intend that this Bill shall come before the House today. However, I had hoped that Opposition members would be able to speak on it tomorrow. At this stage, I must seek assistance from members opposite to carry out the programme before the House. Tomorrow I will know more about the sittings of the House, but Parliament may not meet during the week after next. I understand that an interstate function has already been arranged to take place from February 17, which means that Parliament will not sit on February 22, 23 and 24. I do not know whether members desire to have Parliament meet on and after March 8: I had hoped that the business of the House could be concluded by March 3, but, unless we receive great

co-operation from members opposite, this appears to be unlikely.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The Premier can always expect co-operation from the Opposition.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I acknowledge that interjection, but I have certain reservations about it that I shall not express lest I destroy the co-operation that exists. If the Leader asks me a question about this matter on Thursday, I shall be able to indicate the position.

INDUSTRY.

Mr. LAWN: In the *News* of last Friday appeared an article headed (in large black type and two columns wide) "South Australia 'Unable to Attract Industry'", which states:

There was serious concern among L.C.L. Opposition members because no new major industry had been attracted to South Australia in the past 11 months, Sir Lyell McEwin, Opposition Leader in the Legislative Council, said this week.

Directly underneath this article appeared another, headed (again in large type and two columns wide) "Rig Plan 'Boost for Whyalla'", which states:

The Chairman of the Whyalla Town Commission, Mr. C. L. Ryan, said today proposed construction of oil rigs at Whyalla would help stabilize economy of the town.

Can the Premier add anything to what appears in the press reports to which I have referred concerning industries for South Australia?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I know that the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited intends to construct oil rigs, particularly those for offshore drilling. I have also been informed that the pelletizing plant to be established at Whyalla at an estimated cost of £9,500,000 was first proposed during the last 12 months, whilst this Government was in office. In addition, some smaller industries will be opening soon; a further application has been received to extend an existing industry in the State; and I expect that a major industry will be established in South Australia soon. That is all the information I can give at present.

GRAPES.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Last Thursday I asked a question of the Premier regarding the terms on which the grape prices committee was appointed, and particularly whether the full conditions applicable to the committee were submitted to the parties before they accepted membership. I also asked for any further relevant information that the Premier could give. Has he a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: On being requested, the Prices Commissioner agreed to be chairman of this committee. I agreed that the Commissioner should use his discretion in conducting the activities of the committee in the most amicable way. To the best of my knowledge, the terms of reference were made known to the members of the committee before it met; if they were not, they were certainly made known before the matters were discussed. Those terms of reference were as follows:

- (1) To confer as early in the season as is practicable to determine prices for all varieties of grapes which may be delivered to wineries for the 1966 vintage.
- (2) Members appointed should have authority to determine prices as a committee without continuing reference to their nominating organizations.
- (3) The committee must arrive at a decision, if necessary on the casting vote of the chairman.
- (4) All sections of the industry and growers are expected to comply with the decisions reached.

Since then, I have convened a further conference, through the Minister of Agriculture, who presided at a meeting last Thursday. Certain matters have been referred back again. I believe that the wine and brandy makers will be invited to attend a further meeting to be presided over by the Minister on his return from Sydney, and that they are agreeable to this course. Therefore, there is nothing further I can add regarding progress in this matter. However, I expect that the conference will take place towards the end of this week.

INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY.

Mr. HALL: I was approached on Friday last by a constituent of mine who is closely associated with the Institute of Technology and who is worried about the money available to that institution this year. He put it to me that last year a £43,000 Commonwealth grant was made available to the institute, together with a £43,000 matching grant from the State Government. That was not repeated this year, and the allocation from the State Government does not include a figure this year to match the £86,000 that was available through this medium last year. I understand that, even though this grant was available in a matched form last year, the total paid to the institute was still only equal to the previous year's allocation. The point made by this constituent is that the sum available to the institute this year is £86,000 below normal, which would result in

severe reductions of equipment and staff at the institute. Can the Minister of Education say whether this is so and, if it is, whether the Government has plans to remedy this apparent serious deficiency in the institute's budget this year?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The constituent referred to by the honourable member has, apparently, more knowledge of the matter than I have, because although I have had many discussions with Dr. Evans of the Institute of Technology, he has never made this point to me. The Wark Committee, under Dr. Wark, was here last week to assess the requirements of the institute, and I expect submissions from the institute regarding its needs for this year and for the next triennium. I have had nothing from the institute to place before Cabinet, so that the point raised by the constituent would be complete surmise. When I receive the institute's submissions they will be made available to Parliament; but, until I receive them, I cannot give any information.

SPECIAL RURAL SCHOOLS.

Mr. CLARK: The Superintendent of Rural Schools, in giving evidence before the Public Works Committee this morning, referred to the establishment, towards the end of 1965, of special rural schools. I understand that where a secondary school enrolment is not high enough for the establishment of an area school these special rural schools will be established in country areas to give children desiring secondary education the opportunity to obtain it in their own school without going elsewhere. Can the Minister of Education say how many of these schools have been established and where they are located? Also, has he any comments about the aims and objects of these schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The proposal to establish special rural schools foreshadows the building up of country primary schools that are not big enough to develop into area schools as they are at present constituted. It is intended to have secondary education in the schools, and it is expected that many students who under the present circumstances leave country areas and go elsewhere to obtain a secondary education will now attend these schools for this education. We expect that, by our doing this, the strength of the schools will be built up, and that we will be able to establish more area schools. At present there are 40 area schools in the State. I announced this scheme a few weeks ago. Seven special rural schools will be constituted in country

areas and, as soon as we can gauge the effect of these, we will examine the possible creation of more.

DOCTOR'S DISMISSAL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was not in the Chamber last Thursday when the Premier and the Attorney-General answered questions about Dr. Gillis and his family. However, I have since read the *Hansard* report of the questions, and particularly of the answers, and I was, to say the least, surprised at the attitude expressed in the final answer given by the Premier, especially in view of the unsympathetic tone adopted by the Attorney-General both in answering questions and in interjecting.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have previously warned the honourable member that personal comment is not permissible in asking a question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am sorry I transgressed. In view of what you said, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the question now. Will the Premier say whether the final answer he gave to the Leader of the Opposition last Thursday represents Government policy in this matter, and can he confirm now that the Government is prepared to consider the re-employment of Dr. Gillis?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is not a question at this stage of whether the Government is prepared to re-employ Dr. Gillis. In my previous reply I said it was entirely for Dr. Gillis to do something for himself and that it was up to him to apply if he desired to be re-employed. His re-employment depends on him and to some extent on what the Public Service Commissioner considers about the matter (in addition to advising the Government). I would be getting personal if I said anything more about Dr. Gillis. However, I have been told that he is again sending circulars to members.

Mr. Ryan: I got one this morning.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have not seen a circular yet, although one may have been sent to my office. From what I have been told about the contents, it appears that he is only wasting his time with this approach.

Mrs. STEELE: There exists an implied reflection on the professional reputation of Dr. Gillis and, despite any offer of a position that the Government makes to Dr. Gillis in the future, what he is most anxious about is that the stigma attached to his good name at present be removed. I understand that, as a member of the Public Service, he is entitled

under section 59 of the Public Service Act to have the charges against him investigated by a board of inquiry. Can the Premier say whether the Government will instruct the Public Service Commissioner to initiate such an inquiry?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Information has been made available to the House and is on record in *Hansard*. I am not prepared to go beyond what has already been said, as all the reasoning will not redeem the position to the satisfaction of everyone. *Hansard* has recorded all that has been said in this matter and, in particular, I do not wish to reflect on Dr. Gillis.

Mrs. STEELE: From the Premier's reply to my question it is obvious that I have not made myself clear, for which I apologize. However, I thought it was a fairly direct question, and I shall ask it again. Will the Premier have initiated a Public Service inquiry on behalf of Dr. Gillis so that the charges for which he was summarily dismissed can be investigated by a board constituted under section 59 of the Public Service Act?

The SPEAKER: Order! This question is in precisely the same terms as a question asked earlier this afternoon, and I cannot allow repetition.

WARNING DEVICES.

Mr. BURDON: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked on January 25 about warning devices at railway crossings at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The inspection of the remaining level crossings at Mount Gambier has been made. The level crossings at Crouch Street and Commercial Street West are already included in the priority list for automatic protection, and they will be considered with others on the list in discussions between the Highways Department and the South Australian Railways when the list of crossings to be protected is next prepared. I am advised that recently some undergrowth has been removed from near the Crouch Street level crossing to improve visibility. At Pick Avenue the visibility is reported to be satisfactory and, provided that the road user exercises reasonable care, no particular hazard should exist. With regard to the recent fatal accident at this crossing, I understand that coronal inquiries are not yet complete: consequently, the matter is *sub judice*. At Ferrers Street, "stop" signs have been installed and visibility is such that if the provisions of the Road Traffic Act

are complied with by drivers of road vehicles no unusual traffic hazard is likely to be encountered. It should be added that rail traffic over the Pick Avenue, Crouch Street and Ferrers Street level crossings is extremely light.

SOUTH-EASTERN DRAINAGE.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to the question I asked last week in regard to Drain M in the Mosquito Creek and Bool Lagoon area?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have received the following progress report:

1. The enlargement of Drain M from the sea at Beachport to Legges Lane and the construction of the new drain from Legges Lane to Bakers Range Drain is practically completed, and has been used for the diversion of the floodwaters from Bakers Range Drain during the past two winters.

2. Construction of the new drain from Bakers Range Drain to the existing Bool Lagoon Outlet Drain, and the enlargement of the outlet drain, is in progress. A part width drain was constructed prior to last winter, and this enabled the discharge of the Bool Lagoon Outlet Drain to be taken *via* the new drain to the sea during last winter. It is expected that this section will be completed by June, 1966.

3. Work is in progress on the construction of stop banks on the northern side of the lagoon, and subject to favourable weather conditions it is expected that it will be completed prior to the 1966 winter.

4. In regard to the construction of the Mosquito Creek inlet channel from near the railway line into Bool Lagoon, the building of the bridges is in hand and it is planned to commence the channel work after the 1966 winter. Subject to favourable weather conditions the work should be completed prior to the 1967 winter.

Mr. RODDA: Of course, other areas in the Eastern Division will require further drainage if they are to reach their full agricultural potential. Can the Minister say whether any inquiries in respect of these areas are pending and, if they are, can he say to which areas they will apply, and when they are likely to be undertaken?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: As the honourable member has said, much work still has to be done in the Eastern Division of the South-Eastern drainage scheme before it is completed. There is certainly work to be done in relation to the scheme which will have to be the subject of inquiry by the Land Settlement Committee. However, I am not certain when that inquiry will be required but I shall obtain that information for the honourable member, and let him know as soon as I can. I shall also obtain some information

for the benefit of the Land Settlement Committee, so that it can be prepared to go to the South-East, if necessary, to make the relevant inquiries.

UPPER MURRAY ADULT EDUCATION CENTRE.

Mr. CURREN: Some time ago, at about the same time as the Ozone theatre in Renmark was offered for sale to the Education Department for adult education purposes, the Renmark corporation offered three acres of land in Cowra Street to the department as the site for the proposed Upper Murray Adult Education Centre. Can the Minister of Education say what action has been taken in respect of these two offers?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Following the offer of the theatre building, a report was requested from the Director, Public Buildings Department, concerning the condition and suitability of these premises for use by the adult education centre. This report has been received and indicates that the theatre is in a sound condition and suitable for conversion for use by the adult education centre. A recommendation for approval to purchase the theatre is being prepared by the Superintendent of Technical Schools.

With regard to the land offered by the Renmark corporation as a site for the Upper Murray Adult Education Centre, the Director, Public Buildings Department, has been requested to arrange a site inspection and to furnish a report on the suitability of this land for the purpose of siting buildings for the centre. This report is not yet to hand, but the Director, Public Buildings Department, has been requested to expedite this information.

TEENAGE DRIVERS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Some time ago I asked a question concerning the issuing of driving licences to persons under 20 years. I notice that the New South Wales Government is considering the issuing of a provisional, temporary licence to youths under a certain age who may be obliged to drive at a speed not more than 40 miles an hour. In my earlier question I suggested that Cabinet consider this matter and that, if such a scheme were implemented, and if a police officer or somebody in authority reported that a particular licensee was incapable of handling a car properly, a recommendation could be made to the Police Commissioner with a view to withholding that person's licence until he was able

to handle a car properly. Has Cabinet considered issuing a provisional, temporary licence under the terms I have outlined, in an attempt to avoid the terrific number of accidents that occur, particularly in respect to teenagers?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Great prominence was given to this matter in New South Wales. More recently, however, Mr. Marshall, S.M., of the Adelaide Juvenile Court has reported on the matter (and I am sure that all honourable members would agree that he is a most capable person in the office he holds). His report contains recommendations along the lines proposed by the honourable member. Cabinet discussed the matter as soon as reports appeared in the press, and decided that further information should be sought from both the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and the Police Commissioner. At this stage I have nothing further to report, other than to say that the matter has not escaped the Government's attention.

NEWSPAPER PRICE.

Mr. HUDSON: Yesterday it was announced that the price of the *Advertiser* and the *News* would be increased as from next Monday, from 5d. to 6d. (or to 5c). I have not worked out the figures for the *News*, but in the case of the *Advertiser* (which gives its daily circulation as 202,000), the increase in revenue would be £843 a day or about £263,000 a year. I believe the *News* has a smaller circulation, so its increased revenue would be about £200,000. In August, 1964, both newspapers increased their price from 4d. to 5d., and I understand that one farthing of the increase went to the agent and three farthings to the respective newspapers. That represented an increase to the revenue of the *Advertiser* of £200,000, a further £65,000 going to the agents. In view of this second increase (for the *Advertiser* it would mean an increase in revenue of £400,000 to £450,000 a year, when taken in conjunction with the previous increase, and a lesser increase for the *News*) will the Premier see whether the price of newspapers can be brought under control?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Some time ago I was told that the salaries of those engaged in newspaper work in South Australia were likely to increase. I do not know whether this applied only to journalists or in what way it was to be implemented. I understood that the increase was to be associated in some way with decimal currency and, although

I am not entirely sure of the facts, I recall having unofficial discussions on these matters. I do not know how the price of newspapers could be dealt with under price control at the moment. Each day I am finding that it is getting more difficult to satisfy requirements on some items under price control. Variations of even half a cent can mean, on the one hand, a loss or, on the other hand, an extra profit to the industry concerned. Of course, I must also consider consumers. Is the organization or industry to sell at a smaller margin of profit because of the changeover to decimal currency or am I to allow an industry or organization to receive an increased margin at the expense of the public? These are only some of the problems associated with price control. When looking at this matter one has to consider hundreds of thousands of pounds profit or loss as against half a cent increase or decrease in the price of an item. Therefore, I shall need all the assistance I can obtain in this matter not only from the Prices Commissioner but also from the Crown Solicitor. I believe the less I say at the moment the less I will have to say later. I refer to these matters concerning decimal currency because, as I am the umpire, I have to be fair. I do not want to be accused on the one hand of making profits for people and, on the other hand, of sending people insolvent.

CHOWILLA DAM.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Works yet obtained a report on the progress of work on the Chowilla dam and on the expected date of completion? Is it possible to speed up the date of completion?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In his question the Leader stated:

The general agreement for the establishment of Chowilla provided that work would be completed by 1968 so that the dam would be operating and be able to satisfy any demand by 1970.

I replied that I would not only be willing but anxious to obtain a report. Accordingly, the Director and Engineer-in-Chief wrote a report on Thursday, but I did not receive it until Friday. In view of the nature and the importance of the project I believe I might be pardoned for reading the report to the House so that members will know the full details. The Director's report is as follows:

Following investigations extending over many years and embracing the whole of the Murray River from its source to Mannum, Chowilla was selected as the best site available for construction of a major regulating storage. It was realized at the time that

many problems would be involved, particularly in connection with the foundation conditions. However, investigation of these problems has been more difficult and has occupied a longer period than was originally anticipated. Extraneous sources used to obtain expert advice and to carry out investigation work have been:

- (1) Advice on the general lay-out of the work from two experienced engineers made available by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army.
- (2) Experimental foundation compaction work by the Cementation Company (Australia) Ltd.
- (3) A geological investigation and extensive drilling programme by the Mines Department.
- (4) A full-scale investigation on foundation treatment and embankment design by Soil Mechanics Ltd., of London, working in conjunction with Professor A. W. Skempton of the Imperial College, London University. Professor Skempton is one of the world's most prominent soils engineers.
- (5) Advice from Deutsche-Shell and Strabag Bau AG, of Western Germany on the use of bitumastic concrete for embankment protection in lieu of stone.
- (6) Experimental work on wave action on the embankment by the Wallingford Laboratories of the British Ministry of Technology.

All of these items are in addition to the large volume of investigation work and hydraulic model testing carried out by the Engineering and Water Supply Department. During a visit by two of the department's engineers to the United States some months ago the investigation programme was discussed with officials of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. Both authorities expressed the opinion that the investigation work had followed a pattern and time schedule which would be regarded as normal in the United States. Aside from work directly connected with the site an intensive and widespread investigation of sources of construction materials has been carried out, particularly in regard to the large tonnages of stone and sand required. Before calling for tenders for construction of Chowilla dam it must be definitely known that sufficient quantities of materials are available and where these can be obtained.

Although it was hoped that tenders could be called in connection with the main contract earlier than will be the case, studies of water availability and use have always been based on the assumption that Chowilla will be completed by 1970.

The Prime Minister and the three State Premiers held a conference in Canberra on April 16, 1962, in connection with the Chowilla dam negotiations. Prior to the conference I supplied the Hon. the Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) with some notes on this project. I quote from these notes (C.S.O., 143/60):

"Does South Australia Need Further Benefits? At the present time South Australia's

diversions from the River Murray are below the amount available in a normal year and it appears likely that such will be the case up to the year 1975 or thereabouts. Assurance of further supplies in years of restriction will of course be necessary before the year 1975 and this would be the first benefit from Chowilla. The position should not be acute in a dry year occurring before 1970 but Chowilla should be in operation by that year to secure the position of this State."

Under the agreement between the Commonwealth, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia the Government of New South Wales undertook to make water available from the Menindee storages under certain conditions for a period of seven years, terminating on January 1, 1970. Although this agreement is of value to Victoria and South Australia in so far as the provision of additional water is concerned it is also of financial benefit to New South Wales for that State receives an annual payment for the use of water it does not at present require for its own purposes. Although the agreement is firm for only seven years the Premier of New South Wales mentioned during the discussions that his State would probably be willing to extend the term if this was later desired by Victoria and South Australia.

In addition to the investigation and experimental work considerable progress has been made on work of a permanent nature. A good class paved road is being built by the Highways and Local Government Department from Paringa to the Chowilla site; a contract was awarded for the construction of two permanent bridges spanning Chowilla and Monoman Creeks, and this work is nearing completion, and the Electricity Trust has extended a transmission line to the site. A two-pronged contract has been entered into with Soletanche Ltd. (a French company) in connection with the bitumastic concrete cut-off wall. The first phase of this contract consisted of experimental work to test the practicability and efficiency of this form of cut-off. This work is nearing completion, and in the terms of the contract if it is successful the contractor will carry out the permanent work as a nominated subcontractor. Applications have been invited in Australia and overseas for registration as acceptable tenderers for the main contract. These applications close today (that was Thursday), after which the physical resources, financial resources and technical capabilities of all applicants will be carefully examined. In the meantime, plans and specifications are nearing completion, and it is expected that tenders will be invited before the end of June next.

Full-scale construction activities should commence early in 1967 and the dam should be completed in time to store surplus river flows in the winter and spring of 1970. I point out in conclusion that South Australia is the constructing authority for the River Murray Commission in connection with the Chowilla project. All plans and specifications and all work carried out on this undertaking must be approved by the commission.

It would appear to me from the report that at no time was the completion date stated to be 1968: it was definitely 1970. I invite the Leader to state that his memory has failed him for once. If he does not admit that, I can only conclude that he was playing politics. I also say to the proprietors of the *News*, who wrote the sub-leader on the subject because they were misled, that I am confident that they would not do an injustice to the South Australians who have done such a remarkable job under extreme difficulties, and that they will seek to correct the error that they have made.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I thank the Minister for his comprehensive statement, but I do not concur in his remarks about playing politics. I assure him I was not playing politics when I asked the question. He assumed that the statement I made about the timing was not correct, but that can be determined if he will bring the docket to the House and then I shall be able to show him that the times I stated were correct, as they are shown in the docket. He was correct when he said that the Premier of New South Wales had indicated that, although the agreement was for only seven years, New South Wales might consider an extension of it. However, the statement was associated with the qualification that water would not be available in times of restriction after 1970. The present agreement already has some qualifications as to time of restriction. Will the Minister bring this docket to the House so that I can peruse it in his presence to check on what he states are my incorrect statements?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have had two desires in my Parliamentary life; to be honest and to be fair. Accordingly, I shall be happy to make the docket available for the Leader's perusal. I was asked in the strongest terms for this report, and this is the report I have received. I have not perused the docket, but I shall be happy to do so with the Leader.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Minister may recall that only £250,000 was voted for work on the project this year. According to the Treasurer's explanation of the Loan Estimates, the following statement was made:

The provision is to meet South Australia's share of the cost of work carried out by the River Murray Commission including preliminary work for the Chowilla dam project.

As the total cost of the project is estimated at £16,000,000, and as the Minister has mentioned 1970 (involving, by then, £4,000,000 as South

Australia's contribution), does the Minister believe that the sum voted for this year is adequate for the work involved? It seems to me that we should have voted £1,000,000 instead of £250,000.

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already asked members not to comment when asking questions.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Does the Minister believe that the £250,000 will enable work to be completed by the date he has mentioned?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, because we have received from the people concerned no complaints about South Australia as the constructing authority.

PARKSIDE SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently, in company with members of the school committee, I inspected the Parkside Primary School. Those members then expressed great concern at the undulating state of the playing area. As this matter has been brought forward in this House several times before, and as winter is fast approaching and large pools of water will then lie in the playing yard, will the Minister of Education ascertain whether tenders have been called for this necessary work and, if they have not, when they will be called?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

BORDERTOWN POLICE STATION.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Last week I asked the Minister of Works a question concerning the provision of flyscreens on the police station at Bordertown. When I asked the question I omitted to mention that the courthouse was also involved. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director of the Public Buildings Department states that it is proposed to install flyscreens on the windows at the Bordertown police station and courthouse and, as the necessary funds have been approved, arrangements are being made to expedite the work.

ROAD SAFETY.

Mr. McKEE: This morning's *Advertiser* contains a report of a statement made by Mr. J. F. Finn (Chairman of the Road Safety Council). Mr. Finn said that the time would have to come when the teaching of road safety for future drivers would be a part of school education. In view of the growing road toll, I believe that this suggestion has some merit. Will the Minister of Education comment on this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The question relates to education in road safety for future drivers. I think I have explained previously in the House that during vacation periods, with the co-operation of the Police Force, classes in driving instruction are held, and at present these are being carried out to the limit of what is possible with the strength of the Police Force and the equipment available today. At present the Education Department is unable to do more regarding the teaching of driving for senior students. However, we would be interested in doing something in this regard when the means are available. Regarding the question of safety first generally in respect of children being on the roads, crossing the roads, and so on, may I say that the children at present receive much instruction from their schoolteachers, who stress what children should do in all the circumstances surrounding their schools and how they should behave generally in relation to the traffic on our roads.

JERVOIS BRIDGE.

Mr. RYAN: In yesterday's newspaper it was reported that the Jervois bridge was opened to allow a ship to pass through but that, because of the state of disrepair of the bridge, repair work was necessary so that the bridge could then be made available to traffic. This happens every time the bridge is opened to allow ships through. First, will the Minister of Marine confer with the Harbors Board to ensure that the bridge will not be opened as a seaway, because there does not seem to be any value in ships using the southern reaches beyond the bridge? Secondly, will he point out to the Minister of Roads the extreme urgency of replacing this dilapidated bridge?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to refer the first question to the Harbors Board as the suggestion has much merit because of the condition of the bridge. In reply to the second question, I shall be pleased to consult with my colleague to see whether something can be done.

LANGHORNE CREEK WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. McANANEY: In the Langhorne Creek and Milang districts there has been a considerable drop in the artesian water table this year because of irrigation in the dry season, and rumours are rife that many inquiries have been received from market gardeners in the Virginia area who wish to come into the area because of the drop in the water table in their area. As I understand that a committee is inquiring into conditions in the Virginia area, will the Minister of Lands ask

the Minister of Mines when that report will be available, and whether a committee could be appointed to inquire into the water table of the Langhorne Creek and Milang districts?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and obtain a report as soon as possible.

WASLEYS PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Following an inspection of the Wasleys Primary School in December last year, I wrote to the Education Department on December 16, when Parliament was in recess, asking when the repairs to the asphalt at the school would be undertaken. Has the Minister of Education a report?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Advice has been received from the Public Buildings Department that a contract for this work was let to B. L. and M. D. Pridham Proprietary Limited on January 6, 1966. The work is included in a group contract for similar work at a number of other schools and police stations in the area, and the contractor will be requested to give early attention to this matter.

NURIOOTPA HIGH SCHOOL.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Will the Minister of Education ascertain whether tenders have been called for earth-grading works at the Nuriootpa High School, as they are urgently needed to provide an additional oval and some tennis courts?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get a report as quickly as possible.

FIREBREAKS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my question of February 3 about the provision of firebreaks on the Archibald Reserve?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Two applications representing 5½ miles of fencing and firebreaks have been received with respect to the boundaries of the Archibald-Makin Wild Life Reserve, and the priority allocated to these applications will accord with the general policy of dealing with applications in the order in which they are received. On present indications, provided that similar sums are available in 1966-67, it would be possible to deal with these two applications in that period.

FESTIVAL HALL.

Mr. LAWN: I noticed in this morning's *Advertiser* that the Government was reported to have refused the Adelaide City Council any further financial assistance in connection with

the festival hall. The report mentioned the need for further assistance, but I am not sure of the position with regard to the assistance promised by the previous Government. Can the Premier give any further information concerning the matter mentioned in this newspaper report and make it clear whether the Government intends to review the previous decision?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: It is seldom that I ask for some special privilege, but perhaps the press may wish to give my reply just as much space as was given to the statement this morning. To get more information, I wrote the Lord Mayor a letter in which I said that at the present time it would not be practicable for the Government to offer the council increased financial support for the festival hall beyond the amounts set out in the Statute. What may be possible later, of course, I could not say, except that the immediate outlook for Government finance would appear very difficult. The Government would nevertheless be prepared to honour its obligations under the Act. In the circumstances, no approval has yet been given for the plans, which would appear to require £877,000 more than the £1,000,000 contemplated in the Act, and the council was told that the Government would not wish to approve any design until the funds required were assured. Moreover, I indicated that I thought it desirable that the Government should have some estimates of the prospective earnings and expenses of the council on the operation of the hall so that both the Government and the council might be assured before any firm capital commitment that the recurrent financing costs were within the capacity of the council. I also wrote:

In summing up the main financial problems, Cabinet would have me say:

- (1) The Government, whilst most sympathetic to the proposals, regrets that it is unable to offer a system beyond the level provided in the Act.
- (2) The Government will honour its obligations under the Act even though this will mean a severe strain on resources.
- (3) The Government would be unable to increase council's annual borrowing authority beyond about £700,000 should council desire to borrow to finance part of the cost of construction of the hall.

The acute shortage of finance estimated to be available to the council and the Government appears to leave no alternative to:

- (4) finding a new source of funds not presently in view to cover the balance of costs of the project as now planned; or

- (5) replanning the whole project to ensure that the cost can be kept within the limits envisaged by the Act.

UNIVERSITY FEES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about university fees?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Both the member for Mitcham and the Leader have asked questions on this matter, and I will reply to the Leader's points. The amount made available by the previous Government was £20,000 a year, not £30,000 as suggested by the Leader in his question. The Fees Relief Committee moved cautiously in putting into effect a scheme that was fairly new. (This was the scheme under the previous Government.) Students who appeared very unlikely to pursue their courses successfully were refused grants or loans, and some students who were offered loans declined them. In 1965, there were 60 applications from metropolitan students, of which 44 were approved at a cost of £3,300. Of the 16 refused, some were granted extensions of time in which to pay normal fees. Also, 143 students from the country were granted the "country concession" of up to £100 at a cost of more than £14,000. Thus, the total cost exceeded £17,000. As yet, there is no experience in regard to repayment of loans made under the scheme introduced by the previous Government, as no repayment has yet become due. The Fees Concessions Committee considers that graduates who receive loans and leave the State, either temporarily or permanently, will probably honour the obligations they have incurred in being enabled to qualify for their profession. The estimated cost of the scheme as laid down by the present Government is expected to be about £35,000.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week concerning loans to students?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The loan is interest-free during the student's course and for two years thereafter. In most courses a borrower will begin to earn a salary on completion of his course; a medical student, as the honourable member said, will receive during his compulsory hospital year a modest salary roughly equivalent to what a young graduate in arts or science would receive as a first-year teacher. In the case of a medical student the interest-free period could be eight years for that part of the loan made in his first year at the university; it would be more than two years for the whole of the loan. It is only after such an interest-free period that the loan

begins to carry interest, and then only the balance not repaid within the interest-free period attracts interest. Repayment is not compulsory within the two-year period; the only penalty for not repaying in full within that time is that the amount not repaid then bears interest until it is repaid. If the medical student, as is likely, has a bigger loan than a student taking a shorter course, he will also have a longer interest-free period, and when he enters upon his profession he may well have a greater capacity to pay. There does not appear to be a strong ground for differentiating in the general conditions of repayment between medical students and others, particularly as the Fees Concession Committee has power to review cases of hardship or special circumstances and to recommend to the Minister the conversion of loans, wholly or in part, to grants.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am grateful for the Minister's reply and especially for the explanation that the whole of the loan does not fall due for repayment within two years. I point out that this is certainly not the meaning one would first derive from reading the circular from which I quoted in the House last week and a copy of which I handed to the Minister. As the circular does not precisely set out the terms but makes them appear far more rigorous than they apparently are, will the Minister arrange to have the relevant paragraphs of the circular rewritten?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I cannot say "Yes" or "No" at the moment. I will examine the matter to see whether a further explanation can be given. I point out to the honourable member that these forms have been printed at considerable expense. I believe that the supplementary information contained in the pamphlet can be made available to people interested without the necessity of altering the form that has been printed.

KEITH AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Since the Keith area school has been completed there have been difficulties in relation to the drainage of the schoolgrounds. This matter has been the subject of a private inquiry by consulting engineers, whose names I think are Tonkin and Moss. I believe that, as a result of the inquiry, a plan was prepared and that the Education Department approved of it. Can the Minister of Works confirm that this work has been approved and say when it is expected to be carried out, as this will be the third winter in

which there has been a problem and we have always tried to have the matter cleared up before winter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I cannot give a reply at the moment but I assure the honourable member that I will treat the matter as urgent, obtain a report quickly, and inform him as soon as I have obtained it.

TEACHING HOSPITAL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In this morning's *Advertiser* appears a small item regarding the quota of medical students at the University of Adelaide, which I understand includes the Flinders university. The purport of the report is that there are only 120 places at both Adelaide and Flinders universities. There are 227 local applicants and 148 oversea applicants, so there are three times as many applicants as there are places to be filled. I have been informed that the lack of places will not be overcome until the teaching hospital is established near Flinders university, as it is not possible to establish a full medical school at that university before the hospital is established. In view of the tremendous pressure for admission to the medical faculties, as evidenced by these figures, and in view of the shortage of medical practitioners, will the Minister of Education say what steps are being taken, or what the time table is in relation to erecting a teaching hospital, so that this pressure can be relieved?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Government is most conscious of the urgent need for another teaching hospital and, in fact, a report was called for from the competent committee set up to examine whether the existing hospitals were able to do any more than they were doing with existing facilities, in relation to teaching hospital work. That report has just been made public, and it is obvious that, however much the Government may wish to push on with this, the question largely turns on finance available. However, I shall endeavour to obtain a report for the honourable member, with a view to showing the time table, but I again stress that, if every obstacle is put in the way of the Government's obtaining the necessary finance, then the Government is necessarily hampered in its programme.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Some time ago, after the Queen Elizabeth Hospital had been completed, the Australian Universities Commission, in making grants for teaching hospitals, actually restricted funds available to South Australia on the ground that the

teaching facilities provided at that hospital were not being used to their fullest extent. I understand that the limitation of 120 places is based on clinics available for the students. Will the Minister of Education obtain a report from the Chief Secretary on whether the facilities provided at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital for the medical school there are, in fact, now being fully used or whether some restriction still applies in the use of those clinics?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the Leader. In discussions I had with the Australian Universities Commission when it was last in this State, the commission gave me its opinion on this point which, in fact, gave rise to the setting up of a committee to inquire into the situation (the committee whose report I previously mentioned).

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I understood the Minister, he said something about obstructions being put in the way of the Government with regard to funds. Am I correct in thinking that a teaching hospital would be financed out of Loan moneys and, if I am, to what obstructions was he referring?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: True, it would be constructed out of Loan moneys but the Government still has to buy the land and incur other expenses that have nothing to do with Loan moneys.

INVESTIGATOR.

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. How many days since March 6, 1965, has the fisheries research vessel *Investigator* been at sea?

2. What proportion of this time has been spent on research on South Australian fishing prospects?

3. Does the Government intend to proceed with plans, proposed by the previous Government, to obtain a substantially larger and safer craft for fisheries research work in this State?

The Hon. Frank Walsh, for the Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The replies are:

1. F.R.V. *Investigator* returned from its last sea-going cruise on March 9, 1965. The vessel could not be operated during the remainder of the financial year 1964-65 because of difficulties associated with the appointment of a replacement for the master of the vessel, who resigned from the Public Service on April 2, 1965, to become a marine surveyor. Funds were not available to operate the vessel during 1965-66.

2. The period March 6 to 9, 1965, was spent on the last stage of an oceanographic cruise.

3. Yes.

PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act, 1965.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.
The purpose of this short Bill, which amends the Parliamentary Salaries and Allowances Act, 1965, is to correct a drafting error which appears in the Third Schedule thereof. In clause (1) (a) (i) of the Third Schedule the additional salary of the Premier and Treasurer is described as £2,500 a year. This is erroneous. The additional salary which it was intended should have been provided for the Premier and Treasurer was £2,100 a year. It was never the Government's intention that the Premier and Treasurer's salary, or for that matter any other Minister's salary, should be changed until a determination is made by the tribunal. Honourable members will recall that this was clearly stated in the second reading explanation of the principal legislation. In other words, Ministers' salaries and allowances were intended to remain the same as the salaries and allowances payable to Ministers, including the Premier and Treasurer, before the principal legislation was passed. The existence of this error in the Third Schedule of the Act was brought to my attention in the early part of January of this year and I gave prompt instructions to the Treasury that the error should be rectified and that an amending Bill should be prepared to correct this drafting error.

Honourable members will note that the amendment contained in clause 3 has been made retrospective to December 23, 1965. This is the day on which the Governor assented to the relevant part of the principal Act. By so making this amendment retrospective to that

day the position will be regularized and the Premier and Treasurer's salary will be what the Government intended it should have been at the time the principal legislation was presented to Parliament.

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

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 30. Page 3259.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): This Bill makes two amendments to the powers of the Electricity Trust in respect of compulsory acquisition. I think the House must accept the position that it is necessary for a major undertaking to have the necessary authorities to enable it to carry out successfully the duties assigned to it by Parliament. Therefore, I believe that the authorities requested here are necessary, and for that reason I support the Bill.

Earlier this session we passed a Bill dealing with compulsory acquisition. That Bill, much more comprehensive than this Bill, was debated fully in this House, and it has been discussed in another place. I presume that future acquisitions by the trust will be subject to that Act, and I should like the Minister to clear up that point. Difficulties are always associated with the acquisition of land, particularly where a landowner does not desire that an easement be granted. Therefore, I believe that the legislation passed early in the session was designed to effect a uniform practice as between the various departments, and that it was good legislation because it meant that all departments were dealing with acquisition on the same basis. Previously each department had under its own right some powers of acquisition and dealt with them in different ways, and as a result of the non-uniformity there was sometimes criticism as between one department and another. I should be pleased if the Minister would say whether these powers will be exercised under the previous legislation or whether the trust will still exercise the powers of acquisition which it previously had and which I think were handed down from the time when the original company was the supplying authority for Adelaide. Obviously, it is necessary for the trust to have the right to establish the necessary supply lines which alone can provide the power required by industry and by the community as a whole.

I suppose every member from time to time receives complaints that for some reason or another acquisitions have taken place under conditions which were not fully understood by the owner of property or which were imposed after the acquisition was first discussed. That applies particularly with rights-of-way, and it is something I believe we should try to overcome. It is necessary to ensure that all terms and conditions of easements are understood by the persons with whom the matter is being negotiated. We cannot be too scrupulous when considering a negotiated agreement, or when asking whether, after the agreement has been made, there are conditions or matters which have not been explained to these people or which are not fully understood by them.

No department would wilfully do this, but some officers are anxious to get agreement and do not go fully into all the implications. I understand that the trust is a semi-government authority, and I assume that the powers of acquisition of the trust will now be superseded by the general powers that were set out in the previous Bill. If this is not the case, we shall have to reconsider this power. If it is in the general category, that answers the question but, if it is not, I should like to re-examine this matter to see to what extent the powers conferred on the original company and exercised by the trust would be applicable to this extension. Must the trust use the new powers of acquisition if they are applicable, or can it opt to use either one or the other? When the previous Bill was introduced it had the merit of placing all authorities of the Government under the same terms and formula, and there was no suggestion that one department was sharper than another in dealing with certain matters. I should like the Minister to answer my queries, but I support the second reading.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): The Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act Amendment Bill, which has been discussed here and in another place and is on the Notice Paper at present for a conference, provided an additional mode for the acquisition of land. That is, a further alternative procedure was prescribed so that land could be acquired by proclamation, subject to certain safeguards and conditions, in place of the old provisions. Either set of provisions could be used.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It was an additional mode: it did not supersede the previous mode.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it left it to the acquiring authority to choose which mode it would proceed by. Under the Compulsory

Acquisition of Land Act, although the trust was not stated by the Bill to be a prescribed authority, power was given to proclaim it a prescribed authority for the purpose of using the new provisions—but the new provisions only, not the old provisions. Therefore, the Government could proclaim the trust a prescribed authority for the purpose of this new alternative mode of acquiring, and that would be an alternative to its powers of acquisition under the existing legislation. Other public authorities would have the two modes prescribed by the Act, but the trust would have its existing powers plus the new power under the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It could use either.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I thank the Leader and the Opposition for supporting this Bill, and I believe the Attorney-General has answered the Leader's first query. Dealing with the securing of easements, I am sure the Leader agrees that, although it is true that some people do not fully understand, the departments are always anxious to have the clearest understanding. I shall ask officers who negotiate with these people to be especially careful in respect of this matter. Although an officer may not give a detailed explanation on every occasion, I am sure that we can arrange for this to be done. Departmental officers have always been anxious that both parties fully understand the terms of an agreement for an easement.

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

ELECTRICAL WORKERS AND CONTRACTORS LICENSING BILL.

Adjourned debate on the question: "That this Bill be now read a second time"—which Mr. Millhouse had moved to amend by striking out all the words after the word "That" and inserting in lieu thereof:

the Bill be withdrawn and redrafted to provide for a workable system of licensing.

(Continued from February 3. Page 3808.)

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): I am amazed at the Opposition's attempt to belittle this measure which is so long overdue and necessary for the protection of human life. It is apparent that, from some of the remarks made by members opposite, their approach to the Bill leaves much to be desired. If the Bill is responsible (and we contend that it is) for saving the life of one person, it is then justified and deserves the support of the House.

Some members opposite have acknowledged the desirability of licensing electricians, but they have disagreed with certain features in the Bill. We contend that money does not replace human life. Responsible engineers and officers of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, at safety seminars held in this State, have said that the licensing of tradesmen would help eliminate faulty electrical work and resultant accidents. The figures supplied by the trust clearly demonstrate the extent of inferior installations at present being made. They show that in the last 12 months 800 installations in the metropolitan area were refused a supply connection by the trust because they did not comply in some respects with the wiring requirements of the Standards Association of Australia. It seems that most of these installations were undertaken by non-qualified electricians. When such work is undertaken by amateurs, including the handyman, it rarely conforms to those standards, and causes the householder concerned considerable expense, for if the trust refuses a connection the householder has to secure a competent electrician to go over the work.

It is hoped that, by the implementation of this measure, only competent tradesmen will be able to perform electrical work, who will be required to maintain certain standards before a connection can be made. Indeed, it will be a great benefit to the householder to know that competent men will be carrying out electrical installations in accordance with the required standards. According to the trust's records, it receives 1,000 reports a year of faulty appliances. Under the trust's regulations, if an officer believes that an installation or appliance is dangerous, he must disconnect it immediately, give verbal notice of such action, and tie a warning label to that installation or appliance. However, it is not practicable for trust officers to be aware of every faulty installation that exists. Although the trust employs about 60 inspectors in this respect, they cannot be expected to know what goes on in a house after the trust has initially approved wiring installations. The trust's service rules and conditions of supply require the following:

No installation will be connected to the trust mains until inspection by the trust to ensure that it complies with the service rules of the trust and the wiring rules of the Standards Association of Australia, and has successfully passed the tests prescribed therein. The first inspection will not be charged for, but for any further inspection rendered necessary by the installation failing to pass the first one, a charge of 10s. will be made, and such charge shall be paid to the trust before the installation

is connected. Copies of the trust's service rules may be obtained free on application. Although the observance of the trust's service rules, in conjunction with the wiring rules of the Standards Association and the passing of the tests, have in themselves the effect of ensuring that the wiring of the consumer's installation shall be good and sound, yet the trust will not be responsible for such installation, the rules and tests existing solely for the purpose of the trust.

The number of electrical fatalities in South Australia in the last 10 years has been as follows:

	No. of Fatalities.
1955	5
1956	6
1957	7
1958	6
1959	7
1960	7
1961	6
1962	5
1963	6
1964	6
Total	61

These figures clearly demonstrate that more care and better workmanship (and the Bill is aimed at this) would have results. Of a total of 61 fatalities within that time, it is believed by responsible officers of the trust that 13 were caused by incorrect wiring. These figures prove the necessity for such a Bill as this.

Some figures have been quoted regarding electrical fatalities in other States. I have only the Australian figure for the period 1957-1961, during which there were 149 fatalities. The causes of these fatalities were flexible cords and plugs, 30; overhead lines, 26; switch gear and switchboards, 15; crane-overhead lines, 12; earth wire open circuited, 6; portable tools, 5; installation wiring faults, 2; and unclassified, 53. I have previously quoted figures on the number of refusals because of faulty installations. To amplify this I will give details of incidents of faulty workmanship that occurred in Victor Harbour in 1963. A migrant was labouring for a builder. After the building alterations were complete the labourer completed the electrical installation, which was duly inspected by the trust and not passed or connected by it for the following reasons:

- (1) Bad conductors behind switchboard.
- (2) Switchboard not correctly wired for J tariff.
- (3) Sub circuit earth to be connected to main earth not to neutral link.
- (4) Bushes required for conduits at meter box.

- (5) Earth to be sleeved in J heater and connected to casing.
- (6) Bush required for conduit entry into range.
- (7) Main earth to be connected below barrel union.
- (8) 7/052 tails required for main circuit breaker.
- (9) Switch upside down in bathroom.
- (10) Six power points on long polarity.
- (11) Bracket light requires new lampholder and to be earthed.
- (12) Conduit not earthed in roof.
- (13) Main sub circuit earth. Break of gauge to 3/036.
- (14) Method of connecting earthwires above switchboard not approved.
- (15) Trimmers required to support T.N.S. last section to switchboard.
- (16) General tidy up of installation.

Mr. Langley: Who did that?

Mr. BURDON: An unskilled electrical worker. No doubt, if this work was completed and not approved by the Electricity Trust, the house owner was probably involved in much expense in having the faults repaired. I do not think any Opposition member would deny that this work was dangerous. If it had been connected not to the trust supply but to another installation, it is impossible to know what the result would have been: one or more fatalities could have occurred. We hope that, in some way, the Bill will overcome some of these problems.

Mr. Quirke: All those faults were between the main and the plug?

Mr. BURDON: Those were various parts of the connections within the building itself. They would have been between the main source of supply and the power points in the house. In 1963, an Adelaide tennis court became a cage of death because of faulty wiring. School-children who felt a tickle when they touched wire netting surrounding the court did not know how close they came to being electrocuted.

Early in 1965 a worker was electrocuted at a South Australian Farmers Union factory at Woodside. This death could have been avoided if sufficient correctly wired outlet plugs had been provided. The workman was about to use an electrically operated insect spraying unit which was strapped to his back. He was working on a wet cement floor, which is extremely dangerous at any time for a person handling or using electrical equipment. The machine was plugged into two extensions and then into a plug in the wall. The wall plug was not earthed, one extension was tough nylon sheeting and not a flexible lead, and the connections to the plugs were carelessly made and taped with medical type adhesive tape. The

terminals of some of the extension plugs were loose and evidently the movement of the leads caused a short circuit within the plug. The resulting short circuited current passed through the machine and to earth through the man's body. If the wall plug had been correctly earthed the man's life probably could have been saved.

People in other States have found measures similar to those found in the Bill necessary and have licensed electrical contractors and workers. Some members have said that we should not have licensing in all sections, while other members have said that it is necessary to have licensing. To those who say we should not have licensing I point out that we have found it necessary to license plumbers. If it is necessary to license them for health reasons surely it is necessary to license electricians, because I do not think any honourable member would like to grab hold of an electrical wire carrying 240 volts or more. I have a healthy respect for electricity because probably only one good thump and a person has had it.

Mr. Quirke: I have been knocked twice.

Mr. BURDON: The honourable member is lucky to be here, and I assume that at this stage he has respect for electricity. I do not doubt for a minute that he will support the Bill.

Mr. Freebairn: We are opposed not to the principle of licensing but to the way the Bill is drawn up.

Mr. BURDON: I appreciate what the honourable member said about the principle of licensing. There has always got to be a start on anything, so let us start. Surely honourable members agree that it is necessary to start. The member for Light has referred to certain matters. I ask the honourable member to give us his wholehearted support, for we should take a reasonable view of this matter and make a start somewhere. If we find that some of these provisions do not work properly, we can amend them.

Mr. Quirke: You should have a go at some recasting.

Mr. BURDON: We invite suggestions. Reference was made to migrant tradesmen. While many of these persons are competent, those of us who worked in industry realize that some migrant electricians are inefficient by our standards. I am not being disrespectful to any migrant to this country, because I know there are many excellent electricians amongst the migrants, and we hope that many more such people will come here. However,

we must realize that in some oversea countries the electrical standards are not as high as those that we require.

Mr. Langley: And they are on different voltages.

Mr. BURDON: Yes. Therefore, it can become a real problem. I hope my remarks are not misunderstood, for I have a high regard for the migrant tradesmen who come to this State. By and large, the electricians amongst them are excellent tradesmen, who meet all the standards we require. I refer only to the odd one who causes difficulties.

Mr. Heaslip: You are having a bob each way.

Mr. BURDON: I have already said that the regulations in some other countries are different from our regulations. Provision is made for courses at the trades school to enable people to keep abreast with modern standards of wiring rules and regulations. However, statistics show that very few people satisfactorily complete the course. In 1960, when the course started, 21 people commenced the course and eight completed it; in 1961, 28 started and 15 completed it; in 1962, 14 started and eight completed; and, in 1963, 15 started and eight completed. Altogether, of the 78 who started the course only 39 completed.

Mr. Quirke: Did they fail or pull out?

Mr. BURDON: They just gave it away. It was not compulsory for these people to attend these classes for their further education in relation to electrical standards or the furthering of their knowledge in the electrical field. This goes to show that many people are not prepared to advance their knowledge. Because of the paucity of legislation in this State requiring persons to be thoroughly conversant with the regulations, many of these people take the easy way out, and as a consequence the lives of consumer householders and employees in industry are in jeopardy. The member for Gouger (Mr. Hall), speaking in this House some time ago, said that he carried out his own wiring rules in relation to his caravan that was on display at the Royal Adelaide Show. I do not know whether the trust would give authority for this caravan to be connected.

Mr. Freebairn: A 32-volt transformer was used.

Mr. BURDON: I am happy to hear that, because it could have been fatal to some of the honourable member's constituents and probably to himself if it had been wired other than to 32 volts. The member for Light (Mr. Freebairn), speaking in this House the other

day, had much to say about this measure. I have read his comments several times, but I am not able to follow his reasoning. However, I do not necessarily blame the honourable member for that. I expect Opposition members to be fair and to see that this legislation is given a start, for I believe it is essential for the future safety of every South Australian. I do not wish to see accidents happening to people in the country. Although I have been referred to as a city member, that is not true, and I take exception to that accusation.

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) quoted percentages of population, the number of deaths, and other information. However, I maintain that the figures quoted by the honourable member do not truly reflect the actual position, for they do not pinpoint the number of accidents arising as a result of faulty leads, appliances or installations. I have endeavoured to pinpoint most of the faults in relation to wiring, and I hope that by doing so I will clearly show the members opposite what can happen as a result of faulty wiring. The member for Mitcham also referred to an engineer friend of his who had radio technicians working under him. Those people would not be members of the Electrical Trades Union.

Mr. Langley: They are not members of the Electrical Contractors Association, either.

Mr. BURDON: Possibly. The Electrical Trades Union covers radio tradesmen and technicians of various grades. Provisions are made in awards, such as the Metal Trades Award and the Television Industry Award, and many of these persons are covered by Commonwealth determinations. The establishment at Salisbury has many of these tradesmen. The Electrical Trades Association was responsible for making the radio trade a compulsory apprenticeship under the Metal Trades Award. If the member for Mitcham doubts this, he will find that the member for Semaphore was one of the foundation members of the Radio Trade School Committee and he represented the union. This Bill takes care of apprentices and experienced personnel. Many radio personnel operate under Commonwealth regulations, but where Commonwealth and State laws operate, the Commonwealth law takes precedence. A radio technician or a radio ham operating under a Commonwealth licence is subject to rules and safety regulations, so he is outside the scope of this legislation. He can perform his duties under Commonwealth regulations and determinations, and this Bill does not interfere with his livelihood.

Mr. McKee: That should clear up many questions.

Mr. BURDON: I hope it does, and that these people will now have a clear picture.

Mr. Langley: That's what I told the constituent of the member for Mitcham.

Mr. BURDON: The member for Mitcham said that his information was secondhand, but he said that his informant told him that power flows when a circuit is completed, and he attempted to imply that one could not turn on a switch without the consent of the trust. I am not an electrician, but it is obvious that his advice came from someone knowing little about the position. This is the danger that this Bill is trying to overcome. If an active wire were connected to the wrong terminal the circuit would end at the point and would only be completed when returned to earth, possibly through an unfortunate person at the cost of his or her life. I have given a fair account of the disabilities under which people have lived in the past, but we hope that with the introduction of this Bill, we will enter an era where housewives, employees in factories, and the families of everyone in the State will be immeasurably protected. I support the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I listened with some attention to the member for Mount Gambier, but he was making heavy weather of this Bill, and he did not explain or excuse (it is impossible to explain) what is in it. This is another Bill introduced by the Labor Party that I cannot support.

Mr. McKee: Because it was introduced by the Labor Party?

Mr. HEASLIP: No, that is not quite right.

Mr. McKee: You don't oppose sensible legislation! It is introduced for the development of the State.

Mr. HEASLIP: If any member opposite can prove to me that this legislation will develop the State, I shall vote for it.

Mr. McKee: It will save lives, so it must be good.

Mr. HEASLIP: No member opposite can prove that to me or anyone else.

Mr. McKee: Why did other States do it? They wear your guernsey, and yet they did it.

Mr. HEASLIP: It cannot be good for the State; it is socialistic, it is regimentation, and it takes away the freedom of the individual. To say that it is good for the development of South Australia is nonsense, because it takes away the initiative of the individual. South Australia and Australia have been developed on

the initiative and freedom of the individual. This Bill destroys both. In the First World War, the Australian soldier made a name for himself because of his initiative and freedom of action. This Bill takes both away, and it cannot develop South Australia.

Mr. Langley: The Electricity Trust developed South Australia.

Mr. HEASLIP: I acknowledge that the trust has helped develop South Australia. However, we had electricity long before this measure was introduced. The Bill will not help us.

Mr. McKee: Why not?

Mr. HEASLIP: Can anybody say that it will not take away the freedom of the individual? Not only that: the Bill takes away the individual's initiative; it will retard South Australia's growth, as will most of the legislation that has been introduced into the House this session. Although the Bill will necessitate increased costs, that factor is only of secondary importance. In his second reading explanation, the Minister of Works said:

This proposed legislation is primarily designed as a safety measure to protect the general public and workmen in their dealings with electrical equipment.

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) gave the House some rather interesting figures in relation to fatalities caused through electrical installations, not only in South Australia but in other States where electricians were required to be licensed. South Australia's percentage was far below that of those States where licensing applied. The member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) tried to answer that fact by saying that the figures included fatalities as a result of the deceased's contact with overhead wires. However, our objective is to prevent all accidents and to save lives. If the Bill could be responsible for that, I would have another look at it. The Minister also said:

A workman was killed in a country factory when using an appliance from a power point which had not been earthed; . . .

Will this legislation prevent that sort of thing? Of course it will not. It has not been proved that the power point in that case was not installed by an electrician who could become licensed under this measure. The member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) did some research on this matter.

Mr. Clark: It wasn't very evident from his speech.

Mr. HEASLIP: Members of the Government have evidently seen fit to ignore certain figures. The member for Light said:

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.

I point out that, although electricians are licensed in those three Eastern States, the figure for South Australia is 10 below that of Queensland whose population is only slightly larger than ours.

Mr. Clark: Are you arguing against licensing?

Mr. HEASLIP: No.

Mr. Clark: Then what on earth are you trying to prove?

Mr. HEASLIP: That licensing will not prevent fatalities. According to the member for Light, in 1961 South Australia had half the number of fatalities that Queensland had.

Mr. Ryan: If the Bill saved one life it would be worth while.

Mr. HEASLIP: If that could be proved I might have another look at it.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The purpose of the Bill is not to prevent accidents.

Mr. HEASLIP: The Bill will not do what the second reading explanation claimed it would.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It will put every radio station in Adelaide off the air.

Mr. HEASLIP: The real purpose of the Bill is to implement socialistic policy and take away the freedom and initiative of the individual. Socialism is designed to take away from those who have and give to those who have not. However, the Bill does not take away only from those who have—it takes away from everybody. It provides for a form of dictatorship, just as Russia has dictatorship. The Bill is unreasonable and I will support the motion of the member for Mitcham that it be withdrawn and redrafted. It is similar to so many other Bills introduced by the Government this session, some of which have been withdrawn and redrafted by the Government itself. Clause 7 states:

From a day to be fixed by proclamation, and except as provided by this Act—

(1) No person shall—

(a) perform or carry out personally any electrical work or offer or undertake to perform or carry out personally any such work unless he is licensed as an electrical worker in respect of that electrical work.

To find out what is electrical work we cannot go to the dictionary—we must go to the definition in the Bill, which states:

“electrical work” means any work performed or carried out on any electrical installation and includes the installing, constructing, erecting, repairing thereof or the altering of the structure thereof or the replacing of any part thereof or the adding of any part thereto or the carrying out of any work thereon for the maintenance thereof but does not include work in relation to—

and there are some exceptions stated. The definition of electrical installation states:

“electrical installation” means the whole or part of any appliance, wire, system or wiring, conduit pipe, switch, fittings, equipment, motor, apparatus or device wherever situated which—

- (a) is intended or designed or adapted for the purpose of using or consuming; or
- (b) is used, intended, designed, or adapted for the purpose of carrying or transmitting,

electricity at an operating voltage in excess of 40 volts and includes any insulating or protective material or casing thereon.

The member for Mount Gambier tried to show how stupid the member for Mitcham was for saying that under this legislation an unlicensed person would not be allowed to turn on a switch. However, the definition in the Bill would prevent unlicensed people from turning on a switch because this puts into operation a current. How stupid can you be!

Mr. Casey: Have you an interpretation on that from the Parliamentary Draftsman?

Mr. HEASLIP: It is stated plainly in the Bill.

Mr. Langley: Is turning on or off a switch an installation?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, it puts into operation a current, and the Bill prohibits that. I am not opposed to licensing if it is reasonable. If a person charges for his work he should be qualified.

Mr. McKee: You are not trying to tell us that you are a reasonable man.

Mr. HEASLIP: No, I am trying to say what I think. The member for Mount Gambier referred to the licensing of plumbers. Although they have to be licensed, that does not prohibit anybody else from doing plumbing, whereas the Bill prohibits unlicensed people from doing electrical work. Most people fix their taps and clear their drains and, although we have licensed plumbers, those things are allowed. However, the Bill provides that as soon as an electrical machine goes wrong a licensed person must be called in to repair it. Hundreds and hundreds of country people have electrical pumps up to 20 miles from their homesteads. These people may take the best part of the day to get to the pump, and when they find it is not working they will have to go back to

the homestead and ring up a licensed electrician. Even if it took only an hour, why should it be necessary to do that? I venture to say that some people in the member for Frome's district could easily take more than half a day to get out to one of these pumps.

Mr. Casey: They haven't all got electrical pumps.

Mr. HEASLIP: Some of them have; they have 240-volt electric generators out there. Under this Bill, if something goes wrong with the generator they will have to wait for somebody to come from Peterborough or Hawker or Carrieton to fix it up. If they do not wait, they will be breaking the law. If sheep are waiting for water, do I break the law and give the sheep water, or do I wait for an electrician to come and fix something up? This Bill says we have to wait. It is perfectly silly to try to bring in legislation such as this. We must be realistic about these things. I believe that if a person pays for a job to be done it should be done by a qualified man, and in that respect I have an amendment on the file. I would still not be happy with the Bill, but it would be much better if my amendment were inserted. I do not believe in taking away the freedom of the individual. This Bill as it stands will kill initiative, and it will be bad for the people and for the country. I have a letter here from a person in my district which reads:

I am very disturbed at the announcement in today's *Advertiser* about the Government's intention to license electricians. It would, as I understand it, mean that only licensed electricians would be permitted to carry out any new installations or do any additions or repairs. Whilst I and probably many other people do not class myself as an electrician, I am quite capable of doing small jobs such as wiring an additional power point or a light . . . These jobs I have done on my own property and have always had them inspected and passed by the E.T.S.A. inspector. In fact, the inspector has made the remark that it is a pity—

I hope members opposite will listen to this—that all electricians' work was not done as neatly as that done by many home owners.

Mr. Langley: There is nothing to stop them getting a licence.

Mr. HEASLIP: This Bill will take away the right of all those people to do that work.

Mr. Langley: Not that person.

Mr. HEASLIP: If he does not get a licence, it will deny him the right.

Mr. Casey: If he is that good, he will get a licence.

Mr. HEASLIP: This Bill takes away the freedom of the individual. The Leader referred!

to the effect it would have on radio and television. I maintain that the Bill will stop many people from lawfully carrying out harmless work which they have done in the past. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the general principle set out in this Bill. When any person in a trade or profession holds himself out for reward for something he does, he should comply with certain standards. However, I think this Bill goes too far. The honourable member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) said that, if it were found that the Bill went too far, we could amend it. My opinion of controls and planning is that, however necessary they are, they in themselves create nothing and have a bad effect. I think it is much better to start with a minimum of control and planning and then build up if deficiencies are found, rather than start with something that is too complicated and interferes with the general activities of the public. For that reason, I will support the amendment.

I believe that it is ridiculous to place so much limitation on primary producers. It is necessary for such people to become proficient in various things. If we go on as we are, it will be necessary for a farmer to spend all his time training and gaining experience in order to qualify under the legislation. It is almost necessary now for a primary producer to be a veterinary surgeon. If it became illegal for other than a veterinary officer to deliver a lamb, the 150 lambs or so I have saved would have been lost. If we impose too many restrictions in these things we will do more harm than good. About 18 months ago I wanted an electrician, and he came and did part of the job but did not come back. I told him I would not pay his account until he finished the job, and finally he came back some four months later. However, I had already taken the plug out and put another one in. In doing so, I broke every regulation under this Bill.

It is ridiculous to try to prevent people from carrying out these simple jobs, for a farmer who has the ability to stay on a farm obviously is capable of improvising and carrying out this work. I support the Bill in general principle, but I think it goes too far. It is much better to start with a simple Bill and then add anything afterwards that becomes obvious, rather than try to go too far and then have to bring it back to something that is sensible and reasonable.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the Bill. I acknowledge that it has been on the Notice Paper for a long time. This Bill has long been a platform of my Party. The reason for my putting my name down when I did, sometime last year, to speak on it was certainly not that I know anything about electricity. Here I am reminded of the famous professor of some branch of science who once had to confess to his wife that he did not really understand how electricity worked. She said, "Oh my dear, don't you know that all you have to do is press that little button there?" I speak not as an expert on electricity but as someone rather in the category in which the professor's wife found herself.

I believe that the principle of the Bill is to protect users of electricity, and I am supported by the member for Torrens who said that the principle of the Bill was a worthy one, and who further said that, if the principle was to promote greater safety and save lives, there was much merit in it. Further, the honourable member said that, if it raised the standard of workmanship and the quality of work undertaken, it must receive the support of the House. It was further admitted by the member for Torrens that this was the only State without such legislation.

The member for Gouger unduly and unfairly reflected gravely on the member for Unley, and this sentiment was later echoed by the member for Light. Recently, we have become accustomed to the member for Light echoing his apparent ideal, the member for Gouger. The member for Gouger said that the member for Unley was responsible for this legislation and that the legislation was introduced at his behest, but the member for Unley would be the first person to agree with me that this is absolutely untrue. The Labor Party intended to introduce this legislation long before the member for Unley was a member of this House. The member for Unley is a practising electrician and an extremely good one. In fact, he is as good an electrician as he is a politician, and he must be an extremely good politician to increase his majority so tremendously at his second election, despite one of the most expensive campaigns ever waged against a sitting member in this State.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: We will try him out one of these days.

Mr. JENNINGS: The result will be the same. The member for Unley spoke extremely well when supporting the Bill. A practising electrician, he informed the House, from the depths of his great experience, on this matter.

Before his election to Parliament, the member for Semaphore was the Secretary of the Electrical Trades Union. He supported this Bill, as he has since he has been associated with the industry and not only since being a member of this House. I took deep umbrage at the remarks of the member for Gouger, but this feeling was healed by time, because this Bill has been on the Notice Paper for a long time. My interest was restored by the remarks of the member for Light, who seems to be emerging now as a moth from the cocoon that embraced him in obscurity and anonymity for the whole of his Parliamentary existence. He referred to the member for Unley in terms similar to those used by the member for Gouger. It seems that the member for Light is seeking to emulate the member for Gouger, because he must know that the member for Gouger will not be here after the next election, or he may be seeking to take his place as the provocateur-in-chief of the Liberal Party.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I wouldn't make too many prophecies about the next election; the result may not be so good.

Mr. JENNINGS: For you it won't be. If it is the intention of the member for Light to become the provocateur-in-chief of the Liberal Party, he faces the same destiny and will share the same fate as that of the member for Gouger. The member for Light did show that, like electricity, a little knowledge is a dangerous thing. We have had the benefit of a reply from the General Manager of the Electricity Trust to a series of questions asked by the member for Semaphore, and the member for Mount Gambier referred to them this afternoon. The questions and answers are as follows:

Question 1: The number of connections to new premises each year? Answer: Excluding those from existing undertakings acquired by the trust, the number of new consumers connected to the trust's system for each year ending June 30 was, in 1963, 14,536; in 1964, 14,434; in 1965, 15,869.

Question 2: What is the number of installation inspectors employed by the trust? Answer: The Electricity Trust employs 60 electrical inspectors.

Question 3: What is the number of faulty appliances complaints? Answer: No record is kept of the number of appliances which become faulty. An incomplete assessment can be made from the number of reports received by the trust of appliances (both fixed and portable) which have become faulty to the extent of causing electric shocks. Over the last five years, there has been an average of 66 reports a year of appliances causing electric shocks. In addition there has been an average of 26

reports a year of shocks received from appliances because of faulty flexible cords or associated accessories.

Question 4: What is the number of disconnect notices issued as a result of faulty appliances or installations? Answer: If a trust officer found an installation or appliance which, in his opinion, was dangerous, he would disconnect it immediately, give verbal notice of the action, and tie a warning label to the installation or appliance. No record is kept of these disconnections, but very approximately there would be 1,000 cases a year.

Question 5: What is the number of reported shocks? Answer: The number of reports of electric shocks has averaged 261 a year during the last five years.

The member for Mount Gambier gave the number of electrical fatalities for the years from 1955 to 1964, totalling 61. I reiterate that these are figures for South Australia. Recently, I heard in a news broadcast that a man in the Northern Territory had been electrocuted. Admittedly, the Northern Territory is not South Australia, but it is close to parts of it. He was electrocuted when trying to repair an electrical fault in his refrigerator. The questions continue:

Question 7: What was the increase in consumer appliances in the past 20 years? Answer: Neither the Electricity Trust nor the Bureau of Census and Statistics has any records which could answer this question. The average annual consumption of electricity by domestic consumers has risen from a figure of 720 kilowatt hours in 1945 to 3,080 in 1965, indicating a considerably increased use of electrical equipment.

Question 8: What is the number of re-work installations per annum over the last 10 years? Answer: The Electricity Trust does not keep these records for more than a year. In the last 12 months trust inspectors refused to connect 800 installations in the metropolitan area because they did not comply in some significant respect with the wiring rules of the Standards Association.

I did some checking up with the General Manager of the Electricity Trust about the speech of the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall). The General Manager has every facility at his disposal for supplying information of this nature. He is prepared and willing, I am sure, to give to every member of this House such information. He is a member of a body not directly concerned with legislation of this nature, other than to properly advise the Government. He says this in regard to his reading of a copy of the honourable member's speech:

(1) The honourable member's overall statistics of electrical accidents in the Australian States are slightly inaccurate but they give a fair representation of the relative positions.

(2) Regarding deaths of females, the member for Gouger chose two years—1961 and 1962—when there were no such deaths.

So obviously the honourable member was cunning enough to pick two years when the figures would suit his case.

Mr. Hurst: In other words, figures can mean anything or nothing.

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes; it is the old story. He continues:

In 1964 two women were electrocuted.

There was no question of that fact being mentioned by the honourable member. Then:

In the 10 years from 1955 to 1964 there were 65 electrical fatalities in South Australia; 25 of these were in the electrical trade and would not affect women or children. Of the remaining 49, 10 were women or children—namely, 20 per cent.

Then he comments on the honourable member's next statement:

(3) This statement, based on the statistics that "it was far more dangerous to live in a State which had full control", is specious. This is the General Manager of the Electricity Trust speaking.

The Queensland authorities are very concerned at the high accident rate in that State and have the most comprehensive licensing legislation to endeavour to reduce it. But accident figures reflect the habits of the people. For example, the Queensland figures are affected by cases where victims have been bare-footed or wearing brief clothing, which exposes a greater area of the body to possible contact with live metal. It is suggested that the Government's reply to Mr. Hall's inferences drawn from the accident statistics of the various States might be that the Government believes that without licensing of electricians the Queensland figures would be higher, and it believes that with licensing the South Australian figures would be lower.

(4) The honourable member has stated that the Bill makes it an offence to repair a dangerous appliance, but not to use one. This is correct. In Western Australia a regulation states:

"No person or consumer shall permit any wires, cables, fittings, apparatus, appliances or accessories which are in an unsafe condition to be connected or to remain connected to an installation." If the Government so desired, a similar regulation could be made in South Australia or a similar clause could be added to the Bill.

Then the General Manager comments on the honourable member's suggestion that the Bill be amended to eliminate reference to appliances. He continues:

(5) During the 10 years from 1955 to 1964, there were 65 electrical fatalities in South Australia and, as mentioned above, 49 of these were concerned with other than the electrical trade. Of these, 24 (or approximately 50 per cent) were associated with electrical appliances or flexible cords.

(6) The honourable member has stated that it would be an offence to change a spark plug on a motor vehicle. Strictly speaking, this is correct, although the normal vehicle wiring is excluded, being six, 12 or other low voltage. Obviously, no action would ever be taken on the changing of a spark plug, but there would be no objection to a specific exemption for ignition circuits of internal combustion engines.

It would be possible to exempt motor vehicles completely, provided caravans were still retained within the scope of the legislation.

Mr. Quirke: Does the honourable member know the voltage of a spark plug after it has passed through a coil?

Mr. JENNINGS: He continues:

Caravans normally use 240 volts, and it is important that they be correctly wired.

Here, I should like to refer to what the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) implied about approaches made to the Minister in charge of this Bill, that the people who had approached him had not received much sympathy—or, as I think the member rather inelegantly put it, that they had been "brushed off". Nothing is farther from the truth here. On November 15, 1965, the Minister received a deputation from the Wireless Institute of Australia. He had before that considerable correspondence with that institute. Then, on January 20, 1966, the Minister received a deputation from the Institute of Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Servicing Engineers of South Australia. He received on November 25 last a deputation from the South Australian Motion Picture Exhibitors Association, and in every instance much correspondence has been entered into with those organizations. I am informed that only last week the Minister received a deputation from the Institute of Engineers on this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you move amendments as a result of these representations?

Mr. JENNINGS: The honourable member should contain himself in patience for a little while. There has, inevitably, been much correspondence with the Electricity Trust, the Electrical Trades Union and the Australian Labor Party, but I cannot see anywhere that there has been any correspondence with the Liberal and Country League. I think what I have said will dispel any allegation that the Minister has brushed off people who have come to see him on this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: He does brush them off if he does not do anything about it, and that is the fact.

Mr. JENNINGS: I think it can be said that the organizations appear to be satisfied with the way they have been treated. If they were

not, I would prefer to have it from their own mouths than from the mouth of the member for Mitcham. I do not think it is necessary for me to refer to what the member for Rocky River said a few moments ago. He made a speech which, if it had emanated from another source, we would have been able to say was peculiar, but as it came from the honourable member we had to make certain allowances. He started off very well, as he immediately conceded in reply to an interjection that the reason he opposed the Bill was that it was introduced by the Labor Party. Of course, he mentioned that it was socialistic legislation.

Mr. Heaslip: It is not true Socialism.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not know the honourable member's definition of any form of Socialism, but if this is like Socialism I am even more proud than ever to be a Socialist. The honourable member went on to make assertions *ad nauseam* without having anything to support them. He certainly kept repeating himself as though he had eaten some good turkey stuffing. Apparently he believes that if one repeats something often enough it is just as good as giving arguments to support what one is saying. The member for Glenelg tried with, I thought, remarkable persistence to ask the honourable member whether he thought doctors should be licensed either to kill or cure if they did not have a degree in medicine, but the honourable member either did not hear or studiously avoided answering the question. Although I do not have the authority of the Minister to do this, I believe I can assure the member for Rocky River that it will not be an offence under this legislation to turn a light on or off.

The member for Stirling supported the Bill, as I would expect a man of his intelligence to do. He said, however, that we were starting with too big a Bill and perhaps could amend it later. He said it would be better to start off with a simple Bill and, if it were not sufficient, we could add to it later. I remind him that if this Bill passes the second reading he can amend it straight away; all he needs is the numbers. The Bill merits passing the second reading. I understand that the Minister intends to move some amendments and is prepared to accept at least one from the Opposition. This is in keeping with the tolerant and broad-minded attitude that this Government has always shown, in direct contrast with what it experienced when in Opposition. I support the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I think it only right and proper that a person who undertakes for

reward to install wiring in a house should be competent. There is no reason why that should not be so because, if everyone is allowed to do this, they have no certificate of competency and one does not know what one is going to get. The work may be done more cheaply, but the results of inexperienced work can be costly. I would take all sorts of care to see that anyone wiring a house, new or old, for me was competent to perform the work. No fly-by-nighter who just told me that he knew all about it would receive my sanction to proceed with the work. Any person would have to demonstrate to me that he was capable of doing the wiring, because to install is one thing but often, as applies in relation to repairing a house, it pays to renew rather than to repair. This is so because it can be very expensive to rip out wiring and fittings, as these can be damaged.

I support the principle that electricians should be licensed, just as plumbers are licensed. Plumbers have to be licensed in two ways—they are licensed as plumbers, but before they can interfere with the drains of the Engineering and Water Supply Department they must have the certificate of that department to do the work and possess a drainer's licence.

Merely having faultless wiring in a house will not prevent all accidents, as there is a history of accidents among the trained workers of the Electricity Trust. These accidents constantly happen, yet these men know full well the impact they can get from the voltages they deal with. They handle live wires of 240 volts, and often wear gloves. However, I have known of a case where the glove has been punctured by the wire and the sweat from the man's hand has caused him to get a shock, which has knocked him off the wire. I do not know how this type of accident will be averted. It is wrong to imply, as some members opposite seem to imply, that all these things will be prevented by this Bill, as human frailty enters into the matter. I do not think the legislation should apply to minor repairs to household equipment, which can be carried out safely by thousands of people. I would not do this, as I do not know enough about it, but I, like the member for Semaphore and the member for Unley, know many people who can faultlessly repair simple household equipment when repair is most necessary.

Mr. Langley: Some can and some cannot.

Mr. QUIRKE: I know, but under this Bill everyone will be prevented from doing this. I

think it should be firmly realized that installations from the mains to points of supply in the house should be rigidly controlled. However, although this legislation will mean that one will have to send for an electrician to make a simple repair to an iron or toaster, it will not prevent this equipment from getting out of repair and being dangerous while in disrepair. If a licence must always be obtained, it will undoubtedly prolong the delay in remedying a fault. This legislation is too rigid and inflexible. A strong room was fitted with an electric light and equipped with an old-fashioned brass switch, which people going into the room simply flicked on. However, in due course the switch cover became unwound, and I happened to be the one to come along to switch the light on. Of course, I was practically knocked unconscious, for the force of 240 volts is absolutely terrific. These things will continue to happen; there will always be the frayed cord that may connect an iron to the point of supply. Many people are competent to effect their own simple repairs, although I personally would get somebody like the member for Unley to effect them.

Mr. Hall: They call them "switch doctors".

Mr. QUIRKE: Competent people will be stopped from undertaking these simple repairs. The Bill provides:

The Governor may by proclamation exempt from all or any of the provisions of this Act any electrical installation if he is of the opinion—

- (a) that in that part of the State in which the electrical installation is situated a sufficient number of licensed electrical workers is not normally available; or
- (b) that for any other reason such exemption is desirable in the public interest.

That provision may lead to the exemption of far-flung 240-volt systems, and is indeed right and proper. Indeed, my only real point of disagreement with the Bill is the rigid control that it seeks to impose. Its provisions should stop at the point of supply in a house. I do not know how the Government intends to amend the Bill.

Mr. Millhouse: The amendments are not on the file.

Mr. QUIRKE: No. The trust, although not out to exploit people, will have to obey the dictates of the Bill. If I apply for a licence, I presume I have to go through a certain procedure to obtain one; does that involve a test of my knowledge of the trade?

Mr. Hurst: Yes, if you are not a tradesman.

Mr. QUIRKE: In that case, the Bill should say so. I must say that I agree with the pro-

vision that a licensed electrical worker cannot become an electrical contractor, for it will prevent the former from doing work that he is not entirely competent to perform. However, I should like to know who will issue a certificate of competency to an applicant.

Mr. Hurst: The trade school, under the tradesmen's rights and regulations, is the body to determine that.

Mr. QUIRKE: Is there an examining committee?

Mr. Millhouse: A practical committee with no powers!

Mr. QUIRKE: I cannot see where the powers reside in this Bill. What degree of competence is required of an electrical worker? Must he have served his apprenticeship?

Mr. Hurst: Yes, or pass a test.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Bill does not say so.

Mr. Hurst: That is covered by Commonwealth law.

Mr. QUIRKE: If there is to be an issuing authority, there must be some yardstick by which a man's capacity will be gauged, and I do not think theoretical knowledge will be sufficient to enable that to be done. I would have nobody but a practical man wiring my house and, under this Bill, he would be a certificated man. Certificated men could pass a theoretical examination in electricity, but many children at high schools could do that. Hams throughout the country with transmitting and receiving equipment can do all these things, and this Bill does not lay down anything regarding proof that these people are qualified from a practical point of view.

Mr. Casey: How does a projectionist get a licence at present?

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not know.

Mr. Casey: He goes before a special committee.

Mr. QUIRKE: A projectionist has only one job to do: he is a projectionist. An electrician has many jobs to do.

Mr. Hurst: All these things will come by regulation.

Mr. Heaslip: Why aren't they in the Bill?

Mr. QUIRKE: The member for Semaphore is perfectly honest in his expressions: he is honest in every way, but is he satisfied that the conditions for qualifying, as outlined in this Bill, are in themselves sufficient?

Mr. Hurst: I am satisfied that the administrative body will do a good job.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you tell us why Parliament should leave these things to an administrative body?

Mr. Hurst: Parliament will get a chance to discuss them when the regulations come up.

Mr. QUIRKE: I would prefer to see the committee directed in some way as to the standard of competence, because a regulation-making authority can regulate people out of existence, so to speak.

Mr. Langley: Persons in the electrical field at present who are competent workers would most likely receive their licences. However, an electrician who did the wrong thing would lose his licence.

Mr. QUIRKE: I would prefer to have in this Bill some standard prescribed rather than have the matter left entirely to a regulation-making authority that could put forward regulations week after week. These bodies do not usually do that, but it can be done. Members know the authoritarian attitude that can come in. Regulations can be set aside, and therein lies the danger.

I am satisfied that there is a necessity for the qualifications of people to be made known by means of a certificate of competency that can be presented by the electrical contractor or electrical worker. I am not sure whether an electrical worker will be precluded entirely, unless he has a contractor's certificate, from undertaking simple wiring jobs.

I think members realize that there are deficiencies in this Bill. They have been pointed out to the Government, whose duty it is to take notice of them and to remedy them by putting amendments on the file before the Bill reaches the Committee stage. It is not only fair and reasonable but proper that the matter should be handled in that way. Many amendments would not be required in order to satisfy me, but some amendments are necessary. It is important to know whether a man who obtains a licence as an electrical worker will be precluded from undertaking to do a simple job in a household and quoting a price for doing it. Must the customer go to the bigger electrical contractor?

Mr. Hurst: Provided he does not employ labour he can do that work.

Mr. QUIRKE: Most of them employ lads who go with them on wiring jobs. I do not like to think that, in order to do a small job, an electrical worker must obtain an electrical contractor's licence as well. He would not use the contractor's licence in a big way, because not all of these people are capable of standing the financial strain involved. Another thing is that, even though wiring may be faultless, the human element will come into the matter and there will still be accidents with

electricity because of neglect of household installations.

Notwithstanding the prohibition on a person's doing work himself, we must remember that it would cost about 30s. an hour to have the work done by a tradesman. I think the position would be covered if the provision applied to the wiring only and finished at the plug point. There is the case of the man who shaved in his bath with an electric razor and apparently dropped the razor into the bath. Cords used to be popular in bathrooms because they ensured that people could not inadvertently touch a switch with wet hands. However, I understand that there is now supposed to be a waterproof switch. My second name is Didymus in regard to things like that. I am in favour of the main purpose of the Bill, which is to license people who work with this extremely dangerous medium. It provides that they will be competent to do the work without loss to the householder who employs them. The member for Gouger has a worthwhile amendment on the file and I think it should be supported by all members. With the reservations to which I have referred, I support the general principles of the Bill.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I support the Bill, even though many of its so-called deficiencies have been pointed out. All the statistics that have been quoted in the debate show the reason for the introduction of the Bill. I have spoken to practising electricians in my district and without exception they have stated that they fully agree with the idea and principle of licensing electricians.

Mr. Freebairn: What about your fruitgrowers; have you spoken to them?

Mr. CURREN: I have spoken to the electricians who do the wiring for most of these installations. Fruitgrowers who have installations are quite happy to have electricians install the wiring. Despite the predictions of the member for Light that fruitgrowers in my district would be up in arms about the Bill, no complaint whatever has been brought to my notice about it. The member for Light has had much to say about the District of Chaffey in his recent speeches, but apparently he gleanes his knowledge from afar.

Mr. Freebairn: You were not in the Chamber to hear my speeches.

Mr. CURREN: I cannot be blamed for that. I can stand many things but I am afraid I cannot stand the burlings that come from the member for Light.

Mr. Quirke: By now every fruitgrower on the river could apply for a licence, anyway.

Mr. CURREN: I do not agree with that, because very few growers undertake their own installations. In the main, the people in the river districts are quite intelligent, but they do not claim to be able to do everything. The member for Rocky River spoke about the so-called evil effects of the Bill on the outer areas of the State. Apparently he did not study the Bill as closely as the member for Burra studied it, for he did not pick up the reference to exemptions of installations dealt with in clause 3.

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

Mr. CURREN: The member for Burra has apparently studied this Bill much more closely and has noted some of the provisions contained in it. The member for Rocky River had much to say about the position in remote country areas. However, I point out that clause 3, providing for exemptions by proclamation, takes care of that. The remarks of Opposition members concerning the changing of spark plugs are absolute nonsense. It is ridiculous to claim that a motorist would be committing a crime if he changed a spark plug in a motor vehicle.

Mr. Millhouse: That is what the Bill says.

Mr. CURREN: The member for Burra complained that too much was laid down in the Bill and that its provisions were too rigid. However, he then complained that the persons to do the licensing and the qualifications that would be necessary were not specified. Therefore, that is a reversal from his earlier remarks.

Mr. Freebairn: Did you listen to the speech made by the member for Enfield? He talked about spark plugs, too.

Mr. CURREN: The member for Enfield did pass some remarks about the lack of light that the honourable member for Light shed on the question. The fact that the qualifications necessary for an electrician to obtain a licence are not included in the Bill does not in itself make this a bad Bill, as members opposite have claimed. I do not think the examinations a doctor or a plumber must pass in order to be permitted to operate are laid down in any Act of Parliament, so why should such a thing be laid down in the case of an electrician? I support the Bill and the general principles involved.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I do not wish to delay this matter: first, I think it is wrong for a Minister to stonewall his own Bill and, secondly, I think that sufficient has been said now for most people to get a pretty good idea of what the

Bill contains. It seems to me that every member who has spoken has agreed that some kind of control is necessary. However, they have argued against the provisions of the Bill. This is a safety measure but we do not claim that it will prevent all accidents: no legislation designed to preserve body and limb will do that. All other States have found it necessary to enact similar legislation, and some States have had these provisions for many years. It is strange that this State is the last one to do so, and the reasons have varied why we should not pass this legislation. In my second reading explanation, I gave figures of fatal accidents since 1960. Many members, particularly Opposition members, have quoted figures from other States but comparisons do not prove much.

No quoted figures have proved the case these members were trying to establish, that the enactment of legislation does not reduce the number of accidents. I query why they avoided this point. I am sure that figures would show the contrary in spite of the greatly increased use of electricity. It is not denied that the use of electricity has greatly increased and is rapidly increasing: it plays a vital part in our community today. Since the introduction of this Bill much has been said, some of it fairly but some remarks have been unfair. I agree that the Opposition has a duty to perform and, as one who was a member of the Opposition for 15 years, I do not deny Opposition members the right to criticize forcibly. It is their duty and they would be failing in it if they did not do so, but they should have some responsibility. I was disturbed and disappointed when the member for Mitcham said that I had brushed off people who had tried to see me. Everyone who made a request to see me about this Bill was granted a deputation, and had the greatest freedom to discuss the matter with me.

Mr. Langley: Only recently we spoke to the Electrical Contractors Association in Parliament House.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: In part, the member for Mitcham was correct in what he said about the Electrical Contractors Association. An officer of that association rang me prior to the introduction of this Bill, and I told him that I should be happy to discuss any matters before the introduction of the legislation. However, I admit that I overlooked calling him before the introduction of the Bill. However, in the Parliamentary lounge in the presence of the member for

Unley and others, I told members of that association in no uncertain manner that my door was open and that I would welcome a discussion on all aspects of the Bill. This they never did, but I would have been willing to see them. Brushing people off is something I would never do. I assure the honourable member that his statement is incorrect. I hope that he will in future have more respect for me than to suggest that I would brush people off. I admit that we have not agreed that amendments are necessary. In fact, each deputation that came to see me left, with one exception, satisfied after I had made the best possible explanation of the Bill.

In the case of the exception, I agreed to discuss the matter with the appropriate people. I will not name them, because under Standing Orders I am not permitted to do so. However, this we did and the result was that I have discussed the matter with the member for Torrens. An amendment will be moved by the Government at the request of those people, who pointed out what I believe was a just and proper thing to refer to. The Bill aims to achieve certain standards for the electrical workers of this State, but the member for Gouger said that it had the inevitable hallmark of Socialist legislation. He is entitled to say that, but it seems to me to be a requirement of all or most trades or professions where life and health are vitally concerned to afford some sort of protection. Every Government in Australia over recent years has found it necessary to introduce legislation to protect life and limb. For instance, in South Australia we have the Health Act, the Food and Drugs Act, etc. It can be said today that we control the plumbers by Act and regulations, and we even have the Hairdressers Registration Act, the Dentists Act, the Lifts Act, the Pharmacy Act, the Road Traffic Act and the Scaffolding Inspection Act. These Acts have been on the Statute Book for many years. They were not repealed by the previous Government; in fact, it is much to the credit of the previous Government that many of those Acts were enacted. They all demanded a standard. These standards are required for the protection of life and limb. No doubt, from what the member for Gouger has said, the L.C.L. Government would not have introduced that legislation had it not been for the progressive thinking of that humane section of society known as the Socialists. This seems to me to be an admission on his part that the Government did it under pressure. The words of the honourable member

make one feel proud of being a member of a Socialist society, which has the progressive spirit, unlike the cold, cruel, bloodless thinking of the Conservative people—an aspect we see in the thinking of the honourable member.

Mr. Millhouse: Then you admit you are still a Socialist?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am a Socialist, and proud of it. I have never denied it. The member for Light referred to professional workers and to electricians being professional workers. He told some fantastic story—

Mr. Freebairn: It was not fantastic at all.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: If I remember rightly, the story was that, when he visited a constituent in his area and they switched on the drawing room light, the toilet flushed in another room. I am sorry: that was not the case.

Mr. Clark: It was just as foolish.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It was. He led us to believe that the person who did the wiring was an expert and that when the heating system was switched on the lights in the drawing room came on.

Mr. Freebairn: I said he was a professional electrician, which was true.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This was one of the best arguments that could have been brought forward for the licensing of electricians, because this man could not wire even a fowlhouse properly, yet the honourable member said we should not interfere with this. If we did not, we would be allowing people to be exploited by people professing to be electricians. The member for Unley and other members gave figures obtained from the Electricity Trust about the number of faulty wirings made by electricians, or people who claimed to be electricians, last year. There were about 800 of these, they said. Much was said about taking away the rights of an individual. However, if we do not introduce legislation of this nature we shall be denying people protection from the exploitation of unqualified people.

There has been much discussion about bringing appliances under control. The member for Unley, the member for Semaphore and the member for Enfield gave figures made available by the Electricity Trust of the number of faulty appliances that the trust was called upon to inspect, and they amounted to about 1,000. These could have caused 1,000 deaths. I think it was the member for Burra who said that this legislation would encourage people to allow electrical appliances to get into a state of

disrepair, and I know that is partly true. However, if I remember correctly, it has been found necessary in Western Australia to introduce legislation to provide that if a person uses a faulty appliance he is guilty of an offence.

Mr. Hurst: It is just as dangerous.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: It is.

Mr. Clark: Which Government introduced that?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I cannot say. I will now contrast the remarks made by the member for Gouger with those made by the member for Alexandra. The member for Alexandra drew attention to electric fencing and mentioned three types, two of which were worked from low voltage (batteries or wind power). The Government sees no reason why these should not be exempt from the licensing provisions. However, the third type works from the Electricity Trust's mains. Although the Government agrees that such a fence is safe, it is, after all, similar to any other 240-volt appliance, and should be correctly wired and installed.

Mr. Quirke: Does the Minister understand that electric fences can be shifted every day?

Mr. McKee: Like everybody else in his Party, the honourable member doesn't wish to be satisfied.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I think he will be satisfied. While the Government believes that a strong case exists for bringing all farm appliances of 240 volts and over within the provisions of the Bill, it has seriously considered the difficulties of a person's obtaining the services of licensed electrical workers to effect repairs in this regard. The Government is aware that only a small service may be required in the case of a milking machine's breaking down, and that any delay may result in loss of production. This may apply also to a shearing shed where repairs must be effected in the shortest possible time, so that shearing can proceed without delay. In such cases the Government believes that primary industry would suffer if it had to rely on obtaining the services of electricians for small repair jobs.

Mr. Freebairn: Are you going to provide for this by amendment?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I ask the honourable member to be patient. The member for Rocky River (Mr. Heaslip) mentioned the case of a pump in a paddock breaking down, and stock suffering from thirst as a result.

Mr. McKee: He may have to apply mouth-to-mouth resuscitation.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Government believes that an individual in any of these circumstances should be permitted to attend to such work, even though he runs a risk in so doing.

Mr. Quirke: He will do it in any case.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: He may. The Government is prepared favourably to consider an amendment that will exempt from the provisions of the Bill appliances used for rural production. In relation to the matter of spark plugs, raised by the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall), this, like various other types of installation, seems to me to be a case for the committee's consideration. Clause 10 provides for the appointment of an advisory committee which, as honourable members may have realized, will represent a wide range of interests. Clause 3 provides that the Governor may by proclamation exempt any installation from the provisions of the Bill. I submit, first, that the power of exemption is necessary because of the wide definition of an electrical installation. For example, it would seem likely that the exemption may be granted to cover radio and television installation provided that the person working on that has a licence granted under the Wireless and Telegraph Act.

After the Bill has been passed, there will be an interim period before licensed workers do the work. I remind members that some years ago this House set up a committee under the provisions of the Health Act in connection with the inclusion in that Act of provisions dealing with clean air and it selected a wide field of people, with which I agreed, and gave the committee power to make regulations to prevent the pollution of air. This committee has been working for a number of years in an endeavour to frame such regulations, and the committee set up by this Bill will have to work for many months in order to provide satisfactory regulations. I would say that it would be two years before a proclamation could be made.

Clause 7, the basic provision in the Bill, provides for the fixing by proclamation of a day after which electrical work is to be carried out by a licensed electrical contractor unless he is licensed. To me, the licensing provisions of the Bill are simple, but I appreciate, as other members do, that the writing of the regulations will be a most difficult and complex task. This is because there are many types of electrical work and the various types of registration will have to be determined. For

example, there are people working in the advanced field of electronics.

Mr. Freebairn: In Western Australia, they have four different categories.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: They have a number of categories, and a number of categories for the licensing of electricians will be provided by this Bill. This afternoon it was mentioned that no type of examination was prescribed. I submit that, in this State, it would be most difficult to provide in a Bill for such an examination. It must be accepted that many people are carrying out the installation of electrical services in South Australia today in a most competent manner. However, we have to make laws to protect the people from the few who are not carrying out the work in a competent manner. I acknowledge that many of the competent persons could not sit down and do a written examination and I am sure that the committee will have to make provision for licensing some of these people on the basis of their record. Then, the younger man coming on, the apprentice, will require a restricted licence to enable him to carry out his work. All of these regulations must come back to Parliament for approval, so we are not delegating authority for the regulations to an outside body at all.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course, the regulations will come into force before we get a chance to consider them, won't they?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That applies to every type of regulation.

Mr. Millhouse: That is correct. I thought your Party believed in less rather than more Executive control.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: There are some things we believe in and some things that we find it necessary to do. There are ideals without realism.

Mr. Millhouse: There is a good paragraph on that in the Premier's policy speech.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: If we can for one moment discuss the Bill before the House without dragging in extraneous matters, it will be a change. I do not want to make this a political issue: this matter is too important to be a political football. It concerns the safety of life and limb, and many complex problems are associated with it.

Mr. Langley: In the long run all electricians will serve an apprenticeship.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, they will have to serve an apprenticeship and then sit for an examination. However, these things

cannot be determined immediately. The committee will be made up of representatives from a wide field, with the Electricity Trust being the predominant representative, and will be anxious to see that the utmost quantity of power is used, that the utmost service is given to the community and that the widest field of electrical operations continue to function smoothly and economically in the interests of the State.

Clause 3 deals with exemptions. Later the Government intends to take action to put beyond doubt the fact that certain professions (members of which were never intended to be licensed as electrical workers) are exempt from the provisions of the Bill. Those exempt will be consulting engineers, instructors at trade schools, technical high schools and the university, and so on. I am sure that honourable members must realize that the Government never intended that these people should be licensed. We believe that the committee, to be set up under the Bill, would never have demanded that they be licensed. However, to put the matter beyond any shadow of doubt, we will insert this exemption in the Bill. I hope I have convinced honourable members—

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: You have not convinced me—rather the reverse.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: If I could change the opinions of the Leader I would be Mandrake. I am sure that all members believe that some type of legislation is necessary in this connection. I commend the Bill to the House and trust that it will pass through its remaining stages.

The SPEAKER: The question is:

That this Bill be now read a second time, which Mr. Millhouse has moved to amend by leaving out all the words after the word "That" with a view to inserting the following words in lieu thereof:

the Bill be withdrawn and redrafted to provide for a workable system of licensing.

The question before the Chair is:

That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the question.

For the question say "Aye", against the question say "No".

The House divided on the question:

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

Noes (15).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, and Millhouse (teller), Sir Thomas

Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bywaters and Hughes. Noes—Messrs. Bockelberg and Pearson.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Question thus passed in the affirmative.

The House divided on the second reading:

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

Noes (15).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, and Millhouse, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bywaters and Hughes. Noes—Messrs. Bockelberg and Pearson.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Interpretation."

Mr. HALL: I move:

Before the definition of "committee" to insert the following definition:

"business of primary production" shall have the meaning assigned to that expression in the Land Tax Act, 1936-1961, as amended.

I move this amendment on behalf of the member for Flinders, who is absent. Its object is to allow some freedom of movement on agricultural properties. The definition of "business of primary production" in the Land Tax Act is as follows:

The business of agriculture, pasturage, horticulture, viticulture, apiculture, poultry farming, dairy farming or any other business (excluding forestry) consisting of the cultivation of soils, the gathering in of crops or the rearing of livestock.

The object of this amendment is to give a true meaning to subsequent clauses that I believe the Government will accept. We want to remove the difficulty encountered when electrical equipment has to be repaired quickly.

Amendment carried.

Mr. HALL: I move:

In the definition of "electrical installation" to strike out all the words after "which" and insert:

is intended for the conveyance control or use of electricity supplied or intended to be supplied by an electricity supply undertaking at a voltage in excess of 40 volts; but does not include any appliances, wires, fittings or apparatus connected to and

beyond any electrical outlet socket which is installed for the purpose of connecting portable electrical appliances, fittings or apparatus and at which fixed wiring terminates.

This amendment has a direct bearing on the operation of the Bill. The matters contained in the present paragraphs (a) and (b) have been dealt with in debate. These lines cast a wide net and bring every appliance under the operation of the Bill. The "protective material or casing thereon" includes the simple insulation tape to protect frayed wires. This amendment raises the restrictive voltage to 40. It goes further than the Government intends this Bill to go. It covers every aspect of repair work in connection with electrical goods in the home, in the case of everything connected to a voltage over 40. Much of the wording of the amendment is taken from the Victorian Act, and I believe it gives the protection that the public desires: that is, that all work of a permanent nature in a building, dwelling or factory must be carried out by qualified tradesmen, but the householder or handyman will still be able to repair many appliances on the spot. As people will repair appliances despite any restrictions, the amendment will prevent a wholesale breaking of the law. If it is carried, people will be able to place insulated tape on frayed wires and do other work to keep down costs. It would not be possible to have enough inspectors to police the provision as it appears in the Bill. I confidently move the amendment, which means that these provisions will apply only to wiring up to the outlets.

Mr. COUMBE: I support the amendment. If electrical workers are to be licensed, we should have a Bill that will work. The Bill as drafted will cause endless trouble and will not be workable. If the amendment is carried, wiring and installation work in a house or factory will have to be carried out by a licensed electrical worker or contractor, but the responsibility will terminate at the wall outlet in a house. It will be impossible to police the provision in the Bill as drafted. It will be completely impossible in any court of law to prove who has carried out certain work on a household fitting. At present hardware stores sell all types of electrical fitting and cable commonly used in the household. The standard of such equipment, which has to be approved and passed by a committee, can be bought by anybody. We agree with the principle that in a factory or house the wiring should be performed by licensed workers, but that in respect of fittings inside a room the Bill should not apply. Accordingly, such a provision would make the Bill workable.

Mr. LANGLEY: The use of electrical appliances has grown tremendously over the years, and it is as easy to be ignorant of these appliances as it is of electrical wiring. Only yesterday I visited a house where somebody had tampered with the cord of an appliance, so that the appliance would work in one terminal and not in another. The person concerned was unaware that an earth situation existed at one of the points. Although this provision may be difficult to police, it is at least a safety measure that may eliminate some of the hundreds of faults that develop in electrical appliances, and it may well prevent loss of life. This part of the Bill is important, because it deals with the wiring of houses and factories, in which there have been a number of accidents, and the inclusion of the provision will at least act as a deterrent.

Mr. Ryan: Some modern electrical appliances are so complicated that the average person cannot repair them if they become faulty.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. There are types of electric iron now that enable the temperature of the iron to be varied, and we have pop-up toasters. These appliances are complicated.

Mr. Hall: What method of policing the Bill will be used?

Mr. LANGLEY: The Electricity Trust will be the authority, in the same way as we have a police force to police regulations requiring a motorist not to exceed a speed of 35 miles an hour in certain areas.

Mr. Hall: Will inspectors have the right to enter houses to search?

Mr. LANGLEY: When a person has completed electrical work, the Electricity Trust officer inspect the work. If something goes wrong with an appliance, the correct thing to do would be to go to an electrician and have it repaired properly.

Mr. Hall: How are you going to catch the thousands who will not go?

Mr. LANGLEY: Such people would be foolish. Washing machines in laundries and kitchens are extremely dangerous. This all adds up to the fact that it is dangerous for people to play around with electrical equipment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support this amendment. The Bill is so full of holes that we cannot patch it up in Committee: we can only make it a little less bad. I shall give an example of the utterly absurd lengths to which this provisions goes, as worded at present. The definition of "electrical installation" includes a piece of flex because a piece of flex

is either the whole or part of any appliance, wire, system of wiring, conduit pipe, switch, fittings, equipment, motor apparatus or device, wherever situated which is intended, designed or adapted for the purpose of carrying or transmitting, electricity at an operating voltage in excess of 40 volts. Therefore, any work done on a bit of flex (and many other things are included, too) is work done on an electrical installation. The definition of electrical work would include cutting in half a piece of flex, because that is doing work on an electrical installation. It does not have to be connected to anything at either end but could be just a piece of flex two or three feet long. This is absurd, and anything like this should not be included in any Bill that comes before this Chamber. If the amendment is not accepted we shall have a piece of legislation honoured in the breach and not in the observance. It will be ignored by the people—that is bad law—and there is no way in which it can be effectively policed.

Mr. SHANNON: I am not an electrician and I would not risk handling any permanent installation in my house. However, from where the electrician finishes I am perfectly competent to carry on. I can remove the cord if it is faulty and, if I cannot deal with it, I can take it to the nearest repair shop. No great risk is involved if the installation is properly installed. The risk of removing a plug from a power point in the wall or elsewhere is negligible. The real risk, however, is to children who tinker around with the outlet plugs. Nevertheless, outlet plugs are being manufactured today that are reasonably fool-proof in the case of someone inserting a hairpin.

Mr. Langley: They are not.

Mr. SHANNON: I am informed that they are. With the old power points if anyone pushed in a piece of metal, such as a small screwdriver, a fatal accident could occur. However, I have not heard of a fatal accident resulting from a person's taking a plug from a power point. The member for Unley spoke about irons, the heat of which can be regulated by a knob on the top of the iron. Most people would accept the fact that if this knob goes wrong it is the work of an expert to repair it. I do not believe a householder would tamper with it and, even if he did, he would not run any risk of being electrocuted because at that stage the iron would not be connected to the power. The washing machine is a little different, and I think the member for Unley is right in warning people about having such

an appliance in the kitchen, for instance, where people are handling water. However, I do not think this amendment will have any effect upon that hazard. I do not oppose anything that will be a safety measure, but I think we must be realistic: after a qualified person does the actual wiring and provides the outlets from which electricity will be drawn the rest is the householder's job. If we tried to go on with it from there we would be in all sorts of strife, and it would be virtually impossible to police. If a person had a piece of equipment that was faulty he could tell an inspector that he was going to send it out to be repaired, and the inspector would have to accept that statement. Many little jobs are done in any home. Any householder can take an adapter off a piece of flex and put a new one on.

Mr. Langley: I don't agree with that.

Mr. SHANNON: I have done it many times, and I am not even a handyman. It is a simple operation, involving removing only two screws. I point out that when a person does this he is nowhere near the power supply.

Mr. Langley: What happens when you turn it on?

Mr. SHANNON: I have yet to install one that has not worked. One would never do that work when the equipment was plugged in to the power supply.

Mr. Langley: You may put it on and it may work, but you could still get a shock from it.

Mr. SHANNON: What is the honourable member talking about?

Mr. Langley: I am talking correctly.

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member does not understand what I am putting to the Committee. All I have done is replace a worn adapter with a new one.

Mr. Quirke: And there are thousands of them on sale.

Mr. SHANNON: Yes, and obviously they are not dangerous. If we provide that every storekeeper can sell this equipment only to a qualified man, this legislation will receive short shrift.

Mr. HURST: The Government would be wise not to accept the amendment. Much has been said about controlling appliances beyond the outlet. Trust figures, if analysed, show that the greater proportion of accidents occurs from the outlet in flexible cords and appliances. From 1955 to 1964, 61 electrical fatalities occurred in this State and 49 were concerned with other than the electrical trade. Of these, 24, or about 50 per cent, were associated with electrical appliances or flexible cords. When one considers the complications of electrical

appliances and circuits it is obvious that the ordinary person should not tinker with them. The public is entitled to legislative protection to ensure that when they pay for a job it should be done according to the rules and regulations.

Mr. Quirke: How would you police this provision?

Mr. HURST: Legislation is designed to prevent people from doing these things. The provision should be left as it is so that people would be protected.

Mrs. STEELE: The member for Torrens challenged the member for Unley on how this provision could be enforced, on how we could stop people from repairing their own equipment in their own homes. The member for Semaphore tried to do this but failed, so I hope the Minister will say how it can be done. I cannot see how a person can be caught doing what this legislation calls an illegal act. The person must be caught in the act for it to be proved that an illegal act has been committed. The member for Port Adelaide said that a woman was electrocuted by a washing machine. However, the accident was proved to have been caused by faulty wiring carried out by a person who was supposed to be a qualified electrician.

Mr. Ryan: He was not competent, and if there had been licensing he would not have been able to do the work.

Mrs. STEELE: This had been installed by a qualified electrician. I accept that licensing is necessary, but in this case the installation, not the equipment, was faulty. Electrical appliances are becoming too complicated for people to be able to repair them, and I wonder whether the Government should ask manufacturers of appliances to have built-in intricacies which would make it impossible for people to repair them. The member for Torrens said that people could buy parts or flex to repair appliances. Will a person have to produce the certificate of a qualified electrician every time he purchases any of this equipment; or does it mean that retailers will not be permitted to sell that equipment and that electricians will obtain their supplies only from the wholesale houses? The provision is a fallacy, and I support the amendment.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The Minister omitted to refer to my comment in relation to conduit pipe. Under the existing regulations any plumbing work must be undertaken by a registered plumber. As it is usual to use metal plumbing fixtures as earth connectors for electrical wiring, it seems that before a plumber can engage in repair or alteration

work he must call in an electrician to detach the earth wire, which may involve a minimum charge of £2 2s., and that after the plumbing work has been completed the electrician may have to be recalled and perhaps another fee paid to effect the electrical earth connection. If any wiring mishap occurred a court action could ensue. If the amendment is accepted, I think it will be evident that such a contingency will not lead to an illegal act. The amendment excludes wiring outside the fixed part of a circuit and bare earth wire attached to a plumbing fitting is outside the fixed part of the circuit, because it is an exposed wire. I know of houses served by three-pole transformers on which the earth wire is actually alive, although it carries low voltage, certainly not as high as the 40 volts mentioned in the Bill. Because of this, the clause as it stands makes it illegal for a plumber to detach the earth wire that had been fitted by an electrician and to re-fix it on completion of his plumbing work. No-one wants to break the law, and I draw this situation to the Minister's attention, in the hope that he will recommend that Government members accept the amendment. The absurdity of the clause as it stands gives an invitation to every householder to continue to repair electrical appliances, and I suppose that most of us regularly repair such things as the toaster or hot water jug. I hope the Committee will accept the amendment because it is in the interests of the general public.

Mr. RODDA: I support the amendment. I am not an expert on electrical appliances but the amendment seems to meet some of the objections raised by country people in relation to the effect the Bill will have on their carrying out repairs to such things as an electric pump.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I ask the Committee not to accept the amendment. I want the Bill to be worth while. We have been told of the number of accidents that occur in the handling of appliances, which makes it necessary for the Bill to deal with appliances. The member for Onkaparinga proved conclusively that many an amateur, who thinks he can handle a simple job, fails completely. A grave danger always exists, especially if the connection is made on a cement floor and the adapter is incorrectly wired. Evidence before the Committee shows that at least 1,000 appliances were found to be faulty in one year. This could have resulted in 1,000 deaths. How many more appliances were dangerous? It is difficult to

know where to draw the line. The Committee should carry the clause in its present form and provide that degree of safety that is so necessary in the interests of life and limb.

Mr. QUIRKE: It seems that an entirely new idea of legislation has crept into this place over the last nine months or so.

Mr. Ryan: Isn't it to be expected, after 32 years of tyranny?

Mr. QUIRKE: I expected it to be different, but I did not expect it to be as bad as it is.

Mr. Ryan: That is only your opinion.

Mr. QUIRKE: That is so. It has always been recognized during my time here that if a law is not enforceable it is a stupid law. We pass legislation and it is then the duty of the Judiciary to see that it is enforced. This measure is directly contrary to that, because it cannot be enforced; therefore, I entirely disagree with it. The Minister of Works criticized the member for Onkaparinga for what he said regarding some wretched adapter. As the Minister said, if one of these adapters has provision for three wires and a person connects only two there can be a dangerous connection. But how on earth will the provisions of this Bill prevent that? Unless this law can be enforced it is a bad law, and it should never be attempted.

Mr. Langley: It will be enforced.

Mr. QUIRKE: It cannot be enforced, without trespassing on the privacy of a man's home. Will we have people knocking on doors and demanding to look at all electrical installations?

Mr. Langley: They do it now.

Mr. QUIRKE: Is that what is intended under this Bill?

Mr. Langley: It will be a deterrent.

Mr. QUIRKE: The Minister said there were at least 1,000 pieces of bad equipment in houses. Probably these are 10,000 or 20,000, but how can we enforce the law to correct that position? Is it proposed to go through all houses and inspect every appliance? The position cannot be policed in any other way. If that is what is proposed, this is a damnable piece of legislation. In my experience it has always been emphasized that it is bad to enact a law that cannot be enforced, because it brings the whole system of law making into contempt.

Mr. McKee: Can you tell me of any laws not being enforced today? What about S.P. bookmaking?

Mr. QUIRKE: An attempt is being made there, but the privacy of the individual's house is not invaded. Warrants would be needed to

enter every house. Fatal accidents will occur notwithstanding this legislation, unless by means of inquisition every house is entered to see that the law is being obeyed and that faulty equipment is sent to a shop for repair. Apparently, the Government intends to enforce the law by intruding into private households of the people, because it cannot be done in any other way. If this is what is intended I shall never vote for it, because it is contrary to everything I have understood about good law-making. In the long run it would be a better for a few people to die rather than have a wholesale intrusion into the lives of people. Once, a man's home was his castle but under the Bill everyone but the occupants of a house will wear out the carpet. The Government probably never had that intention, but now that it knows this legislation cannot be enforced without an intrusion into the privacy of people it should not be passed.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I strongly suggest to the Minister that this legislation be brought into line with that in force in other States, rather than try to introduce something which cannot be enforced, and which is so full of weaknesses as to bring the legislation into disrepute. In other States, the control is on the installation up to the switch point, and that is a good law. With the use of the word "wire", we get a position that cannot be policed, unless inspectors are permitted to enter a house at any time without warning. The people of South Australia will not stand for legislation of this kind. They are entitled to some privacy in their own homes. Some things exempted in this Bill are more liable to cause accident than are some things which are not exempted and which, by the very nature of things, cannot be policed. One exemption relates to the oiling, greasing, cleaning or painting of any electrical installation. Many installations are in use in South Australia today where the switchboard requires greasing. I have four or five on my own property. This greasing is a dangerous job, and I always get an electrician to do it. But that work is exempted while the simple mending of a wire for a toaster becomes a criminal offence. Have we ever heard such rot? Surely our request is reasonable? If it became desirable to extend the provisions of the Bill it could be amended and improved. I hope the Bill in its present form does not become law. It represents an intrusion into our homes. Why did the Electricity Trust introduce the one-meter tariff? It was found impracticable

to police the two-meter tariff. I hope the Minister accepts the amendment, because it is vital to the success of the Bill.

Mr. LANGLEY: This matter gets back to the safety of the people. Breaking into homes has been mentioned. My experience is that people are always pleased to have electricians point out to them electrical faults in their homes. Officers of the Electricity Trust are polite and do a good job. When they tell people what is wrong, the people say, "Thanks very much for telling us." People like to be assured that their electrical equipment is in good order. This breaking into people's homes will not occur. Officers of the trust will not go into houses.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Then how will they police this provision?

Mr. LANGLEY: The main thing is to have safe appliances. We have been told that many people have been injured through using appliances that are faulty. If a householder is told he has faulty electrical equipment he will have it repaired. If electrical workers do not do their work properly they can have their licences taken away.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Is that a promise or a threat?

Mr. Freebairn: Is it proper for a householder to change the element in an electric jug?

Mr. LANGLEY: Often cords used for jugs are used also for toasters, and some have only two wires. When this is pointed out people are only too happy to have it remedied.

Mr. QUIRKE: The honourable member has completely evaded the point. I would not object to the courteous employees of the Electricity Trust asking a householder if he would like his electrical installations inspected, but this will become law, and if the appliance is faulty the householder will be told he must have it repaired and that he will break the law if he does the job himself. It is not possible for the trust's officers to go to every house, so people will still mend equipment themselves. Certainly it would be a good thing for the trust to instruct people, but a law is not necessary for that: it can be part of the domestic work of the trust. This provision cannot be enforced, and no member opposite has given one sound reason why the amendment should not be carried.

Mr. Langley: It should not be carried because of public safety.

Mr. QUIRKE: Nobody is trying to thwart safety. The member for Unley has suggested the real solution to the element of danger in

relation to household installations is to institute voluntary inspection and advice by the trust, whose officers can visit people and offer to inspect their installations to ensure their safety. Once an appliance is found to be unsafe the officer concerned can make sure that it is put right.

Mr. Hall: Do you think he will ask for a penalty, if something needs to be done?

Mr. QUIRKE: He could say, "If I find anything unsafe you will be liable for a penalty," but that is not the way to do it. If the member for Unley can induce the trust to undertake the real safety measure that he himself has suggested, I am sure it will fill the Bill admirably, and remove the necessity for such a bad provision as this one.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Evidently, the Minister does not intend to accede to the suggestion I have made. To illustrate an example of the ridiculous way in which the Bill has been drafted, I refer the Committee to the definition of an electrical worker under clause 2, bearing in mind the provisions under clause 7. Then, if we read clause 9, we shall find an exemption which means that a globe or fuse wire can be altered. Assuming I have a mixmaster attached to a power point in my house, I apparently cannot disconnect it to use another electrical appliance.

Mr. Coumbe: If you bought it, you could not even connect it up.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No. I could not install it, alter it, or disconnect it for repair.

Mr. Coumbe: It is doubtful whether you could switch it off.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. The fact that common equipment in the house cannot be altered shows how ridiculous the Bill is. The Bill has been made wide enough to be all-embracing, but I do not think the Government realizes that it does this. To try to police it would not be desirable; indeed, it would be ridiculous.

The electrical centre advises people to buy certain equipment that is considered to be safe and that can be connected to any power point. However, under this Bill, the equipment cannot be used and surely the Minister can see that this legislation is impracticable. Every honourable member on this side favours the inspection of installations in the interests of safety, but why have we in South Australia suddenly found that we are so clever that we can go further than Victoria, where it has been found that control cannot be exercised beyond the plug?

The trust could not administer these provisions and would not want to do so. This clause is so widely drawn that "electrical work" includes the plugging of an electrical utensil into the trust system. A law that brings particular installations under the control of the trust is a good law, but to go to the extreme of regulating people in regard to the use of appliances in their own houses is completely ridiculous. The Minister should have another look at the clause. He should revert to what is common law in the other States—non-interference with installations from the switch onwards.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), Heaslip, and McAnaney, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

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

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Boeckelberg and Pearson. Noes—Messrs. Bywaters and Hughes.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. HALL: Under the definition of "licensed", paragraph (1) contains the definition of an electrical worker and paragraph (2) the definition of an electrical contractor. I know of instances in country areas where a person is the proprietor of a garage or motor repair shop, and although he may not be a mechanic or an electrician he is the principal of the business and he contracts to do electrical work. He does that by arranging for work to be done by employees who are expert in that work. Paragraph (1) states:

"Licensed" in relation to an electrical worker means a person who is the holder of a current licence permitting him to perform personally such electrical work as is specified in his licence.

As I understand it, the person I have described cannot any longer hold out the service of his business to do this work unless he holds this licence. The whole approach to this legislation is, "You shall do it if you are permitted to do it." The Minister himself stressed this earlier, and I believe the whole attitude is wrong.

In the country areas I referred to we have proprietors of businesses who do not know anything of the mechanical or electrical side of the work, although their employees do.

Those employees could be licensed electrical workers, but unless the proprietor is a licensed electrical contractor (as I read the clause) he cannot do the work. This is a most important matter, and it requires a definite interpretation. Will the Minister clarify this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Where several electricians were employed by a company, the employer would have to have a contractor's licence.

Mr. HALL: I thank the Minister for that explanation, and move:

In paragraph (2) of the definition of "licensed" after "licence" second occurring to insert "or employs a person who is the holder of a current licence permitting him to carry on trade or business as an electrical contractor in respect of such electrical work as is specified in his licence."

This means that the electrical worker can get his contractor's licence and do work on behalf of his employer, so that he will also be safeguarding his own employment. The employer should not be placed in the position where a fully qualified licensed electrical worker cannot be sent out on a job.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I strongly support the amendment. The original provision may prove a hardship in many country towns where often a man is responsible for many types of repair and servicing jobs. He probably has in his employ an electrician who would be capable of doing the work. To apply this provision to the whole of the State is too silly for words.

Mr. CUMBE: I support the amendment, as I do not think the Minister's explanation covered the position. Will the Minister look at this again? Under the provisions of clause 9, unless a man is licensed or takes in a partner who can get a licence, he will have to give up that work. This is so important that the brief explanation given by the Minister requires further consideration.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), Heaslip, and McAnaney, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

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

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bockelberg and Pearson. Noes—Messrs. Bywaters and Hughes.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 3 and 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Powers of Trust."

Mr. HALL: I move:

Before "Subject" to insert "(1)" and to insert the following subclause:

(2) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act the Trust shall not refuse—

(a) to issue an electrical worker's licence to an applicant to carry out or perform personally any electrical work on such electrical installations as are normally installed in a dwelling-house if the applicant satisfies the trust that he is competent or qualified personally to perform that electrical work; or

(b) to issue a contractor's licence to an applicant who employs an electrical worker licensed under this Act or who is himself licensed as an electrical worker under this Act.

I move this amendment also for and on behalf of the member for Flinders. The honourable member's objective is to ensure that the trust will not capriciously refuse a licence to an electrical worker or contractor. I believe that under the amendment the trust would have to give reasons for a refusal.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Too many members are conversing, and I ask them to refrain from doing so while the honourable member is addressing the Committee.

Mr. HALL: It is the honourable member's intention to ensure that, in simple wiring jobs in a dwellinghouse, it is unnecessary to know all about electrical matters, in which I include such things as switchboards and other complicated equipment used in industry. Paragraph (b) follows the amendment that I moved in relation to clause 2, dealing with an electrical contractor's licence. The member for Unley says that a person must not use a piece of insulation tape around a wire, and maintains that he is not being restrictive. As the Leader has said, we cannot apparently even flick a switch under this Bill, but the question of safety is not involved in this clause. The Government has put its name to something it cannot explain. The member for Flinders is known for the thought he gives to the framing of legislation and to reject this amendment is to reject common sense.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The object of the amendment is to introduce sweet reason into a piece of sour and unreasonable legislation, and I think it would have been inspired by the reference the member for Unley made in his second reading speech to the necessity for a person

to serve an apprenticeship of five years in order to do simple cottage wiring, which is the simplest of all trades and can be learned at the Goodwood or Thebarton technical schools in one term of tuition on one night each week.

Mr. Langley: You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I did such a wiring course at Goodwood in order that I would be able to wire farm buildings and one of the first things that the instructor told the group was, in effect "You fellows are going to get in one term of one night a week the instruction that apprentices get in three years. We expect a bit of study from you, but you will come out just as qualified as they do." Competence in cottage wiring can be acquired by anyone with common sense, and students are taught by competent instructors.

The member for Unley, who thinks a five-year apprenticeship should be served before this work can be done, is displaying a complete lack of appreciation of realities. Such an apprenticeship may be necessary to enable a person to study detailed wiring of motors or switchboards, or specialized wiring, but it is most unreasonable for simple cottage wiring. Householders will do their own wiring, as they have been doing, even though it will be illegal if this clause becomes law.

Mr. Langley: One minute you say the work should be carried out properly.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I do not follow the honourable member's interjection, but if he repeats it I shall reply.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is not in order in inviting members to interject.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I am sorry, but the member for Unley has an interest in the legislation and I like to take special note of his contributions to this debate. I do not doubt that the people in the Unley District will closely follow the outcome of the debate.

Mr. LANGLEY: Every Opposition member was pleased that electrical work in houses would be carried out properly, and now we find the members for Light and Gouger taking the opposite view and saying that some people should have restricted licences. The Opposition was happy so far as installations were concerned, but was not happy concerning the repair of appliances. If the amendment is carried, we shall get to the stage where a certain man will do motors, another will put in lights, and yet another will do something else.

Mr. Freebairn: That is the situation in Western Australia and the Labor Party introduced the provisions there.

Mr. LANGLEY: Every State in Australia has the licensing of electrical workers, but that does not mean that our provisions have to be the same. We have different conditions. For instance, we have the best electrical undertaking in Australia.

Mr. Casey: If the Opposition had its way one plumber would put in a tap, another a pipe and so on.

Mr. LANGLEY: Yes. It is wellnigh impossible to stop people doing certain things, but the dangers are paramount. Anybody can be an electrical contractor under the Bill, but when a person comes to do electrical work that is the time he could be in trouble. Oliver J. Nilsen's and Unbeahn and Johnstone are not electricians but they employ licensed people and can therefore be electrical contractors. Under the Bill there can be electrical contractors or licensed electricians and electrical contractors. I do not believe in restricted licences. I believe all members opposite agree that electrical installations should be done by licensed men. However, we are now getting back to a restricted basis. In later years it will be found that those doing electrical work will be those who came up through the trade school and learned the trade. This will be of great benefit to the people generally. I am opposed to restricted licences being given to electricians.

Mr. HALL: Apparently we are not to have qualifying categories.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the attention of honourable members to Standing Order No. 79, which states:

Every member shall be uncovered when he enters or leaves the House or moves to any other part of the House during the debate; and shall make obeisance to the Chair in passing to or from his seat.

This session one or two members in particular have often passed in front of the Chair without attempting to make obeisance to the Chair. During the evening when the Committee finished the Budget debate members from another Parliament were sitting in the Speaker's gallery. They passed remarks to members of the Committee (which subsequently reached me) that the conditions that operated in this Committee on that particular evening would not be tolerated in their Parliament. This afternoon one particular member left and re-entered the Chamber twice (which meant he passed the Chair on four occasions) without attempting to make obeisance to the Chair. This evening a

member from a Parliament in another State was in the gallery, and a member (a different member from the one to whom I have just referred) passed in front of the Chair about 24 times without attempting to make obeisance to the Chair. I do not think members of this Committee want either the public or members of other Parliaments to be given an opportunity to criticize adversely the way we conduct our business here. Therefore, I hope that in future members will observe the Standing Order to which I have referred.

Mr. HALL: The only explanation we have had of this matter so far has been given by the member for Unley, who talked of restriction. However, I was not talking of restriction. Apparently we are not to have varying qualifications for different categories of people, and therefore before a person can be asked to install a three-point power unit he will need to have had a five-year apprenticeship.

Mr. McKee: That is your story.

Mr. HALL: It is not my story. The honourable member for Unley does not want different categories, and therefore a person must be fully qualified over the whole range of work he might be required to do in an electrical business, such as work on electric motors, switchboards, radios—

Mr. Langley: I did not mention that.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member mentioned enough. He said a person had to have a five-year apprenticeship to wire a house. Well, that is a jolly good thing for a person who is going to do complicated work, but it is nonsense to say that a person needs a five-year apprenticeship to wire a house.

Mr. Langley: I did not say that, either.

Mr. HALL: Such a suggestion is an insult to a person of normal intelligence. The complications the honourable member mentioned related to two-way switches. I point out that it takes only six years to become a doctor.

Mr. Hudson: Be reasonable.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member for Glenelg is supporting this legislation, which is completely restrictive and will substantially raise the cost of housing in South Australia. Every £10 that goes on a house is important, and this will undoubtedly raise that cost by demanding qualifications that are not necessary. The member for Unley could not tell the public that five years' training is required to wire a house.

Mr. Langley: I don't want to. I said five years' training was required to make an electrician.

Mr. HALL: This amendment provides that a person may be licensed to wire a house if he is qualified to do so. The member for Unley and the Government say that he must also be able to rewind an electric motor, which may be an intricate piece of machinery. The explanation given is a most disappointing one. The member for Unley said it was automatic that an employer of a licensed electrician would obtain an electrical contractor's licence.

Mr. Langley: I said he could apply for a licence.

Mr. HALL: I know that under this restrictive legislation he has to apply. The honourable member said it was automatic that he would be granted such a licence once he had taken the step to come into line, but the Minister did not say it was automatic, and there is no guarantee that it will be automatically given. No reasonable man, except a complete theorist, could object to this amendment.

Mr. HURST: The garage man can contract to do a job if he has a contractor's licence and if he employs a man competent to do the work. If he has both licences he can do the job himself. I ask the Committee to reject these amendments, because they are ridiculous.

The Committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), Heaslip, and McAnaney, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

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

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bockelberg and Pearson. Noes—Messrs. Bywaters and Hughes.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendments thus negated.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Clause 4 (6) provides:

The trust (including an officer or employee of the trust or a member of the committee) shall not be personally liable to any person in respect of any act done or decision or determination made in good faith in the course of administering this Act.

That is a fair provision but, when we add that on to paragraph (e) of clause 5, we get a peculiar position. Clause 5 provides:

Subject to this Act, the trust may—(e) do any act or thing which is prescribed—

I do not object to that, but I object strongly to the words "or is necessary or convenient"

that follow. Do they mean that an officer of the trust can go into anyone's house at any time to see if he is doing any repairs? Who will decide what is necessary or convenient?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: This clause gives power to the trust to issue and otherwise deal with licences for electrical workers and electrical contractors. Paragraphs (c) and (d) enable the authority to attach conditions to or otherwise modify licences. For example, a television repair man or refrigerator mechanic will be an expert in his own field, and where it is necessary and convenient for him to do that work he can do it. That is all it means.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister's explanation does not make any sense, as paragraph (c) of this clause specifically sets out that the trust may specify the nature of the electrical work in respect of which a licence is issued. This is more than that: it is anything necessary or convenient to be done. Every employee of the trust will have complete immunity, so long as he can show that he acted in good faith.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Paragraph (c) is a perfectly normal provision; I see no reason for all this fuss and bother and I ask the Committee to adhere to the clause.

Mr. SHANNON: Obviously, this is not a necessary power. Any employee of the trust (and not necessarily a qualified officer) may be involved, and this could place the Government in an embarrassing situation. The person concerned could do anything.

Mr. Langley: He wouldn't do that.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: A person can only carry out the "objects of this Bill or incidental thereto".

Mr. SHANNON: But I suggest that the Minister may still find an officer or employee who will do something that he merely thought conformed to this measure. Surely it would not be any trouble to make a regulation describing what should be done. The Minister should at least have that much control so that he knows what is going to be done.

Mr. HALL: The amendment proposed by the member for Flinders provided for a special type of wiring in certain houses and the member for Unley said that this was wrong and that we should not have various categories of licence.

Mr. Langley: You agreed that all electrical work should be carried out by qualified people.

Mr. HALL: The honourable member said we ought not to have various categories, yet he is supporting a clause that specifically allows for this. The honourable member is saying

we should not oppose what was submitted by the member for Flinders. The clause goes beyond that and the Bill is a farce, yet honourable members opposite, including one from the industry, are strongly supporting it.

Mr. Langley: You do not know what you are talking about.

Mr. HURST: The amendment that the member for Gouger attempted to move specifies the electrical work in a dwelling house. It is quite obvious that he is talking loosely about the provisions. Much has been said about the effect on radio technicians, yet honourable members were told in the second reading explanation that provision was made to cover certain aspects. Clause 5 guides the licensing authorities along that particular line, but it is vastly different from the amendment of the member for Gouger, which provided for a completely restrictive licence in respect of an installation within a dwelling house and was not in regard to the whole of the radio, television and electronic industry.

Mr. HALL: I should like to ask the member for Semaphore what words specifically prevent the trust or administering authority from saying that such a licence cannot be issued.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

In line 24, to strike out—

The CHAIRMAN: Order, the Leader is out of order. The Committee has already dealt with an amendment to line 26. We cannot go back.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I understood that the previous amendment moved by the honourable member was at the beginning of this clause.

The CHAIRMAN: It is set out on the file as being at line 26. No amendment to this clause can now be moved.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: The Leader's point is probably well taken and I think your ruling is correct because the amendment proposed by the member for Flinders was in respect of line 27, and goes beyond that. The Minister may be prepared to recommit this clause. In clause 5 (c) the words "do any act or thing which is prescribed" appear. The remaining words could be struck out and the words "in the licence" inserted. Clause 5 (c) provides that the trust may specify the nature of the work in respect of which a licence may be issued. I should like to see the nature of the work an electrician may do prescribed on his licence. As the Minister seems emphatic that the trust should specify the nature of the work, surely

it should specify the nature of the work on the licence. Perhaps the Minister could have the clause recommitted and make this provision.

The Committee divided on the clause:

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

Noes (14).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, and McAnaney, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele and Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bywaters and Hughes. Noes—Messrs. Bockelberg and Pearson.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7—“No person to perform any electrical work or contract or perform such work or hold himself out as an electrical contractor or worker, etc., unless licensed under this Act.”

Mr. HEASLIP: I move:

In subclause (1) (a) after “personally” wherever occurring to insert “for profit or reward”.

I hope the Government will accept this simple amendment. If it is accepted, it will still give freedom to the individual to do odd jobs for himself. However, a person who is engaged to do work for payment must be a licensed electrician, and I agree that that is necessary mainly for the protection of women, particularly widows. The amendment would allow people with initiative to continue to do work that they are now doing quite safely, and it would save much expense to householders on small jobs such as the fixing of a flex or the wiring or tightening of a connection on a plug or the changing of a plug. Many of these small jobs on electrical appliances can be easily and quite safely attended to by most people. I am sure that many people in the city as well as in the country would appreciate having this right.

We know that only six deaths occurred in 1961 as a result of faulty electrical wiring. If the Government is so conscious of the need to save lives, it could pay a bit more attention to the large number of deaths that occur through accidents on the roads. This amendment will not make it more dangerous but will allow the individual to use his initiative to do work he is able to do. I hope the Government accepts this reasonable amendment.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I ask the Committee not to accept this amendment, because it defeats the intention of the Bill. It asks that permission be given to anyone, irrespective of his knowledge, to repair electrical appliances. A free job could cost a life.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip (teller), and McAnaney, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

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

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bockelberg and Pearson. Noes—Messrs. Bywaters and Hughes.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9—“Savings in certain cases.”

Mr. HALL: I move:

After paragraph (2) to insert the following paragraph:

(2a) For a person to perform or carry out electrical work on an electrical installation in, on, or over any land which is situated outside the area of a municipality or a township as defined in the Local Government Act, 1934-1964, as amended if the electrical installation is used in connection with the carrying on of the business of primary production.

I move this amendment also on behalf of the member for Flinders. It ties up with the first amendment accepted by the Committee, which defined “business of primary production”. I believe the Minister is willing to accept this amendment. It allows immediate jobs to be performed outside the home on a primary-producing property.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

In paragraph (6) to strike out “principal”; after “erection” to strike out “of buildings or similar structures” and to insert “, alteration or repairs of any structure, electrically operated machinery or plant,”; and to strike out “for the sole purpose of carrying out a building contract”.

The amendments simply put it beyond doubt that the exceptions will be extended not only to members of the Institute of Engineers but also to all persons whose trade, business or profession is concerned with the instruction of

students and involves the use of electrical equipment generally—university teachers, teachers at trade schools, and so on.

Mr. CUMBE: This matter was first raised by the Institute of Engineers because it was thought that the Bill could seriously impede professional engineers, who have done highly qualified work in the courses they have taken, in carrying out their normal duties. The amendments meet the position to a certain extent, but I am not sure they go far enough. I think they mean that the professional engineer can do design work but is prohibited from physically carrying out the work, which will have to be done by a licensed electrical worker or contractor. I cannot suggest any amendments, but perhaps this could be considered in another place. We all know that teachers at the university, the Institute of Technology, high schools and adult education centres who lecture in electrical work handle electrical equipment connected to the electricity supply as part of their duties. Part of their duties also (and this applies to students, too) is to alter or construct electrical equipment which, as I read the clause, would be prohibited without a licence. Further, will the Minister explain the position of radio hobbyists and other members of the Wireless Institute? Will they be permitted to carry on, bearing in mind the provision to the effect that all work has to be carried out by a licensed worker?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following the deputation from the Institute of Engineers, discussions were held with responsible people, and I am told on the best authority that the present amendment is acceptable to those concerned. I have also had discussions with doctors at the university, who have indicated that they are happy about this provision. They desire exemption in this form, not a blanket exemption. I suggest that the Committee approve this, because I have not a closed door and, if necessary, I shall look at the matter when I have another opportunity.

Amendments carried.

Mr. HALL: There is a difficulty in regard to paragraph (9), which provides:

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

work on any part or circuit which is, or may be, connected to a source of electricity supply. The reference to "electrical installation" is important. This is carefully defined in clause 2. By the definition in that clause it is not lawful to work without a licence on an electrical installation of 40 volts and over. The last part of clause 9 (9) refers to a source of electricity supply. Electricity supply is not included in the definitions. A mechanic working on an internal combustion engine driven by a magneto and spark plugs is working on an electrical installation as carefully defined, because these things work at well over 40 volts. If they can be connected to a source of electricity supply a mechanic cannot work on them. Anything that gives a current of electricity is an electricity supply. Therefore, a car battery and magneto are most definitely electricity supplies. Under this clause no distributor in a motor car could be repaired by an unlicensed person; nor could work be done on spark plugs because they carry about 10,000 volts. That is why it is necessary to have such a good insulation on a spark plug. An electric fencing mechanism has a very high voltage.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: That would be covered by the other amendment, wouldn't it?

Mr. HALL: I think the Minister is correct. Certainly every internal combustion engine and every motor car would be affected. Surely this is not the Government's intention, and therefore I do not think the Committee should allow this to go through. Therefore, I move:

In paragraph (9) to strike out "supply" and insert "supplied by an electricity supply undertaking."

An electricity supply undertaking is carefully defined. I maintain that if this Committee allows the subclause to go through as it stands it is guilty of negligence in its attitude to this legislation.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I ask the Committee to reject the amendment. Clause 9 provides that a tradesman may carry out his normal trade on an electrical installation without a licence, provided that no work is done on the actual electrical circuit except by a licensed electrical workman. It will be realized that the definition of "electrical installation" covers a very wide range of equipment from, say, a switchbox to a 5,000 h.p. motor. As I explained previously, the Bill provides for exemptions to be made by proclamation, and wherever an exemption is necessary (for instance, in the case of the spark plug, to which reference has been made) it will be possible to make it. It will take months to get

these regulations written, and then they have to come back to this Parliament for approval or rejection. Therefore, I ask the Committee to accept the clause as it stands.

Mr. HALL: I cannot understand this attitude. Far from being highly technical, this is a very simple point. All we are trying to do is achieve some common sense in the application of this Bill. If regulations have to be made to exempt electrical equipment on motor cars, there is something radically wrong with the Bill. I am sure that those who administer this legislation will need to have people continually on the alert to examine new equipment coming into the State. I strongly oppose such ridiculous legislation.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Clause 7 provides that this clause shall not operate until proclaimed but there is no specific power in the Bill for making a proclamation, although it may be implied. We have provided powers for proclamations in other parts of this Bill. Clause 7 is the only one that does not, and regulations referred to by the Minister will deal with questions raised in that clause. When this Bill is proclaimed the position to which the member for Gouger referred will immediately operate before any regulation can be made. I do not believe it was the intention to provide in this legislation for all these minor installations, but there are many privately operated installations in this State that will be affected by this Bill.

We cannot make regulations until the Bill is passed and, until it is passed, this is regarded as the law of the land. At that particular time no-one could do the work because obviously the Electricity Trust would not have had the opportunity of going in and granting a licence to anyone. To stick to the Bill merely because it is the Bill is absurd. No danger is involved in changing a sparking plug. Although the voltage is high, the amperage is low: there is no danger although there is some unpleasantness. Why must we put something that is obviously absurd into the Bill? I support the amendment. This is to be administered by the Electricity Trust. I hope the Minister will reconsider this matter.

Mr. QUIRKE: I, too, support the amendment. To illustrate how clause 9 (9) can work in practice, let us take the case of a winery, which has individual installations, each powered by its own motor. There are crushers, pressers, pumps, filters and other equipment. Each piece of machinery for safety purposes has its own motor. These machines are mostly portable. This means that there can be a maze of heavily

insulated wire about the floor. As the machines are pushed around, cables trail everywhere. In some big wineries there may be 100 motors, large and small, performing various functions.

Each motor is switched on by a press button on the machine itself. The cables are constantly being changed from one machine to another. There is no electrician in a winery but these individual motors also have a voltage control on them so that if the voltage drops the motor is not burned out. The foreman knows how to correct that, or some simple fault in the switchgear. Under clause 9, what will happen there? One can work on a pump or filter but one cannot work on the electrical part of it. How will these places fare? I do not know. If any simple fault occurred in any of the equipment it would be necessary to send for an electrician. This provision is absolute nonsense. Notwithstanding this legislation, these men will continue to do the job they know so well, and this can be multiplied 100 times in other industries. It would be ridiculous for the whole operation of a winery to be stopped simply because the voltage control on a machine cut out or something happened to the switch gear, and this provision could not be policed.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Many wheat silos are not connected with the trust's mains but have their own 240-volt machines to drive the elevators. The man in charge of a silo is not an electrician but has been trained to do work like that mentioned by the member for Burra. The man at Poochera is not an electrician, and if a breakdown occurred there it would be necessary to get an electrician from a town 70 miles away. This provision would be satisfactory if it related only to the trust's supply.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall (teller), Heaslip, and McAnaney, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

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

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bockelberg and Pearson. Noes—Messrs. Bywaters and Hughes.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 10 and 11 passed.

(Midnight.)

Clause 12—"Governor may make Regulations."

Mr. QUIRKE: Honourable members will remember that it has been mentioned that compulsion would not be used. However, I draw attention to paragraph (d). The definition of "electrical installation" has been read several times and we see that the Governor may make regulations providing for the inspection, examination or testing of any electrical installation (and that could easily mean a frying pan in the kitchen) compulsorily or otherwise.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Do you reckon an inspector would use that power?

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not think he would be silly enough, so why should the provision be included?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Because it is obviously necessary in respect of some things.

Mr. QUIRKE: The provision for compulsory inspection is there, and I oppose it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have some violent objections to an earlier part of the clause. I attempted to raise a similar matter in relation to clause 5, where there are provisions to widen the scope of the Bill by administrative action or by regulation. I point out that, while regulations are subject to disallowance, as far as this place is concerned, they are frequently passed when the House is not in session and it also frequently happens that Notice of Motion for disallowance of regulations remains on the Notice Paper for months before being debated and the particular regulations are in force during that time. I am not enamoured of that. The provision that the Governor may make regulations not inconsistent with an Act is necessary because an Act without regulations is completely useless. However, these words follow:

. . . which may be necessary or convenient for carrying this Act into effect or for facilitating the operation or administration of this Act and, without in any way limiting or restricting the generality of the foregoing, . . .

It will be seen that by those words we give a regulating power completely outside the provisions of the Bill, wide as the clauses are. I do not know the reason for the setting up of this machinery providing for all sorts of regulations and for Executive action without regulations. If we want bureaucracy in its purest form, we shall get it as a result of this Bill. The Bill will be administered away from

Parliament; no report will be made to Parliament on its operation; and the power will be exercised by an outside committee. I believe the committee itself is not well balanced for, although it has many people on it, no consumers' representative will be a member. In spite of all this, the clause provides for extra legislative-making power by regulation. I intend to move an amendment that will enable the committee to make regulations on matters specifically set out in the Bill and in accordance with it. I move:

After "Act" first occurring to strike out "which may be necessary or convenient for carrying this Act into effect or for facilitating the operation or administration of this Act and, without in any way limiting or restricting the generality of the foregoing, may make regulations".

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (14).—Messrs. Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, and McAnaney, the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

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

Pairs.—Ayes—Messrs. Bockelberg and Pearson. Noes—Messrs. Bywaters and Hughes.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 13—"Evidentiary provision."

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

To strike out "sufficient" and insert "*prima facie*".

It has always been the practice to use the term "*prima facie* evidence". It is possible that there could be a mistaken identity or that the certificate given by the officer of the trust could be open to some question. I think the term "sufficient evidence" means that it is conclusive evidence, whereas the expression "*prima facie* evidence" means that it stands as evidence unless something can be established to show that it is not correct. Many persons will be licensed, and many will probably have the same surnames, with only their initials being different. Therefore, despite the best intentions in the world by the officer of the trust, the certificate could quite easily be wrong. I do not know what the term "sufficient evidence" means. Does it mean

that it is not open to challenge at all? I do not think my amendment would weaken the provision in any way.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): There is no objection to this amendment. True, in our drafting in this State the term "*prima facie*" is normally used, but according to the text books on drafting the word "sufficient" has the same effect. However, as it has been our practice to use "*prima*

facie", it would be appropriate to agree to the amendment.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 14 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 12.20 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 9, at 2 p.m.