HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, September 29, 1966.

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

STATE LOTTERIES BILL.

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

QUESTIONS

MIGRANTS.

Mr. HALL: For some time requests have been made to me about what the South Australian Government can do to fully inform intending migrants from the United Kingdom of the employment position in this State in respect of certain categories of work requiring skilled tradesmen. The matter has been brought to a head by a letter to the Editor in this morning's *Advertiser* emanating from a person in my district. I know that the Premier is in a cleft stick on this matter and that, although he no doubt subscribes fully to the idea of informing intending immigrants of local conditions, he also has the responsibility of continuing South Australia's development. Can the Premier say whether any steps have been taken to ensure that people intending to migrate to South Australia are fully informed of the latest employment conditions in this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: First, I gravely doubt whether all British migrants coming to Australia call at South Australia House or Australia House before they leave. The previous Government set up a system whereby building organizations were able to nominate British migrants for South Australia on a quota basis, and that system has been continued, with some minor variations, by this Government. Serious consideration would have to be given to any suggestion of discontinuing that system. At present, one organization has gone out of business and its work has been transferred to the Housing Trust. Possibly I could attempt to have the Agent-General in London verbally inform migrants intending to come to South Australia of the conditions in the State at present. I point out that a demand for skilled labour exists at Whyalla, where the Housing Trust has built many houses. Many factors affect the position. I could easily suggest that the organizations nominating British migrants cease to do so immediately. Also, I could ask the Agent-General to insert a certain advertisement in the press. However, for how long could I continue to interfere, in this way, with the freedom of choice of people who might desire to come here? As a sensible approach to the matter, I am prepared to suggest to the Agent-General that he supply facts to any British migrants calling at South Australia House for information. Beyond that I can do nothing, because any other course I might take would probably mean discontinuing the nomination of British migrants.

HOSPITAL CHARGES.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Over recent months many people have told me about a problem that has confronted them following hospital treatment. It has been drawn to my attention that the relevant Commonwealth Act provides that, when accounts are made out for inmates' treatment, the day of entry and the day of discharge must be counted as one day for the hospitalization period. As a result, a person seeking hospital treatment in other than a State Government hospital (that is, in a community or private hospital) is always required to pay for one day more than he is reimbursed for by the medical benefits society. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to approach the Commonwealth Government with a view to altering this provision so that benefits are paid for the complete period of hospitalization?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall take the matter up with my colleague and obtain a report.

JETTIES.

Mr. FERGUSON: Last evening, when members were discussing the Estimates, I asked the Minister of Marine a question about the Port Rickaby and Minlacowie jetties. As he did not answer the first part of my question, can he now say whether the Harbors Board plans to demolish the outer ends of these jetties, or will the jetties be left exposed to the sea and so eventually break up?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: No, the jetties will be demolished in due course. Correspondence has been sent to the council concerning the completion of certain works, and for some time the board and I have been awaiting a reply from the council.

Mr. FERGUSON: Recently a fisherman's jetty and haven were completed at Edithburgh,

and a winch was positioned on the outer end of this jetty for lifting fish out of the boats on to trucks. Originally, this winch was so positioned that when men were working on it they were actually suspended in mid-air over the sea. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether this winch has been re-positioned, or whether it is the intention of the department to re-position it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I walked over this jetty, but I did not try the winch, so whether or not I would have been suspended in mid-air I do not know. However, I will ascertain for the honourable member just what has been done, and if nothing has been done I will see what can be done to correct the position.

STATE'S ECONOMY.

Mr. LAWN: I desire to ask the member for Mitcham a question, if he does not mind. On September 1, 1960, the honourable member referred in this House to a gentleman named Mr. P. S. Schrapnel who, according to the honourable member, was an eminent economist. The honourable member said that he had no doubt that Mr. Schrapnel was a very able gentleman and, referring to certain submissions he had made on behalf of the Chamber of Manufactures, the honourable member said that the facts were prepared by a well qualified person. Yesterday, the gentleman in question was in Adelaide addressing a Rotary Club meeting and he said that the Commonwealth Government had not done enough to stimulate the economy and that the Government should have reduced personal income tax by 2½ per cent, which would have cost $40,000,000 out of a $16,000,000,000 Budget. He also said that as a result of the Commonwealth Budget we could expect no improvement in motor vehicle sales or in the building industry in South Australia until the latter part of next year. Does the honourable member for Mitcham still agree with Mr. Schrapnel's opinions?

The SPEAKER: Does the honourable member for Mitcham desire to reply?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, I shall be happy to try to help the honourable member for Adelaide, who I gather has been sleeping on one of my pearls of wisdom since September 1, 1960, and I am duly flattered to think he has borne that in mind and under his pillow for as long as this. I have entirely forgotten what I said in 1960: no doubt it was good, but I have forgotten it and what the context was. Because of my other duties I did not hear Mr. Schrapnel address the Rotary Club yesterday, so I cannot say whether I agree with his present statements or not; but if he were on the ball in 1960, he probably still is now. Far be it from me, however, to pass judgment on what the gentleman may have said yesterday as I did not hear him. I hope that the honourable member for Adelaide will be satisfied with the reply that I have given him.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He is not satisfied.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He is shaking his head at me with a grin on his face. If the honourable member is prepared to accept my reply, I appreciate his courtesy in asking the question.

HOUSING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question of the honourable member for Adelaide has prompted me to search my memory and to remember some figures that Mr. Schrapnel has quoted on building activity throughout Australia, in which he shows that in New South Wales the approvals for new buildings were down 8.1 per cent; in Victoria the approvals were up 8.3 per cent. Queensland's approvals were up 3.3 per cent; but in South Australia approvals were down 18.6 per cent. The question I should like to ask the member for Adelaide (as he is apparently an authority on the works and opinions of Mr. Schrapnel) is whether he agrees that those figures are substantially accurate and whether he can give the House any reasons for the apparently worse position in South Australia than that of any other State.

Mr. LAWN: If the honourable member had listened earlier he would have had the answer. The learned Professor Schrapnel stated yesterday in Adelaide that the low building activity in South Australia was the result of the Commonwealth Budget and would not improve—

Members interjecting:

Mr. LAWN: —until the latter half of next year.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Why is South Australia worse than anywhere else?

Mr. LAWN: Ask Professor Schrapnel!

SEWERAGE RATES.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand that in the past water and sewerage rates notices had a note on the bottom indicating that, although water rates were payable, two months' grace was permitted in respect of sewerage rates.

As I understand that this note does not appear on the present rate notices, I ask the Minister of Works whether this means that both sewerage and water rates are now payable immediately and that the previous policy, which helped people such as pensioners, has now been changed, or whether there has been an oversight in the preparation of the present notice forms?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am glad the honourable member has brought this fact to my notice, as I have not been aware of it until now. I cannot give him the reason for it, but I assure the House that any pensioners who are having difficulty in paying their rates have only to approach the department and the greatest possible consideration will be given them. I am sure they will find the department most helpful.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Works say whether there has been a change in the policy and whether sewerage and water rates are now payable concurrently, or whether the two months' grace previously provided in the case of sewerage rates will still apply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I am grateful to the honourable member for having repeated the question because it was with some concern that I heard his remarks when asking the question in respect to water and sewerage accounts. I assure the House and the honourable member that there is no departure from what has been normal practice for a number of years; there will be two months' grace in respect of the payment of sewerage rates—

Mr. Nankivell: Oversight, possibly, on the notice.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: —and there will be no variation in the accounting systems until we have introduced quarterly billing next year.

THEVENARD SINKING.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: I understand a ship has sunk in Thevenard harbour this morning. Has the Minister of Marine any information on this accident?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I regret to report that this morning at 11.15 the Greek vessel *Eleni K* sank as it was leaving Thevenard. It was making down the channel when its back broke. The ship was able to be moved out of the channel. No lives were lost and the port is not out of action.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: I understand that this vessel was an old liberty ship and that the navigation authorities had refused to give a certificate for it to be loaded, because to have put it in a satisfactory condition would have cost about $30,000. The vessel proceeded to Thevenard and has now broken forward of the bridge and sunk in the harbour. I believe the bottom part is sinking slowly. It was not completely loaded, of course, as vessels have to go on to Port Lincoln from Thevenard to be topped up. It was just leaving Thevenard as the disaster happened. I ask the Minister of Marine whether he will ascertain why the ship was loaded after the navigation authorities had refused to give a certificate.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member seems to be more advanced in his knowledge of the accident than I am at the moment. Nevertheless, I can say that the Harbors Board is preparing to dispatch an officer to Thevenard to investigate. I shall inquire and let the honourable member have an answer.

UNIVERSITIES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Education may remember that there was some debate in the House last Tuesday concerning the sums to be made available to universities in this State during the coming triennium. South Australia is taking significantly less money than the sum recommended by the Universities Commission to be spent on university education in this State. A rumour is circulating around the University of Adelaide (I do not know about the Flinders University) to the effect that, if there is a turn for the better in State finances during the triennium, it may be possible to increase the sum available from the State Government for this purpose and that this increase may then be matched by additional money from the Commonwealth over and above the programme now proposed. I ask the Minister whether, if the State does find it is able to give more money to tertiary education, the Commonwealth Government will match anything over and above what is proposed at the moment?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The question of what the university can do within the amounts already determined is under discussion, because I believe that there was a slight misunderstanding between the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide and the Treasury regarding one matter. That is being examined at the moment and, in the event of the Commonwealth Government's agreeing to make an adjustment in this regard, the State will be matching the amount in question. That is as far as I can go at present.

STEELWORKS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: A circular, dated September 2 and issued by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, indicates that it has several projects for extension of its steelmaking activities in South Australia. The specific references that the circular outlines are as follows: at Whyalla, wharf and harbour extensions, coke ovens batteries, basic oxygen steelmaking plant extensions, universal beam mill, and iron ore pelletizing plant; and, at Coffin Bay, the development of limesands deposits. In view of the vital importance of the B.H.P. Company's activities to employment and general development in South Australia, I ask the Minister of Works to inquire of the Minister of Labour and Industry when these projects are likely to be carried out.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to inquire for the honourable member. I assume from what I have heard and from what the honourable member has said that in respect to some of these projects certain planning has been done and that in respect to others work is already under way. As the honourable member has said, it is gratifying to know that the B.H.P. Company, a private enterprise concern, has confidence in the State and is showing it by extending its activities therein.

CITRUS INDUSTRY.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: During the debate on the Estimates I referred to drag hoses. I am impressed with the possibilities of these hoses, which I consider will improve not only conditions for soldier settlers but citrus production generally. Will the Minister of Irrigation co-operate with the Minister of Agriculture in bringing down a report from responsible officers on whether the efficacy of these drag hoses can be proved, whether they will result in increased production, and whether they will alleviate the disastrous effect in some instances of saline water from the Murray River being sprayed on the foliage of orange trees? At the same time, will the Minister confer with his colleague regarding the future production on the acreage sown to citrus and the available markets for that production, and particularly whether, looking ahead to the markets that may be available to us in five or six years' time, we are not reaching an over-production of citrus on the area now proposed to be sown to citrus in South Australia?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am happy to be able to inform the honourable member that I have already spoken to my colleague on the first question raised. An officer from his department, one from mine, and one other person were some time ago appointed a committee of inquiry into the drag hose system, and the report of that committee is now in my hands. I shall be happy to make this report available to the honourable member. Although I cannot remember any particular aspect of the report in detail, I know that it outlines various advantages of the drag hose system, and examines costs and the necessary hydraulics involved. It is a very thorough and comprehensive report. No action has been taken at this stage on any recommendations made by the committee because I have not yet had the time. However, as the honourable member has raised the question, I shall be happy to examine it as soon as possible.

NON-RETURNABLE BOTTLES.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: For several months now Opposition members (and, no doubt, Government members) have been receiving reports from various people in regard to the use by manufacturers of non-returnable soft drink bottles. I have received correspondence on this matter from councils in my area, and I imagine that other members have received similar correspondence from other bodies. I understand that at a recent conference of the Local Government Association this matter was considered and that it was resolved to ask the Minister of Local Government whether the Government would consider introducing a Bill to enable councils to prohibit the sale in their areas of this class of container. Therefore, can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Local Government, say whether the Government has received such a request from the Local Government Association and, if it has, whether the Government intends to introduce the appropriate amendments to the Local Government Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to confer with my colleague on this matter. To my knowledge, the Government has not yet approved any such legislation, but I shall ascertain whether the Minister of Local Government has received such a request and, if he has, whether he has considered it.

TEA TREE GULLY SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: On August 9 last the Minister of Education informed me that 2¼ acres

of land was being acquired to extend the present restricted Tea Tree Gully Primary School, and that the matter was in the hands of the Crown Solicitor. As the owner was asking for a figure considerably in excess of the Land Board's valuation, the Crown Solicitor was negotiating with him for a settlement. As this school's playing area has been further restricted by the addition of another classroom (making 14 in all), because of the steady increase in student enrolment, totalling 540 to date, will the Minister ascertain the likelihood of an early settlement in this case?

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

NAIRNE PYRITES.

Mr. HALL: A few years ago a firm named Nairne Pyrites was established in South Australia to obtain from pyrites the acid necessary for the production of superphosphate in this State. I understand the capital provided was by way of $1,600,000 from the State Government and $400,000 from four participating chemical companies, each subscribing $100,000. I believed that after its establishment, for the subsequent years of its operation, this company (which is so valuable in the provision of acid to the superphosphate industry of this State) had to repay the State Government about $60,000 a year. I understood these payments had some years to go, but I am now told that the company has been requested by the Government to repay immediately all the outstanding money put into it by the Government. Can the Premier say whether this is so, and, if it is, whether it will have any ill effects on the superphosphate industry in this State?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The facts given by the honourable member are not correct. As I understand it, the repayments by the company are voluntary. However, on Tuesday I will bring down a report containing full information on the matter.

FURNITURE FACTORY.

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Premier a reply to my question of last Wednesday about a furniture factory in the Campbelltown area being refused, under zoning regulations, the right to expand?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The matter is still receiving attention.

EYRE PENINSULA ELECTRICITY.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of last week about electricity supplies on Eyre Peninsula?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As promised, I raised the matter with the Electricity Trust, and the General Manager advises that there has not been any change in the target date for the 132,000-volt transmission line which is scheduled for completion next March. The present construction position is that, of the total of 617 towers required, foundations for about 75 per cent of this number have been laid. In addition, 95 towers have been erected in the Cleve area. Timber has been cleared for the line from Whyalla as far as Tumby Bay. Access gates in easements have been installed throughout the whole length of the line.

BRICK-VENEER HOUSES.

Mr. COUMBE: For some years, the Housing Trust confined most of its activities to the construction of solid brick houses and to a separate type of timber house. However, a few years ago, because of uncertainty about the condition of some of the soil on which houses were being built and because of some foundation difficulties, the trust embarked on a policy of building brick-veneer houses. Apparently this policy has extended into other areas where soil conditions are good. Will the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, obtain a report indicating what is the trust's policy when building on soil of the normal type? In such conditions, will the trust revert to building the solid construction houses or will it continue to build brick-veneer houses? At the same time, will the Premier obtain a comparison of building costs of the trust for brick-veneer houses and solid construction houses of similar size?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Regarding the first part of the question, the trust's policy is to continue to build solid construction houses where it believes the soil is sufficiently good to ensure that drastic maintenance will not be involved. Where it considers that the soil would result in high maintenance costs, it will build brick-veneer houses. I will obtan a report as soon as possible on the latter part of the honourable member's question.

GROUP LAUNDRY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: During the Estimates debate I asked the Treasurer whether he would obtain information about the expenditure on the group laundry and about the method of financing that expenditure. Has he been able to secure that information?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take this opportunity to give an answer to a question asked by the member for Flinders. The charge for work done by the group laundry is 10c a pound dry weight for all classes of work. Regarding the question of the member for Gumeracha, a full review of the operations of the laundry up to June 30, 1966, is given in the Audit Report. From this it will be seen that funds were provided from Loan Account up to June 30, 1966, as follows:

	$
For buildings and plant	2,016,500
For initial stocks	321,500
For financing current operations	200,000

Additional provisions were made under the Loan Estimates for 1966-67 to the extent of $200,000 for further stocks and the financing of current operations. The Loan provision for financing of current operations was necessary because, of course, the laundry must meet most of its costs of wages and salaries and other operating expenses before it can secure payment from the hospitals served. By virtue of this vote of funds the laundry can carry its various debtors, which are mainly the hospitals served, and carry temporarily any loss on operating in the early stages until this is subsequently recovered. This particular Loan vote has in fact covered the loss of $66,000 up to June 30 last as reported by the Auditor-General, and also the sundry debtors of $63,000 at that date. There is accordingly no need, as suggested by the member for Gumeracha, for a further vote to cover the loss to June 30 last of $66,000.

The votes from the Budget, specifically for laundry purposes proposed for 1966-67, are as follows (as compared with actual expenditures in 1965-66):

	Actual 1965-66. $	Estimated 1966-67. $
Royal Adelaide Hospital	116,400	354,000
Royal Adelaide (Northfield Wards)	—	84,600
Queen Elizabeth Hospital	156,655	223,000
Morris Hospital	105	12,000
Parkside Mental Hospital	—	90,000
Hillcrest Hospital ..	—	100,000
Enfield Receiving House	—	5,000
Mental Health Hostels	—	600
Port Adelaide Casualty Hospital	—	100
Port Adelaide V.D. Clinic	—	60
	273,160	869,360

In addition, the laundry expects that it will receive from other institutions, which are not financed through the Budget, and from other minor revenues about $380,000 in 1966-67, making about $1,250,000 receipts in all. These other institutions concerned include principally the Lyell McEwin Hospital, the Home for Incurables, and the Adelaide Children's Hospital. These total funds of $1,250,000 likely to be received from the institutions served by the laundry, together with the $200,000 of Loan moneys for further financing of current operations, will provide the laundry in 1966-67 with about $1,450,000. It is estimated that this will be expended as follows:

	$
Upon salaries and wages (as shown in the Budget and then deducted because the amount will be met from other votes and other sources)	487,100
Contingencies, including linen replacements, to be met out of the funds voted on the various hospital lines and funds to be received from outside institutions	473,000
Interest to be paid to the Treasury as shown in the Revenue Estimates	140,000
Depreciation to be covered by a sinking fund payment to the Treasury as shown in the Revenue Estimates	110,000
Further linen stocks and temporary financing of operations pending recoveries from institutions	200,000

These estimated expenditures amount to $1,410,000, and if the estimates are realized there would be a balance of about $40,000 to offset the loss realized to June 30 last. The charge for service is continuing at 10c a pound.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I thank the Premier for providing the balance sheet for the group laundry for this year. Can he say whether it will be possible, seeing this department is going to have a revenue and an expenditure of the order of $1,500,000 a year, for the documents in connection with it to be placed before Parliament the same as the documents of other departments are? Normally an investigator would not look into the Loan Account in respect of the land and buildings necessary for the laundry. This defect could be remedied if the financial position of the department were shown in the Budget the same as the financial position of other departments, particularly as it will be operating on a big scale and, apparently, on a healthy scale.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The laundry will be responsible for the purchase, from Loan moneys, of certain materials such as linen and blankets. If it were desired to make a profit

from the laundry, it would be simple to charge 1c or more on each item laundered for any hospital or other institution; that would provide a substantial revenue. If we want the laundry to make a profit, however, at the expense of another hospital or institution, I cannot see the value of such a move. Apparently the Auditor-General is satisfied with the conduct of the laundry and with the accounting method applied to its operation, but, if the Under Treasurer has any suggestion in this respect, he may wish to furnish a statement showing the amounts charged to Loan and to Revenue. At the moment, however, I assure the honourable member that, in view of the satisfactory report presented by the Auditor-General, the operation of the laundry must have satisfied him. However, I will have inquiries made.

GAS.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Following the announcement made a day or two ago about the route of the gas pipeline from Gidgealpa and Moomba to Adelaide, I am happy to see that it will pass two important towns in my district and close to a major town in the District of Burra. In view of substantial assistance given to primary industry by the Commonwealth Government in the form of an $80 a ton subsidy on nitrogenous fertilizer, and as natural gas may be an important raw material in the manufacture of nitrogenous fertilizer, will the Premier favourably consider helping to finance a factory to produce nitrogenous fertilizer in one of these major towns in the Lower North immediately adjacent to the proposed route of the natural gas pipeline?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Whilst I hope that the Prime Minister will favourably consider our request for financial assistance, at this stage I will not attempt to open either my mouth or my arms to seek more revenue. We must be patient, because it will not be before 1969 (to coincide with the demands of the Electricity Trust for natural gas) that gas will be delivered. Supplies of natural gas will have to be obtained economically so that the trust can provide it to the people of this State as cheaply as possible, otherwise the project will not be worth while. When gas is delivered to the metropolitan area, the trust begins to use it, and the project is operating smoothly, further investigations will be made. Land has been purchased at Wallaroo and set aside for a particular purpose, and the purchasers of this land would be entitled to have a case considered, along with others. Broadly, when the pipeline is completed and delivers gas to the Electricity Trust, further investigations will be made in respect of those who have applied to use gas for established and new industries. I assure the honourable member that the use of gas for the manufacture of fertilizers or other by-products will have to wait until the gas is delivered, the charge determined for those who require it, and the whole economics of the proposition worked out.

HIGHBURY LAND.

Mrs. BYRNE: On September 20 I asked the Minister of Works a question about the acquisition by the Engineering and Water Supply Department of a 14-acre property at Highbury to guard against the pollution of water carried across the top of this property in an open channel to the Hope Valley reservoir. I have received correspondence from the owner of this property in which he asks the department to allow him to retain portion of the property on the river flat section, including a building site and an access road. If I make the correspondence available will the Minister reconsider this matter with a view to the owner retaining portion of his property?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: If I remember my earlier reply, I think that, at that time, the department had negotiated with the owner with a view to his withholding a portion of his property, but after further negotiation it was decided to acquire all the property. However, if the honourable member makes available the correspondence I shall be pleased to reconsider this matter, because the department desires, first, to see that the land is not used to endanger the water by pollution and, secondly, to give the best possible deal to people from whom land is acquired.

SEAT BELTS.

Mr. RODDA: As a result of the regulations that this Government has promulgated, seat belts will be compulsorily fitted in motor cars from January, 1967, and I agree that this is a good move. Will the Premier take up the matter with the Commonwealth authorities to see whether the sales tax on seat belts can be removed so that the cost involved for the South Australian motorists may be reduced?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes, I shall take up the matter.

TEA TREE GULLY COUNCIL.

Mr. RODDA: I understand the Premier has an answer to a question I asked last week concerning a man who applied for a position with the Tea Tree Gully District Council and was later told his services were not required.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: My colleague, the Minister of Local Government, states that a report he has received from the Tea Tree Gully District Council indicates that the council has no knowledge of this matter. I understand that the Clerk of the council discussed this case with the honourable member, following reports in the newspaper. The report I have relates to the alleged engagement of a person to drive a truck, but the council denies any knowledge of the matter.

MADISON PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Madison Park Primary School.

Ordered that report be printed.

INDUSTRIAL AND PROVIDENT SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1923-1958. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to increase the limitation of the interest of a member of an industrial and provident society from $4,000 to $10,000. Having regard to the variation in money values since 1958 (when the permissible shareholding was increased), the requirement of co-operatives of additional capital and the general circumstances obtaining today, it is considered that the increase is warranted. Clause 3 accordingly so provides, and the remaining clauses of the Bill (except clauses 4, 8 and 9) make consequential amendments to the principal Act.

I am grateful to members for facilitating the passage of the Bill today. Representations have been made from a number of producers' co-operatives that wish to increase the shareholding of members rather than to distribute moneys that would otherwise be distributed as bonuses to members. There is some urgency in this matter, as a number of these producers' co-operatives close their books on September 30, and if this Bill does not pass promptly members will be faced with quite severe extra taxation, far more than they would if they were allowed to increase their shareholding in their co-operatives. What is more, of course, it is to the advantage of these producers' co-operatives when they can, in fact, build up the capital of their undertakings.

It is considered desirable, in order to prevent members with large shareholdings from exercising control of a society to the detriment of members with small holdings, that general voting rights should be limited in the case of future societies to provide for the principle of one member one vote unless the Minister in the case of any particular society approves of a different scale of voting. Accordingly, clause 4 of the Bill makes such a provision in relation to future societies. Members will see that, if this provision were not made, increases of this kind in the limitation on shareholdings could mean that the Industrial and Provident Societies Act could be used as a back-door method of getting around the provisions of the Companies Act. It is necessary to maintain these as genuinely co-operative societies.

Clause 9 provides that no member of an existing society shall become entitled to more voting power than he now has even though he increases his interest in the society beyond the present limit. In other words, the Bill preserves the existing voting rights of members of societies, but precludes any increase therein, by virtue of the increased limitation in the case of existing societies and at the same time provides that in the case of future societies only one vote per member is to be allowed, that is, unless the Minister specially consents to a special arrangement between members which would need to preserve the nature of the co-operative society. Clause 8 makes a formal amendment to the principal Act relating to decimal currency.

I discussed the draft of the Bill privately with the Leader of the Opposition and some members of the Opposition yesterday so that I could answer their questions then. I should be grateful for the assistance of honourable members in the rapid passage of this measure, because if the benefit of the amendment is to accrue to a number of producers' co-operative societies in South Australia this year the measure must pass the House today.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): As the Attorney-General said, he showed the Bill to members on this side yesterday, for which we thank him. We know that the motives for bringing this legislation before the House are of the highest order. The Bill facilitates the opportunities for some co-operatives to extend

their activities by using moneys which I understand would otherwise be unavailable to them. I give the Bill my wholehearted support.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I wish to speak briefly on this Bill, because I think it was a co-operative in my district that was the prime mover in the initiation of the amending legislation now before the House. The original legislation was passed in about 1864, more than a century ago, and it has stood the test of time. I think it can be said that ever since the original legislation was passed co-operatives and industrial societies have played a most important part in South Australia, and to the satisfaction of all concerned.

It is interesting to note that back in 1864, under the original legislation, the maximum amount that a shareholder or a member of a society was entitled to hold was $400. That was increased in 1923, I think, by amending legislation to $1,000 and, as the Attorney-General has just mentioned, the 1958 legislation raised the sum to $4,000. The Bill seeks to increase the permissible maximum shareholding of any member of an industrial and provident society to $10,000. I understand this legislation is sought by societies in this State. In 1958, when an amendment was sought to raise the sum to $4,000, all societies were in favour. I understand that no opposition exists at present to this amending legislation. As I believe it will be of extreme benefit to the societies concerned, I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. CURREN (Chaffey): I have many co-operative wineries and packing companies, as well as a cannery, in my district. I understand that at meetings shareholders have expressed a desire for the increased shareholdings, and the Bill will assist these organizations in obtaining funds for the expansion of their activities. I support the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): This is good legislation that will save co-operatives considerable sums and obviate the necessity to call on loans to producers to carry out certain works. The Bill is somewhat different from the original one introduced some years ago which provided that anybody could invest money in co-operative societies and have a right to vote, although not actively associated with the society. I opposed that measure strongly, and it was not passed. However, growers' money is now being used in their own co-operatives to everybody's advantage. This is a truly co-operative movement. I support the Bill and hope that it has a speedy passage.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the idea of members of co-operatives being able to invest more money in their respective organizations, and stress the value of and the necessity for restricting shareholders' voting rights, so that they are equal. The co-operative movement should be encouraged from every angle, and people other than purely primary producers should show enterprise and participate, to everybody's mutual benefit.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I, too, support the Bill but regret the necessity for it to be introduced, passed through both Houses, and approved by His Excellency, all within 24 hours. It seems to me that the matter should have been brought on earlier, because the request was made some time ago. I hope that in future the Attorney-General will be able to introduce the Bill to allow more discussion on it than has been allowed today. However, I thank him for introducing the Bill, because it is a useful measure concerning our primary production. As the Bill has to pass both Houses today and be presented for His Excellency's signature tomorrow, if it is to be implemented, I do not intend to delay its passage.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): Representation was made concerning this matter some time in May last. At that time the Registrar of Companies advised the Government against the proposal. In consequence of this, as I was not satisfied with his objections, I arranged for a series of consultations with representatives and accountants who were concerned with the industrial and provident societies' works. I then finally resolved the matter with the Registrar, who pointed out that, provided certain safeguards about voting rights were included, he could withdraw his initial objections. That could not be arranged overnight; it took a series of consultations before this position was arrived at. When it had been arrived at, the draftsman was instructed to prepare the Bill. At that stage we were already engaged in the Budget debate.

I was then asked by a member of another place to introduce the measure quickly, although no specific deadline was given me at that time. I pointed out to him that, the sooner facilities were given to the Government to proceed with its legislative programme in this House, the sooner this Bill could be introduced. I told him the Bill would come in urgently and as soon as we had considered the Budget. The

Government has used its best endeavours to see that this matter should be dealt with promptly and ahead of the Government's normal legislative programme. In those circumstances I do not think there is any justification whatever for the remarks of the member for Gumeracha.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense! Everything you have said is completely beside the point.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Societies which may be registered."

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Can the Attorney-General say whether the figure of $10,000 was arrived at as a result of consultation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): Yes, it was the figure asked for by the producers' co-operatives as a suitable figure. There are considerable bonus moneys amongst some producers' co-operatives. Shareholders' resolutions have been passed to the effect that if this amendment is made they wish to keep an increase in shareholding value rather than have the distribution of bonuses. Mr. Tilley advanced this figure as being suitable for the many producers' co-operatives with which he has to deal.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Rules and amendments."

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I would not have spoken except for the remarks of the Attorney-General in concluding the second reading debate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The second reading debate cannot be referred to in a debate on this clause.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not intend to refer to it.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member must speak to clause 4.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I intend to; I have waited until this clause is debated to speak. The Attorney-General knows as well as anybody else that the real reason why a Bill goes through stages on successive days, and not sooner, is so that people will have an opportunity to see the effect of the various clauses. This gives people outside a chance to see the clauses and to see whether their effect will be adverse or otherwise. In this Bill, we are not allowing time for that to be done, and that is undesirable.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is not discussing clause 4.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am going to now. It is this clause which should, in my view, have had the benefit of delay so that people could see it. I had a chance to look at the Bill when it was in typescript last night. I noticed then that a similar clause did not appear in the Bill some years ago when the amount was raised. I am now assured by those who have seen the clause that it is all right, but I do not know what unforeseen effects it might have on people. Of course, that is the reason why we should wait, and all the things said by the Attorney-General were completely beyond the point. We are not doing what we normally do in Parliamentary practice: we are not giving a chance to people outside, as well as to ourselves, to see what are the effects of the clauses. I am prepared to accept what I have been told by other members, that this clause is satisfactory, but I must say that I do it with some misgivings. I hope we will not find later that, because of the haste with which this Bill has been introduced and with which it is being dealt, we have made a mistake and prejudiced the rights and positions of individuals.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know whether the honourable member does not wish us to go on with this matter. Normally it would have been dealt with in the Government's ordinary legislative programme. However, it was not part of the programme we introduced at the beginning of the session. Urgent legislative measures have been on the Notice Paper now since February this year without getting time for debate in this place because of the time that has been taken on other matters before Parliament. Because of the effect of the Bill for the benefit of members of co-operative societies, the Government has seen fit to introduce it in a way in which it normally would not do, and it has done so at the behest of numbers of Opposition members. I find it extraordinary that, when the Government has gone to the lengths it has done in the last two days at the behest of Opposition members to bring this in, we should get this kind of treatment in the debate.

Mr. Millhouse: It is what you deserve from what you said.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: This clause is necessary and has been requested by the co-operative societies for some time, as have the other clauses. Some societies get into difficulties in keeping the Registrar of Companies up to date on deceased persons. Under the Act, the Registrar insists on his rights regarding the rules of the various societies. Many difficulties and much administrative work result. Will the Attorney-General examine the matter and try to simplify the administration of co-operative

societies by inquiring into the necessity for their sending in returns and making out new registers each year?

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 9) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Later:

Bill returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

In Committee.

(Continued from September 28. Page 1926.)

Clause 6—"Power to make payments."

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): During discussions last evening I said that my predecessor had used certain trust funds, and I understood that the Leader took exception to my remarks. I now frankly admit that the member for Gumeracha did not find it necessary to use trust funds to the extent that I have. I have a complete list of figures if required but to clear up a point, the Government, from time to time, used funds held in trust and on deposit account for financing in accordance with clause 5. Ordinarily this occurred in the earlier parts of a year when revenues were flowing in less rapidly than expenditures were being incurred. I have already, on September 13, in answer to the member for Mitcham, indicated that Treasury records show that the previous Government used trust and deposit funds for deficit financing to the extent of $1,240,000 on June 30, 1958, and $2,672,000 on June 30, 1959.

When the Committee adjourned last night members were dealing with clause 6, and the member for Flinders asked whether we had unfortunately left out certain words contained in the 1964 Act. A discussion took place last year that I could not recall at the time, on the present wording used in clause 6. Regarding the difference between clause 6 and comparable clauses in earlier years, I point out that in the explanation of the Appropriation Act of June, 1966, the full explanation of the differences was given. With one exception all clauses are in the general form that has been followed in Appropriation Bills for many years. The exception is clause 6, which previously included the wording in the Bill now before the Committee, and a final phrase as follows: . . . , at a rate in excess of the rate which during the period in respect of which the payment is made, was in force under any return made under the Acts relating to the public service, or pursuant to any regulation or any award, order or determination of a court or other body empowered to fix salaries or wages.

On October 5 last year, the Leader said that he could not see the need for the additional authority given by this final phrase, but the Bill was passed in the form in which it was presented and I undertook to obtain a report on clause 6. The Under Treasurer examined the matter and found that clause 6 was first inserted in an Appropriation Bill in 1936, when it was apparently thought desirable to secure an appropriation authority for certain salary and wage increases made retrospective to the previous financial year. The Under Treasurer has expressed some doubt as to the necessity for clause 6, and considerable doubt as to the necessity for the final phrase. I sought the opinion of the Crown Solicitor who reported that there was no legal necessity for the insertion of clause 6, but he saw no harm in the continued inclusion of the clause to cover some situation that could conceivably arise in the future. I decided that the best course would be to retain the first part of clause 6, which makes quite clear the Government's right to use appropriation to make retrospective payments, but to omit the final phrase which seems to add nothing in authority and which seems to be open to misinterpretation and likely to cause confusion. I informed the Auditor-General of my proposals and he indicated that he had no objection. Clause 6 in its shorter form is therefore included after being fully considered by the Under Treasurer, the Crown Solicitor and the Auditor-General.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Although there is no apparent reason for clause 6, I believe it is necessary for the Treasurer to have the power to make retrospective payments in certain instances. Sometimes it is difficult to have every account completely paid and genuinely settled by June 30. I did not introduce this clause, as that was done in the time of Sir Richard Butler, but over many years I have used it in respect of wages and salaries. A tribunal frequently makes a new determination and makes it retrospective to the time of the application for the new award and, in those circumstances, unless the provision is included, the Treasurer would have to call on the Governor's Appropriation to cover it. It could well be that that might not be sufficient, and that the matter would have to stand over until the next time Parliament dealt with Appropriation Bills.

I do not see any great danger in this clause. The Treasurer pays as a result of legal matters, and if that is the purpose of the clause I see no reason to exclude it. The present form is slightly modified, but clause 6 could be usefully retained. Sometimes it is necessary for the Treasurer to have a little extra approval at his disposal in this matter. I support the clause.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I raised my query last evening to ensure that the Treasurer was fully protected and now that he has given us his assurance I have no further objection to the clause.

Clause passed.

Clause 7—"Expenditure from Hospitals Fund."

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): Last evening I expressed concern that in clause 7 members were being asked to approve expenditure for the first few months of next year. On further examination I find that approval is sought for the expenditure of $350,000 from the Hospitals Fund, but at this stage no proposal is before members concerning this expenditure. The State Lotteries Bill has not been passed yet, and the Bill on the totalizator agency betting system is still on the Notice Paper of another place. I do not believe that it is usual to have an Appropriation Bill refer to expenditure for the next year. It seems a bad principle to rely on the tenuous ground that certain legislation may be passed to produce certain revenues. It seems wrong to include in this Bill a sum not included in the Estimates already approved by members. I move:

To strike out "three hundred and fifty" and insert "one hundred".

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: If the T.A.B. legislation is not passed in time to produce revenue for the Hospitals Fund no damage will be done. If, on the other hand, revenue is produced by that means no harm will be done by the clause. An appropriation is necessary, as in clause 7, so that the Government may use any moneys that may accumulate in the Hospitals Fund after June 30, 1967, and before the passing of a new Appropriation Bill. There is nothing new or unusual in such a provision. Concerning expenditure from Consolidated Revenue, provision is made in Supply Acts pending the passing of the Appropriation Act, and for expenditure from Loan it is made in the annual Public Purposes Loan Act. The Public Purposes Loan Act of 1966 provides specifically in clause 9 for the borrowing and expenditure of up to $30,000,000 for the purposes of 1967-68 until a new Act is passed. The provision in clause 7 of this Bill is entirely comparable with this: it does not constitute a new departure in appropriation procedure, and it is necessary to keep the business of the Government running in the new year pending a new appropriation. I believe that even the member for Gumeracha would be well aware of the necessity for this because during his time he introduced a comparable section into the Public Purposes Loan Act.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not sure that I agree with the Treasurer on this matter. The two things he has mentioned are dissimilar. In the Public Purposes Loan Act, Parliament has already approved of specific work, for instance, the reconstruction of a hospital to cost $6,000,000. Under the Public Purposes Loan Act, $2,000,000 may be appropriated towards the cost of that work. As all members know, when they passed the appropriation for $2,000,000 this year they committed themselves to an appropriation, really, of $6,000,000, because the other $4,000,000 will be necessary to complete the work. The Estimates have been prepared and the Public Works Committee has examined the matter, so the position is clear, for we are there dealing with a public work for which Parliament has approved a specific amount.

I think the Treasurer will agree that in this case we have agreed in the Estimates to three specific amounts. These are, speaking from memory, $50,000 for the Adelaide Children's Hospital, $25,000 for the Home for Incurables, and $25,000 for Minda Home. Those amounts total $100,000. The Treasurer has not told us what institutions are to receive the remaining $250,000 or what the basis of distribution will be. In other words, he has taken the control of the finance away from this Committee.

Under this authority, the Treasurer could decide to give all this money to one institution, because he could say, if we passed this clause, that he had authority to do so and that there had been no criticism from this Committee. However, I am sure all members would agree that the $250,000 that may become available should be divided among a number of institutions on an equitable basis. I believe it would be a good and healthy thing for these amounts to be properly approved in the Estimates, for then the requirements of various institutions could be discussed. Then, as is customary, we would ultimately get agreement upon the form of the Appropriation Bill and the passing of that Bill.

This provision has the disability that we are appropriating a sum of money that does not exist and may never exist, and we are taking the appropriation of this sum away from Parliament. Over many years, the Treasurer of this State has been very much curtailed as to the amount of money he can use under the Governor's Appropriation without going to Parliament. Actually, we are completely altering the provision of the T.A.B. legislation which was before this Chamber only a fortnight ago, when we said that money would be voted by Parliament on the recommendation of the Chief Secretary. There is no recommendation of the Chief Secretary, and Parliament will not be voting the money to the individual institution. We are going back even on the member for Frome's idea that T.A.B. would be established on the same basis as it is in Victoria, for Victoria waits until it gets the money in the fund and then appropriates it in the usual way.

There is not very much substance in the provision that is before the Committee. As the Leader of the Opposition has said, this Parliament will be considering Supplementary Estimates at the end of this year. We are bound to meet in the first week of July to consider a Supply Bill, and it would be easy then, if the money were available, to provide in the Supply Bill for the distribution of this money. I ask the Treasurer to accept the Leader's amendment, for it will save confusing the accounts, which previously have always been drawn up on an annual basis.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I remind the Committee of what I said in my second reading explanation regarding this clause. I do not know whether I can make the position any clearer than that. As the member for Gumeracha said, we will be seeking an appropriation on or before July 1 next year. I maintain that what I said in my explanation covers this matter. I do not know how long it will take to arrange for the establishment of these undertakings. If they are well founded and represent a financially sound proposition, and if a particular hospital is in need of assistance, why should the waiting period be extended, provided there is the necessary security that is contained in this Bill?

Mr. HALL: I think the Treasurer is missing the point. In approving this extra expenditure for the first few months of the next financial year ($250,000), we shall be automatically giving him power to allocate sums as he sees fit to individual hospitals and institutions. Clause 16 (8) of the State Lotteries Bill provides:

"public hospital" means—

(*a*) any hospital which is under the Ministerial control of the Chief Secretary;

(*b*) any hospital to which Part IV of the Hospitals Act, 1934-1962, applies or is deemed to apply; or

(*c*) any other hospital or institution which, in the opinion of the Chief Secretary, is not carried on for the purposes of profit. . . .

Is it fair that the Treasurer should now ask us to give him an open cheque in order to permit him to support any institution, as he thinks fit? The present provision is an unnecessary delegation of Parliament's power. Although we do not wish to deny a hospital or an institution money that it may obtain, we wish to ensure that Parliament knows for which hospital or institution the money is to be used.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am rather surprised that the Treasurer is so modest in his request. Why has he not sought in this Bill the appropriation of general funds! The proper time to appropriate moneys for use in 1967-68 is when that time arrives. We are dealing with Budget funds that bear no analogy to Loan commitments. The Leader's amendment accords with proper accounting practice in so far as it limits the appropriation of moneys to the affairs of 1966-67, pursuant to the Estimates that have been approved. I support the amendment.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

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

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Ferguson. No—Mr. Jennings.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 8 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STAMP DUTIES 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 Stamp Duties Act, 1923-1965, and the Stamp Duties Act Amendment Act, 1965, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It has three main objectives with which I deal in order. The first is to amend the principal Act to provide that as from a date to be proclaimed there shall be a stamp duty of 2c on every receipt issued for $10 or over but less than $50. Issue of such receipts will be compulsory only if demanded by the person making the payment but once issued the requisite stamp duty on the receipt will be compulsory. On the other hand, issue of receipts for amounts of $50 and over will remain compulsory whether demanded by the person making payment or not, and will continue to be subject to the present duty of 5c. The purpose of the enactment is to protect the Government revenues which have suffered considerably since the minimum amount of receipt subject to duty was raised from $4 to $50. It is estimated that the loss of revenues suffered is of the order of $100,000 per annum and that this amendment will restore the revenues to approximately the level which earlier obtained.

The immediate provision for the new duty is made by clause 8 (*e*) which adds the new rate of duty to the schedule. Clauses 4, 5, 6 and 7 make necessary consequential amendments. Clause 4 amends section 82 of the principal Act which defines "receipts". Formerly at $4, this definition was altered last year to read $50 when receipts for under $50 became not taxable. As it is proposed to tax receipts for $10 and over, the definition is now being changed to include receipts for amounts of $10 or upwards. Clause 5 (*a*) amends section 84 of the principal Act by retaining the ordinary provision requiring receipts to be given on request and making separate provision for the compulsory giving of receipts for $50 or over.

Clause 5 (*b*) and (*c*) make consequential amendments to subsections (2) and (4) of section 84 of the principal Act. Clause 6 amends section 84b of the principal Act which was inserted last year to provide for a person to compound for the duty. As amended, this section will now provide that a person may compound for the duty on all receipts or put duty stamps thereon—in other words, he may either put duty stamps on every receipt whether given voluntarily or compulsorily, or pay the whole of the duty direct to the Commissioner in respect of all receipts. Clause 7 makes a consequential amendment to section 84c, dealing with penalties. The other amendments relating to duty or receipts relate to exemptions. The first, made by clause 8 (*f*), includes an exemption from duty on receipts given for bets on totalizators operated by any person authorized to operate totalizators. At present the exemption is limited to receipts on bets on totalizators operated by racing clubs. Should a totalizator agency board be authorized in due course, the amendment will make the necessary provision in regard to receipts.

Clause 8 (*g*) will exempt from stamp duty receipts to the Social Welfare Department for maintenance or relief payments, or moneys paid out of any trust fund of the department. Such payments include relief paid in cash, maintenance payments to deserted wives and families, payments from various trust fund accounts, refunds of amounts overpaid, and payment of maintenance subsidies for children placed out with foster parents. It is considered that such receipts which are in effect receipts for social service payments should not require stamping.

The second set of amendments is made by clause 8, paragraphs (*a*) and (*d*). Those paragraphs deal with stamp duties on moneylenders' contracts and hire-purchase agreements, raising the present rates. At present the general rate of duty on those instruments is $2 for every $200 (with lower amounts where the consideration ranges from $20 to $150), and in future the general rate will be $1.50 per $100. The proposed rates have been applicable in Western Australia since 1963 and are, in fact, lower than those operating in Victoria and Tasmania, where the rate has been 2 per cent since 1958 and 1960 respectively. Only in New South Wales and Queensland is a lower rate equal to $1 per $100 still applicable. Recent press reports suggest that the rates in Victoria may be reduced to $1.50 per $100, but that the duty will be extended to apply to a wider range of credit instruments. It is also reported by the press that the rates may be increased to 1½ per cent in New South Wales.

The third set of amendments made by paragraphs (*b*) and (*c*) of clause 8 raises the rates of duty on conveyances. At present the rate of duty on conveyances on sale is $1 up

to a consideration of $100 and thereafter $2 per $200. The new rate will be $1.25 per $100 (or part) where the consideration does not exceed $12,000, and $1.50 per $100 (or part) where the consideration exceeds that amount. The figure of $12,000 has been chosen so that conveyances of modest house properties in South Australia will be stamped at the lower rate. The present rate of duty on conveyances operating as voluntary dispositions, namely, $2 per $200 will be raised to the same rates as will apply to conveyances on sale, which I have already mentioned. The rates on conveyances have remained unchanged in South Australia since 1927. In all the other States there is a basic rate of $1.25 per $100 and in all other States except Queensland a higher rate of $1.50 per $100 is applied when the consideration exceeds various stated figures. The increases in the duties on conveyances, hire-purchase agreements and money-lenders' contracts are expected to give additional revenue of $900,000 this year and $1,350,000 in a full year. Clause 9 makes a drafting amendment to last year's amending Act, section 15 (*d*) of which contained an inappropriate reference to a heading in the Second Schedule to the principal Act.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1932-1964, as amended. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object will, I think, be apparent to members. Section 225 of the Licensing Act provides for a petition for a local option poll to be presented in February or March, 1955, or any third year thereafter. The next third year period will occur in 1967, that is, next year. All members are aware that a Royal Commission into the Licensing Act has been set up and is still conducting its investigations. Among other things the Commission will inquire into the subject of local options. It is clearly undesirable that local option polls should be held during the early part of next year, in view of the fact that on completion of the Commission's inquiries legislation may be required. Accordingly, it is now provided that any local option polls should be postponed for one year. The Bill is designed solely to maintain the existing position pending the outcome of the Royal Commission's investigations.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUDIT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Audit Act, 1921-1959, as amended. Read a first time.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to remove weaknesses from the surcharging provisions of the Audit Act. Section 27 of the Act requires the Auditor-General, when satisfied that irregularities have occurred, to surcharge the deficiency and forward to the Treasurer a statement of unsatisfied surcharges to be enforced against the person responsible. The section does not state upon whom the surcharge is to be issued. Section 28 requires that when such a statement is forwarded to the Treasurer, the Treasurer is to ascertain the person responsible and send him a notice in writing of the surcharge. How the Treasurer is to perform this duty is not specified. It is the Auditor-General who is given all the powers of investigation, and only he can examine persons on oath in the exercise of his duties and powers under the Act. The Treasurer has no statutory powers of inquiry and thus the Act is defective.

The principal amendment, which is made by clause 4 (*f*) of the Bill, will enable the Auditor-General, after his investigation is complete, to require the accounting officer, or other person concerned, to show cause why he should not be surcharged; if he does not show cause to the Auditor-General's satisfaction, he can then be surcharged directly by the Auditor-General with the deficiency. The amendment eliminates any doubts as to whether the Treasurer is to be surcharged in the first instance and then required to ascertain the person responsible. A consequential amendment is made by clause 4 (*g*), which removes present provisions dealing with unsatisfied surcharges and substitutes a simple provision that all surcharges are to be reported to the Treasurer.

The other amendments made to section 27 are of a minor order. Paragraph (*a*) of clause 4 removes the last eight lines of subsection (1) as it is not possible to give a discharge to the Treasurer and the provision has not been complied with for some years. Paragraph (*b*) inserts into subsection (2) certain words designed to enable a surcharge to be made upon a person who has, at the time of an audit,

ceased to be an accounting officer. Paragraphs (*c*) and (*d*) are drafting amendments designed to enable surcharges to be made in respect of any returns, statements, accounts and receipts and not only certain limited types of documents. Paragraph (*e*) inserts the words "or any regulations" in the paragraph dealing with non-compliance with statutory provisions. Paragraph (*h*) inserts a new subsection (5) to ensure that action for recovery of losses can be taken even though approval has been given to write them off.

Clause 5 amends section 28 of the principal Act consequentially upon the principal amendment to section 27. I have explained the reason for empowering the Auditor-General to surcharge an officer concerned directly instead of reporting to the Treasurer and leaving it to the Treasurer to ascertain the responsible person. Section 28 as amended will merely empower the Treasurer to recover the amount of the surcharge. Clause 6 makes amendments to section 29 consequential upon the amendments to section 27. Clause 7 adds two schedules to the principal Act embodying the necessary forms in connection with surcharges. Clauses 3 and 8 are formal amendments to the principal Act relating to decimal currency.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNDERGROUND WATERS PRESERVATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to strengthen the provisions made by the principal Act in 1959 to conserve underground waters within the State. It is unnecessary for me to do more than refer to the general shortage of water throughout the State, in many areas of which we are dependent upon the supply of underground water. The principal Act, passed in 1959, was designed primarily to prevent contamination and deterioration in the quality of underground waters. The principal object of this Bill is to prevent deterioration in quantity as well as quality. Accordingly, the Bill makes certain provisions regarding the prevention of the wastage of water, artesian wells, and the licensing of well drillers.

I shall deal with these matters in order. The first set of provisions relates to the prevention of wastage of water. Section 9 of the principal Act empowers the Minister to refuse application for, or to revoke, permits for the sinking or deepening of wells or other works connected therewith if he believes that the work would be likely to cause contamination or deterioration of underground water; and "deterioration" is defined by section 4 as meaning deterioration in quality. Clause 7 amends section 9 by empowering the Minister to refuse an application for a permit or to revoke a permit if he believes that the work would be likely to cause contamination or deterioration (as at present provided) or likely to cause inequitable distribution, loss, wastage or depletion in the supplies of underground water.

Clauses 8, 9 and 10 make consequential amendments to sections 11, 12 and 18 of the principal Act relating to terms and conditions in permits, transfer and variation of permits, and directions to owners or occupiers. Clause 11 makes special provision regarding artesian wells and the wastage of water. New section 20a requires artesian wells to be capped or equipped with valves to regulate or stop the flow of water. New section 20b prohibits a person from causing or allowing underground water to run to waste or extracting from any well underground water in excess of his reasonable requirements, with an exemption where the water interferes or threatens to interfere with the operation of underground works so far as wastage is unavoidable. New section 20c requires persons sinking, deepening or enlarging wells, who discover an artesian well to notify the Minister in writing of the discovery, and under section 18 the powers of the Minister to give directions to owners or occupiers are applied to wells in which an artesian well is discovered. There is an exemption in the case of a well being sunk under licence under the Mining (Petroleum) Act, 1940-1963.

Clause 12 inserts in the principal Act a new Part IIIA providing a system for the licensing of well drillers. This is regarded as essential to any scheme of control. Just as persons are required to seek permits before sinking wells, so are persons required to be licensed before they may undertake construction or deepening of wells beyond a prescribed depth. These matters are provided for in new sections 23a to 23h, while section 23i provides for an appeal to the appeal board against refusal or cancellation of a well driller's licence. Consequential amendments are made by clauses 13, 14 and 15. It will be seen that by clause 13 the appeal board is increased from a membership of three to a membership of five, the extra members, who are to be

a member of the Licensed Well Drillers Association and a landowner, being provided for by clause 14. In view of the increase, provision is made by clause 15 for the majority decision to be increased from two to three members of the board.

Clause 16 of the Bill corrects a printing error in section 36 of the principal Act and clauses 17 and 18 (*a*) make certain necessary amendments consequential on the introduction of decimal currency. Clause 18 (*b*) empowers the Governor to prescribe different depths to apply in different parts of the State. This relates back to the provisions relating to the licensing of well drillers. The remaining provisions of the Bill are formal or consequential.

Mr. McANANEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

DENTISTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this short Bill is to enable the training and use of dental nurses under dental supervision in the School Health Service. The Dentists Act prohibits the practice of dentistry except by qualified medical practitioners, registered dentists, or licensed operative dental assistants employed by registered dentists. In view of the shortage of dentists in the State and the relatively simple nature of the work performed in the School Health Service, it is proposed to train dental nurses for the purpose of carrying out this necessary work. In New Zealand a special provision enables the performance in the School Dental Service of dental work for schoolchildren in accordance with conditions approved by the Minister.

Clause 3 of the Bill provides that a person may, under the supervision of a registered dentist, practise dentistry on schoolchildren if:

(*a*) he has satisfactorily completed a two-year course of training and is employed by the Crown; or

(*b*) he has satisfactorily completed one year of the course and practices in his course of training in accordance with an agreement with the Minister.

Clause 4 of the Bill makes a consequential amendment to section 48 of the principal Act, and clause 5 makes a formal amendment to the principal Act relating to decimal currency.

Mrs. STEELE secured the adjournment of the debate.

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Works): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to amend the Apprentices Act, 1950-1966. The Bill contains two rather minor amendments to this Act. The first amendment relates to the number of hours that an apprentice should attend a technical school after the first two years of his apprenticeship. The amendment to section 18 (4) of the principal Act which was agreed to at a manager's conference on the Apprentices Act Amendment Act, 1966, held on March 3, 1966, provided that after the completion of the second year of apprenticeship he (the apprentice) should attend during working hours a technical school or class of instruction for four hours each week in every week that the school or class was open for instruction.

Though it was clearly the intention of the managers that this amendment should apply to an apprentice only in the third year of his appenticeship this was inadvertently not stated in the amendment as agreed upon. As at present drafted, the amendment could be construed as meaning that this requirement was to apply in any year after the second year of apprenticeship, that is, to the third, fourth or fifth year. This was never the intention. It is necessary, therefore, to put the matter beyond doubt by including in this amendment the words "during the third year of an apprenticeship". Clause 3 so provides. The second amendment proposed relates to section 27 (4) of the principal Act and is also an amendment that in its nature is consequential to a provision that was inserted in the Apprentices Act Amendment Act, 1966. In section 27 (3) of the principal Act provision was made that no indenture could be cancelled without the approval of the Apprenticeship Commission.

The penalty for any contravention of this subsection which appears in subsection (4) of this section, however, only applies to an employer. It does not apply to an apprentice, nor the parent. It is the Government's view that the Chairman of the Apprenticeship Commission should be able to prosecute an apprentice who wilfully terminates his indenture after approval for such termination has been refused

by the commission; and also the parent in any case when he or she was wilfully obstructing the implementation of any decision of the commission. This can be accomplished by replacing the word "employer" with the word "person" in subsection (4) of this section; this will be uniform with the other offences provisions in Part IV of the Act. I commend this Bill for the consideration of members.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 4.53 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 4, at 2 p.m.