LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, February 17, 1966.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

OIL LICENCE.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: My attention has been drawn to an article in the *Port Lincoln Times* dated Thursday, February 10, the headline of which states "Oil scandal claim. Shell licence angers local oil search men." Has the Minister of Mines seen the article and has he any information to offer the Council about it?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. My attention has been drawn to an article in the *Port Lincoln Times* of February 10, 1966, implying that an oil scandal was involved in the recent granting to Shell Development (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. of an off-shore exploration licence, and implying unfair treatment of a local syndicate. Nothing is further from the truth. I have carefully examined the departmental files, which contain a great mass of data fully setting out the early history of the portion of the area originally held by the local syndicate. It is on record in these files that the off-shore portion of the area under licence to this syndicate was voluntarily surrendered by the company in April, 1964, because it could not financially deal with the enormous expenditures involved in off-shore exploration for petroleum. The article suggests, of course, that its licence was cancelled. It has been open for application ever since. I am completely satisfied that the syndicate in question was patiently and fairly dealt with by the Mines Department, and I deplore its cowardly and unfair attack on a department well and favourably known overseas as well as locally.

I likewise strongly deprecate any insinuations that the actions of the Shell Company in the whole matter have been anything but strictly honourable and above-board. This goes without saying. As I have already explained, since this company voluntarily relinquished the area it has been vacant for application. An application was made by the Shell company in all good faith and a licence has been granted to it by me. If any honourable member so desires (and this is going further, I appreciate, than we have gone so far in this matter) I am prepared to make the confidential files of the Mines Department on this matter available for his perusal. These files are definitely confidential, as every honourable member understands and appreciates.

To prove my statement that the licence was voluntarily relinquished by this company and that the position is not, as insinuated in the report in the *Port Lincoln Times,* that the previous Government through the Mines Department forced it to relinquish it, I have one of our files here. This is correspondence sent to the Director of Mines by this company on April 14, 1964. For the benefit of honourable members, I point out that it is signed by the three principal partners, including the author of the article (Mr. Blacker). The letter is addressed to the Director of Mines, Department of Mines, Adelaide, and I quote:

> Dear Sir: The licence holders of oil exploration licence No. 32 wish to advise you that they are desirous of amending the licence by surrendering the seaward portions of the licensed area, and in consequence of altering the programme of the work under the terms of the licence. The reasons for the licence holders' requesting the amendment of the licence and the terms thereof are as follows: (1) Enquiries and approaches to companies which are able to and competent to carry out the seismic work presently required under the terms of the licence reveal that there is no company available to carry out this work until 1965. (2) The cost of this seismic work has been discovered to be far in excess of £30,000, the sum proposed to be spent on this work. (3) Inquiries by ourselves at a recent oil search conference in Melbourne revealed that even if favourable results are obtained from the seismic work, rigs capable of drilling a formation in the sea will not be available for a number of years and at the cost exceeding £2,000,000. Information obtained shows that it will be worth while putting down a further hole to a depth of 1,000ft. in the same area. It is suspected by the licence holder that the apparent basement rock in the area is not true basement rock and a hole of 1,000ft. will discover whether it is so.

The rest of the letter is in relation to the licence they are referring to. The latter portions I have read deal with the land licence and not the off-shore licence. At the time the Minister, having given full consideration to the implication of off-shore drilling, granted the application of the company to cancel its off-shore licence and to alter the licence in accordance with the request to allow it at that stage to retain its on-shore licence. When it makes a public statement that the licence in actual fact was taken from it, I repeat that nothing is farther from the truth, and I consider this to be a very cowardly attack upon a department that is renowned for its integrity, not only in this State, but in the Commonwealth and overseas.

MOTOR INDUSTRY.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: My question is directed to the Minister for Labour and Industry. This week in the press it was stated that there had been an upturn in the employment rate in the motor industry in South Australia. In the opinion of the Minister, was this upturn due in any way to the defeat of the Road and Railway Transport Act Amendment Bill?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: As this is a question of policy, I ask that the honourable member put it on notice.

STATE AID TO SCHOOLS.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: In the early edition of yesterday's *News* I read that State Cabinet had not made any decision on whether South Australia should support the A.L.P. Federal Executive move in the High Court on the principle of Federal aid for non-Government schools. This issue is far more important than the Labor Party and affects the whole of the State. That is why I am directing the question. Later in the day, in a second edition of the newspaper, I read with much interest that the Premier, Mr. Walsh, said, in reply to something that he had been asked, "Yes, Cabinet has made a decision on the matter."

I noticed in the *Advertiser* this morning that Mr. Dunstan, replying to something that he was asked, said that he had not given any advice, as Attorney-General of the State, to the Government on this matter. I am not being political at all, but will the Chief Secretary say whether the people of the State should know whether the Government is or is not going to support this move, because it may affect the policy on the whole future of education in this State?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Let me make the position quite clear. There was a casual discussion on the matter before Cabinet but Cabinet had nothing official before it. When it has, it will give earnest consideration to the matter and make a decision.

AIR SERVICES.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Transport a question relating to the Adelaide-Millicent-Naracoorte air service. Speaking from memory, I think the reply was that this matter would receive further attention after the drafting of the Road and Railway Transport Bill. The position regarding this service is that much voluntary work has been done by local people and much money spent in developing airfields in Millicent and Naracoorte. An air service was operating for some time but could not be continued, because there was not sufficient patronage. I understand that negotiations are now being undertaken with a view to reinstating this service but that the same problem exists, namely, that it probably will not be an economic service. During the election campaign, an advertisement appeared in South-Eastern newspapers that, if a Labor Government was elected to office, it would supply a better air service to these particular towns. As negotiations with the companies have been reopened, can the Minister of Transport say, in line with the election advertisement, what assistance the Government is prepared to give for the re-establishment of this service?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: As this is a matter for the Government to consider and as I cannot reply on behalf of the Government on this matter at the moment, I suggest that the honourable member also put this question on notice.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Recently the Minister of Roads gave me a reply to a question concerning passing bays on the upgrade between Aldgate and Crafers and, as I stated at the time, the answer seemed to deal with some bays that have been provided on the downgrade rather than with my direct question in regard to passing bays on the upgrade. Since then, I have found that my constituents in Murray, Albert, Mount Gambier, Millicent, Victoria, Stirling and Onkaparinga are gravely concerned at the Minister's reply to the effect that it is not the intention of the department (I think that was his answer) to do anything further than has been done beyond the freeway from Crafers to Hahndorf over the years, which we know takes time. Therefore, I suggest to the Minister that, as he was aware that those passing bays were under design some 18 months ago, he draw the attention of his department to the urgent necessity for proceeding with this work.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will inquire further into the matter raised by the honourable member, obtain a report from my department and make the information available as soon as possible.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Consideration in Committee of the House of Assembly's amendments:

No. 1 Page 3, line 23 (clause 9)—Leave out "(4)" and insert "(5)" in lieu thereof.
No. 2. Page 4, line 28 (clause 14)—After "operation" insert "for more than two hundred yards".
No. 3. Page 4, line 31 (clause 14)—Leave out "Twenty-five" and insert "Five" in lieu thereof.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Roads): Three amendments are suggested and I propose to deal with all three matters at the one time. The first amendment is simply one of drafting, as apparently a printing error occurred, in that subclause (4) as printed should have read "subclause (5)". The second amendment deals with the operation of trafficators. After a motorist has completed a turn or deviation and used a trafficator, if that is not cancelled out he commits an offence. By adding the words "for more than two hundred yards" the motorist will be given the opportunity during that distance to correct his error, if necessary. It merely gives the driver an opportunity of seeing whether or not his indicators have been cancelled out. I see no objection to the amendment.

The last amendment also deals with trafficators. When the Bill left this Council a penalty of $50 applied to an offence against this section. The penalty seemed excessive, and I believe some honourable members commented to that effect although it was not amended in this place. However, it has been amended in another place by deleting $50 and inserting "$10". It merely means that the penalty will be $10 where a motorist fails to cancel his trafficators.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I do not think the Minister is correct in saying that it was not amended in this Council.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I stand corrected. The original penalty proposed in the Bill was $100 but it was amended to $50 before it left this Chamber. After due consideration, another place considered the penalty of $50 still too harsh and substituted $10. I recommend that the amendments received from another place be accepted.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I support the amendments whole-heartedly, but I am still not sure why we have this matter in the Bill at all. If we had spent a little longer on it, perhaps it would not have been in the Bill at this stage. Until we can get mechanical aids, such as trafficators, perfected, so that they are fool-proof, we should not penalize people unduly. The $10 maximum fine now makes it much better; it is not much more than a cautionary penalty. I do not know on how many vehicles of the cheaper type the trafficators are efficient, although perhaps the more expensive cars have better devices. When we put the trafficator on to turn in a lazy turn, as provided for in many areas these days, and not a right-angle turn, we find that when the vehicle straightens up the trafficator sometimes does not go out of the "on" position. In traffic we do not always hear the noise that the trafficator is supposed to make, and if we are watching the road, we do not see the little indicator light still on. We should introduce laws of this type only when a device that is compulsory on vehicles is perfected. If it is not perfected, we must operate it manually. However, the Bill is better than it was before, and I accept the amendments.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I have no quarrel with the spirit of these amendments, but there is one thing to which I would like to draw attention. Before doing that, let me say that I am happy about the penalty. I think it is enough for this offence. I drew attention in the debate on this matter of leaving trafficators on to the dangerous situation that can occur when the driver leaves his trafficator on, and an approaching vehicle does not realize that, and misconstrues the intention of the other driver. I gave an illustration of how I nearly got into a serious accident at the corner of King William Street and North Terrace. As this happened some time ago, perhaps honourable members will pardon me if I repeat the illustration I gave.

I was going from Parliament House, intending to turn right into King William Street. I was standing at the corner waiting for the traffic lights to change. A man came along in the opposite direction, going along North Terrace and proceeding west towards West Terrace, across the King William Street intersection. He had his trafficator on as though he was going to turn right into King William Road, alongside Parliament House. I started to move across him, as I was entitled to by law, because no-one else was coming, and suddenly he seemed to speed up; so I jammed on my

brakes and he crossed in front of me. If I had taken his indicator, as I was entitled to, as an indication of his intention, there would have been a serious accident, because he was going very fast and it was only at the last moment that I was able, with that instinct that we get after many years of driving, to sense that something was wrong. While I agree with what has been said and with the intention of the other place, I think in the city (and not only in the city of Adelaide but in other cities and towns) 200 yards is too long a distance, because, if I am right, two acres is the depth between North Terrace and Rundle Street, and an acre is 210ft. deep. Therefore, two acres is 420ft. If we accept this 600ft., or 200 yards, it means that a man will be entitled to keep his trafficator on whilst going across every intersection in the city. Between King William Street and Rundle Street he will be entitled to have his trafficator doing the wrong thing. In other words, he can do exactly what this man did to me on North Terrace. But it is a bit worse than that, because, when we expressly provide about trafficators being allowed to be kept going, we give lawful justification for a man to leave his trafficator on. It is worse than if the Act was silent about it. This is a legal view about it, because we are giving such a man statutory justification, in effect, for keeping his trafficator on for 200 yards. Therefore, the position should be carefully scrutinized.

I give that as an illustration. It applies to every vehicle travelling in a north-south direction anywhere in the city of Adelaide. A man is entitled, under this amendment, to keep his trafficator giving a wrong indication until he gets to, and even over, the next intersection. That is wrong. I suggest that we accept the House of Assembly's amendments, except the amendment dealing with the distance of 200 yards. I shall propose 100 yards.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I have no hesitation in supporting the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill's proposed amendment. I am sure that the Minister on consideration will realize that the city blocks are quite short. If people were going from North Terrace to Rundle Street and then to Grenfell Street, their trafficators could be on wrongly all the time. It is desirable to reduce the distance to 100 yards.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It does not apply only to Adelaide.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: In the circumstances, the Minister should take these amendments separately.

Amendment No. 1.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I move:

That amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

As I have pointed out, it is a drafting amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 2.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I suggest we accept the distance of 200 yards. I fully appreciate Sir Arthur's and Sir Norman's comments on this in respect of King William Street, but we should consider also the present traffic laws on our main roads and highways. In King William Road, for instance, which is a main road, motorists frequently cross the lines as they change from lane to lane. A motorist does not interfere with an approaching vehicle but indicates his intention to vehicles following him. It often happens in King William Road that cars are parked at the kerbside meters. A motorist will pull up in the inside lane, which means that a motorist following him will pull out to pass him, and he indicates that he is doing that, either by the hand signal or by the trafficator. He switches on his trafficator to indicate that he is pulling out into another lane. When he straightens his vehicle there has been only a very slight deviation. Often it is not enough to cancel his trafficator, and 200 yards is not a long distance to travel under the circumstances. Even at the required speed of 35 miles per hour it does not take long to travel 200 yards, and a motorist could well be unaware that his trafficator indicator had not cancelled out. I think that we can accept the House of Assembly's amendment.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I am not splitting hairs on this business. I have thought seriously about it and I would much sooner see the amendment go through from the point of view of practical politics than send it back to the other place, but I am not prepared to do that. My proposal does not apply only to Adelaide but to practically every other town in South Australia. I have been making a calculation while the Minister has been speaking. Considering the 35 miles per hour limit which applies in towns (although it is not obeyed, of course, in places like Adelaide or the main street of Mount Gambier or any other town of any importance) it would take a person approximately 12 seconds to travel 200 yards. At a speed of 35 miles an hour it would take about six seconds to

traverse 100 yards. Six seconds should be long enough for a motorist to return his traffic indicators; it is quite an appreciable space of time, especially if one is driving a motor car, when he ought to be alert and thinking about things. Traffic in King Wililam Street or in the main streets of Mount Gambier, Whyalla, Port Pirie and Port Augusta is more likely to travel at 20 miles per hour, so in those circumstances a man has at least 10 seconds to correct his indicator. If he is not going to correct it in 10 seconds, when is he going to correct it? I agree with Mr. Story's argument that in traffic a motorist cannot always hear his trafficator. That cannot be helped; it is one of the things that happen in our present day so-called civilization. These things have to be taken into account. I do not think we would be justified in leaving 200 yards as the distance. I believe the other place could not have considered the sort of facts I am putting to the Chamber. I move:

To strike out "200" and insert "100".

The Hon. L. R. HART: I draw members' attention to a point that has not been mentioned so far. The law requires that if a motorist is going to change lanes he must give an indication that he is going to do so. I have been involved in cases of changing lane, using my indicator to indicate to other motorists that I am about to do so. I have done this in King William Road. Often when driving south from the River Torrens area one finds it necessary to travel at least 200 yards, or possibly more, before being able to change to the lane he wishes to be in so that he can make the turn at North Terrace. A motorist may have to cross two lanes to get into the appropriate lane. In doing this he can easily travel 200 yards before achieving his objective. Therefore, I believe the House of Assembly amendment is reasonable and I support it.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I thought at first that the honourable member was going to assist my cause. I thought he was going to point out that it was even more important to cancel the indicator quickly after turning. I do not think he has read the section clearly. The amendment from another place means that a motorist can leave his trafficator on for 200 yards after he has completed the divergence. The Hon. Mr. Hart spoke about what happened during the making of the divergence.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I support the House of Assembly amendment. Other factors come into this matter, and I believe that a length of 200 yards is reasonable for a person to make sure that his trafficator is back in position. Although there could be some inconvenience to following traffic in, perhaps, King William Street, where intersections are close together, there is very little real risk of an accident through trafficators being left working. I believe that the real danger when indicators are still working concerns any motorist coming in the opposite direction. When there is traffic in front, and to the right or left at an intersection, the position is dangerous. I think the 200 yards is a reasonable distance. In King William Street there is a 35 mile per hour speed limit, but much of our near metropolitan area is zoned for higher speeds, and certainly country roads have an even higher speed limit.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Not in the townships.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: People use trafficators other than in townships. It could apply where the streets are close together, such as in King William Street. However, serious accidents are not often caused by indicators left operating when the vehicle has left an intersection. The main danger is to approaching traffic and, because of that, a distance of 200 yards is sufficient.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: When I spoke in the second reading debate some months ago, my opinion was the same as that of the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan. I thought that this was a triviality, that people would not leave indicators on and that this would not be the cause of accidents. However, since then, I have seen many cases of indicators being left on most dangerously. Moreover, I have come to the conclusion that not only have we the most undisciplined pedestrians in Adelaide; we also have the most selfish drivers.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Armless drivers.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: Yes. An accident nearly happened on Goodwood Road the other day, when a child was almost halfway out of a car. When I indicated this to the mother, she thought I was a raving lunatic. As I was saying, our South Australian drivers are most selfish. I often turn right from North Terrace into King William Street and then, although I have my indicator on, I cannot get over to the left in order to turn left into Flinders Street. It is an utter impossibility to do this in traffic, because the drivers in Adelaide will not take notice of indicators. In other cities that have

traffic lanes, when a person gives an indication of wanting to turn, courtesy is extended. This is seen in London, Sydney and Melbourne. Adelaide is becoming a big city and drivers must stop behaving like small-town hicks. Sir Arthur Rymill's amendment will assist in making people conscious of the possibility of accidents happening and it may make them find out why indicators are used at all. I strongly support the amendment.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: I am afraid that I come down on the side of the amendment. We always have to start somewhere and we are usually opposed to being too stringent or making changes that are too violent. I agree with the suggestion that indicators often have to be operated manually. I do not think that anybody wilfully breaks the law. Sometimes inconvenience may be caused when indicators are left operating through inadvertence rather than because the person concerned is a bad driver.

I find that the best way to drive is to assume always that the other person will do the wrong thing. By that method, and by exercising a little care, I find that I can get through. I would prefer that the indicators be completely automatic. I think I have said in the second reading debate that some turns are not complete right-angle turns. Sometimes the indicators may flick off when the car is turning even at an obtuse angle, while on other occasions they may not and may have to be turned off manually. Sometimes drivers do not hear the warning signal in the car when the indicators still operate because of other noises, and at other times in heavy traffic their attention is on the road and they may not look down and see the warning light. In any case, all cars do not have a light on the dashboard to show that the indicators are operating. When a driver finds that he has not turned off the indicator, he feels ashamed, as I know from experience. A driver could well travel more than 200 yards with the indicators operating and I certainly consider that I would not want to oppose the amendment inserted in another place.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I see both sides of this matter, and hope that I see them fairly. Sir Arthur Rymill mentioned the distance between the intersections in the city. Many of our well laid out towns are heavily trafficked, particularly market towns on market days. This provision is a let-out that was apparently inserted in good faith, but I point out to the Minister that to let a person drive over two intersections with the trafficator flashing is to put that person outside the law if an accident happens.

Is Parliament going to put that man outside the law and say that he has not offended? He may have the indicator flashing for 200 yards, which would take him across North Terrace and across Rundle Street. Is that sensible? I admit that this is a difficult case and do not want to be offensive. However, the distance between intersections in the city is less than 200 yards and, therefore, if a man has a flashing light operating from North Terrace to Rundle Street and has an accident at Rundle Street, this provision may let him out.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: No. He will be liable to be prosecuted for negligent driving, in accordance with the Act.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: No. His defending counsel would say that he had not gone 200 yards and that Parliament had provided this exoneration. Sir Arthur Rymill suggests that the distance be 100 yards. This is not a difficult matter, or a nation-rocking subject; it is a matter of common sense.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I do not agree with Sir Norman's suggestion that, if Parliament sanctions a distance of 200 yards, a motorist who has the turning indicators operating between King William Street and Rundle Street and has an accident will be put outside the law. His suggestion is not correct because of the provisions of the Road Traffic Act, with which I thought he was acquainted. Other clauses in the Act relate to negligent driving and, therefore, a motorist in those circumstances would still be liable.

The Hon Sir Norman Jude: That is fair enough.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I have dealt with this subject previously and do not want to delay the Committee. This provision, as amended, will say that a driver shall not permit a signalling device on his vehicle to remain operating after the completion of the turn or divergence in respect of which the device was put in operation for more than 200 yards. This is not just a penal provision; it is a part of the traffic code of which we are supposed to approve. Will that not mean that a motorist will be entitled to leave it on for 200 yards after he has completed the manoeuvre?

That is how I read it, and I am not without experience in the traffic courts. I did much of my legal work in those courts. I would have considered that I had a good argument in an appeal in the Supreme Court if the legislature

had said that a man using a trafficator was entitled to leave it on for 200 yards.

The CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill has moved:

That "200" be struck out and "100" be inserted.

Amendment negatived; House of Assembly's amendment No. 2 agreed to.

Amendment No. 3.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I have already explained amendment No. 3 as reducing the penalty from $50 to $10. I think that honourable members will agree that the amendment will result in a just penalty and that they will accept it accordingly.

Amendment agreed to.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, lines 13 and 14 (clause 3—Leave out "subparagraph (*d*) of paragraph (1) of the definition of 'ratable property' in".

No. 2. Page 1, line 15 (clause 3)—After "amended" insert "(*a*)".

No. 3. Page 1, line 16 (clause 3)—Before "therein" insert "in subparagraph (*d*) of paragraph (1) of the definition of 'ratable property' ".

No. 4. Page 1—After line 17 (clause 3)—insert—

(*b*) by striking out the passage "and used for the purposes of the University of Adelaide" in subparagraph (i) of the said paragraph (1) and in subparagraph (*g*) of paragraph (2) of the said definition and inserting in lieu thereof in each case the words "dedicated to, or in any manner placed under the care control and management of, and used for the purposes of, the University of Adelaide or any other University in the State or the South Australian Institute of Technology".

No. 5. Page 4—Leave out clause 14.

No. 6. Page 1, after line 17, insert the following new clause—

3a. Enactment of s. 27b of principal Act—Request for poll for severance of area.—The following section is inserted in the principal Act after section 27a thereof—

27b. Notwithstanding anything in this Part contained, not less than one-tenth of the ratepayers of any ward may, by notice under their hands, delivered to the Minister, request that the question whether or not that ward should be severed from the area of which it forms a part and annexed to another area should be submitted to a poll of the ratepayers in the ward and the Minister may request the council to hold such a poll. Upon receipt of such request from the Minister the council shall hold such poll. The provisions of Part XLIII shall with the necessary modifications apply to such a poll and if the proposition is carried the Governor may make a proclamation giving effect to the proposition.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government) moved:

That the House of Assembly's amendments be considered forthwith.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): How can we proceed? I cannot find the amendments on my desk.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: They are being distributed now.

Motion carried.

In Committee.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: At this stage I ask that progress be reported.

The PRESIDENT: I have to report that the Committee has sat and made progress and asks leave to sit again.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: On a point of order, have we made any progress?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN moved:

That the report be adopted.

Motion carried.

EMPLOYEES REGISTRY OFFICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

NURSES REGISTRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 16. Page 4085.)

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Central No. 2): I shall move the amendment that has been placed on the file. This Bill deals principally with the acquisition of interests in land by the Electricity Trust. This body has previously had the power to acquire some easements and now seeks the power to acquire

more; and also the power to acquire freehold properties for the purpose of the construction of substations. I am concerning myself not with the power to acquire further easements but with the control it is proposed to give this public authority compulsorily to purchase sites for substations.

Whenever any public authority seeks power compulsorily to acquire, the matter should be looked into carefully, because the rights of individual people can be seriously affected by acquisitions by public utilities and Government or semi-Government authorities. This Bill gives power at a time when the whole question of town planning is in our minds and is of great current interest. Town planning encompasses the minds of local authorities which, as representatives of the people, investigate planning closely. With planning comes zoning and the various kinds of development that can take place. I am concerned with the public viewpoint on the matter. It concerns me that members of the public may be affected by this compulsory power being given.

Let me take an example of an intersection in the suburbs, on the corners of which there may be houses that may have been established for many years, making it a residential intersection. It may well be that an oil company (this often happens) has applied to the local authority for consent to erect a service station on one of the corners, and that consent has been refused. Here, we observe the right of a public utility to come along after that refusal and acquire one of these corner sites for the erection of a substation. It may well be that after some discussion with the local authority the trust could have secured an alternative site. It might have been just a little off the main intersection, but it would have been in the interests of the people in that locality not to have that kind of change effected.

Let me take another case of a residential locality in Hindmarsh or Bowden. An authority may acquire a site adjoining a row of cottages. Many residents in cases like that claim that some noise comes from the substation that may well adversely affect the rest and quiet of the people in those cottages, whereas, if some consultation had taken place with the local authority, the substation could have been built a little further away, adjoining, for example, some industrial concern or a factory: and, in such a position, the people concerned would not have been affected. But those are hypothetical cases. Taking the substation on the corner of South Road and Daw Road at Edwardstown, we see a prominent and busy corner, which has developed very well indeed, except that on one corner there is the substation. That is not the kind of development that should take place on a corner like that, which has now become so prominent and important. A few years ago no-one could have foreseen the development that has taken place there.

Similarly, at Cross Road, one of our main residential streets, cutting through the southern suburbs of the metropolitan area, there are at least two substations. I do not think it is unfair to enforce some consultation by the trust with the councils to see whether, before sites are purchased, alternative proposals can be put forward. I have much praise for the Electricity Trust. There is no doubt that its achievements in this State are fine. One of the greatest of them has been the keeping down of the cost of electricity. I give it full praise for that. It may be thought that, if it is forced to take sites alternative to the first choice, its costs to establish those substations may rise appreciably, and that the extra cost of laying cable would increase the total developmental cost. But, when we consider the cost of the sites on the main roads and main intersections in their unimproved form, compared with the value of the land around the corner, we perceive there is a considerable difference in value between the two groups of sites. So, when this question arises (and it invariably comes first to mind) that we should not increase the cost to the trust, this important fact must be borne in mind that the sites just a little off the main road or a little way from the main intersections are cheaper to purchase in their unimproved form than are the prominent sites.

My second point, after giving the trust well-deserved praise for all its achievements, is that, as far as local government is concerned, it is fair to say that the negotiations between local government and the trust in the past have not been entirely successful from the point of view of local government. The trust's officers (who are bound to carry out their negotiations in this manner) are very firm indeed when discussions and consultations take place. I emphasize the words "very firm indeed". It is fair to say that most local government bodies have not found much compromise or tolerance in the attitude of the trust in discussions on these matters—for instance, as to the whereabouts of a pole or the putting underground of a cable. So, whereas I have said that consultation is desirable, consultation alone would not bring about any result of the type

I should like to see brought about. That is why it should be taken further than requiring the trust simply to consult with local government in regard to the selection of sites.

I do not deny the need for this authority to acquire sites, although I do not like to see it happening. It has purchased satisfactorily by private negotiation, as is evidenced by the many substations that have been built. According to the Minister, at Richmond apparently great difficulty was experienced. As our way of life is progressing we have to face up to the fact that more and more compulsory power will be given, as time passes, to these public authorities. I am not objecting to their having this power but hope that we may be able to force this authority to discuss and consult with the local government body concerned. This is the aspect of the Bill that concerns me.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I have discussed this matter with the Minister who administers the Electricity Trust Act and he is not very enamoured of the amendment. I am surprised that a member of this place should suggest that a Minister should have some responsibility in a matter of this nature. It is the reverse of what happened to other legislation introduced this session regarding a Minister having the final say concerning a department that comes under his jurisdiction. What happens here is that the council has the opportunity to do something about a matter. If there is disagreement in any way the matter goes to the Minister. The decision may be immediately reversed by the Minister. I cannot see that the amendment will achieve any great change in the Bill. I heard the honourable member say in regard to the Electricity Trust that there had not been much co-operation. I am not aware of this. I think that the Bill in its present form covers all the necessary provisions.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Additional powers of trust."

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I move to add at the end of paragraph (*a*1) the following proviso:

> Provided that no land shall be acquired by compulsory process by the trust pursuant to this paragraph unless and until the council of the area in which the land proposed to be so acquired is situated has been given notice of the proposal to acquire the same and the council has agreed to such proposal. If the council of the area does not agree to such proposal, the proposal shall be referred to the Minister, whose decision as to whether or not the said land shall be acquired by compulsory process shall be final and binding on the trust and the said council.

I point out that there is no intention to vary the position in areas where there is need of power through a large industry being unexpectedly established. It is intended only to vary slightly the position respecting a substation in any one locality. Regarding the final appeal to the Minister, it seems that one is necessary should there be an impasse resulting from the Electricity Trust applying to the local council for consent to establish a substation on a certain site. Some method of arbitration is needed from that point on, and it seems fair and reasonable that the trust should turn to the Minister for a ruling.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I support the amendment. I agree with all other members who have stated that the Electricity Trust is a wonderful asset to this State, because it has provided electricity at a reasonable rate over a very wide area. I am sure that no honourable member here wishes in any way to interfere unduly with the working of this authority, nor does he wish to put any burden on it that will add to the cost of electricity. I think the amendment is fair and reasonable. It leaves the Minister as the final arbitrator. I also think it is fair and proper that local government should have some say in the activities in its area. We are seeing an awareness of planning in local government areas. We cannot have too much liaison between Government and semi-Government departments and local government in the planning of activities. This amendment is a reasonable recognition of the part a local government body plays in the administration of its area. Under it I do not think there can be anything restricted. I support the amendment.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I am still opposed to the amendment. The first portion of it states:

> Provided that no land shall be acquired by compulsory process by the trust pursuant to this paragraph unless and until the council of the area in which the land proposed to be so acquired is situated has been given notice of the proposal to acquire the same and the council has agreed to such proposal.

This only applies where there is compulsory acquisition. There is no control over negotiations between the trust and the person who owns the property, wherever it may be, where the trust desires to place a substation. This only deals with compulsory acquisition. The council has no say where there is no compulsory acquisition. The council has little say in

regard to other parts. This would unduly delay the operations of the trust and would cause much expense.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I stand to be corrected if I am wrong but I understand that, if the Electricity Trust purchases land other than by compulsory acquisition, it still has to obtain the consent of the council for the siting of the substation and for the transmission site. I understand that the old Act under which the trust operates requires that the trust obtain permission for the erection of lines and transmission stations.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What the honourable member says in regard to the old Act is an added reason for this provision.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I support the amendment. On my understanding, the old Adelaide Electric Supply Act applies, except in this particular case. I understand that, when the land is acquired by compulsory process, the trust no longer has to seek the agreement of the council. It may well suit the trust to acquire by compulsory process in cases where it thinks the councils will not agree. I support the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Hill. In view of the attitude that has been adopted by the Minister on other Bills, I would have thought that he would be fully in accord with this provision.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As I have had some experience in local government matters, I appreciate the motive behind the amendment. I am not extremely clear regarding the position as far as the erection of substations is concerned when the Electricity Trust purchases a block of land other than by compulsory acquisition. The amendment provides that councils must be consulted. I ask the Minister to report progress so that we may check the trust's powers regarding substations erected on land purchased in the normal way.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

Later:

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I have given much thought to this matter and to what the Hon. Mr. Hill is attempting to do. I realize that local government is sometimes at a disadvantage when outside authorities (not only the trust, but even Commonwealth authorities) need to establish installations and do not get close to the councils. This is a source of inconvenience and expense to local governing bodies. However, I think the Minister correctly made the point that, in cases where the trust purchases land by ordinary means from a buyer without resorting to the compulsory acquisition provisions, it would not be necessary for it to consult the council on the matter. I do not think I can support the amendment for that reason, but I am in sympathy with the Hon. Mr. Hill for raising the important matter of giving local government the opportunity of knowing what is happening in the area concerned.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have further considered this matter since I raised it a short time ago. I was perfectly aware that in cases where land was bought by private treaty the trust could proceed as it had done in the past. However, being rather new to this place, I took the view that I would be going some of the way if I moved an amendment to provide that, where land was acquired compulsorily, it would be possible to force the trust to take the action that I suggested. However, in view of what has been said and the discussions that have taken place, it seems that it may be possible, after further consideration of the matter, to ensure that in all instances the Electricity Trust consults councils.

If that state of affairs can be brought about it will be more satisfactory than requiring the trust to consult councils only when land is compulsorily acquired. I understand that if I have the amendment withdrawn the Minister will investigate the matter of there being further consultation between the trust and councils when substation sites are proposed and land is acquired, either compulsorily or by private treaty. I seek leave to withdraw the amendment.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I would be pleased to agree to have the matter investigated as the honourable member has suggested.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ELECTRICAL WORKERS AND CONTRACTORS LICENSING BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 16. Page 4070.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Southern): Much has been said in regard to this Bill, and I endorse most of that. In my opinion, if this Bill becomes law, it will cut across many of the normal liberties that people should be able to enjoy. I do not hesitate in saying that I agree with legislation designed to license electricians who advertise and hold themselves out as electricians for profit or reward. However, I oppose making the work of an electrician almost a closed shop so that only those licensed will be able to do electrical work that a handyman is now capable of doing.

If this Bill is passed as it stands and if we accept the principle embodied in it, where will it lead us? We have heard that it is being introduced in the interests of safety in South Australia, although we know that similar legislation, probably not going quite as far as this, exists in other parts of Australia, no statistical evidence has been produced to show there is greater safety in other States. Indeed, I think it would be correct to say that South Australia had a safety factor as high as that in any other State in Australia.

One may well ask whether the next move will be to license, say, bricklayers because, if a wall is built more than 18in. high by a handyman, it could fall over and kill somebody and it may be said that, therefore, there must be a closed shop in relation to that trade. The same argument could be advanced in relation to a carpenter. Again, should a person be allowed to tinker with what is a lethal machine, the motor car? Should not this be a closed shop where only a licensed mechanic can do a normal job that almost any man today can do? There is a principle in this Bill that I strongly oppose. I am not opposed to the licensing of electricians as such—those who hold themselves out as electricians for profit or reward. Then a person employing an electrician will know he will have certain qualifications, but when it comes to preventing a person in his own home from carrying out normal jobs that an average person with average intelligence could do quite easily, I think the principle is being carried too far.

In looking at the application of this Bill one might well ask what the position would be at the university with students and staff using, changing and repairing electrical appliances; would all of those people have to obtain a licence? The Minister may say, "We can give them an exemption." Very well, the university is exempted. Then there are the schools; what about physics teachers in such places? I suppose they could also be given an exemption! There are also P.M.G. employees, especially those engaged in the radio section and even those employed on telegraph lines where the parties work on 50 volts. All would come within the scope of the Bill. All of this would have to be looked at and an exemption given, otherwise all those people would have to be licensed.

Next we look at the people engaged in electronics, people whose livelihood is in that field and, as a hobby, some of them may have a house full of all odd types of equipment. When it comes to repairing such equipment this Bill would cut them out. Very well, may be the comment, they can obtain an exemption. But what of these exemptions? Surely there is a more practical way of handling this matter! I think the Hon. Mr. Banfield said yesterday that even if this Bill saves only one life it will be worthwhile. If that philosophy is applied to any legislation that comes before this Chamber such a statement is reduced to an absurdity because there could be all kinds of odd legislation where it could be said, "Even if it saves only one life it is worth while."

I do not believe this Bill will save one life. On the other hand, it is going to inconvenience many people. I spoke to a young man today who told me he had wired his own house. He had originally built himself a new house; he is quite a handyman. Let me say now that wiring a house is not a difficult job, and any good handyman can do it with comparative ease. The young man I mentioned obtained a quote from an electrician of $500 for wiring the house, but he eventually did it himself for $80. An officer of the Electricity Trust inspected and passed the work; in fact, he said it was a perfect job.

Those are some of the difficulties that enter into this matter. If this completely closed shop is insisted upon, will that price I mentioned remain at $500 for the wiring of an ordinary house? I am extremely doubtful on that score. Continuing this argument further, I point out that under this Bill a handyman cannot replace an element in an electric jug, nor can he do any normal repair job to electrical equipment in a house. The Hon. Mrs. Cooper gave rather a comprehensive list of the electrical equipment in a home, and when one considers what may be in the home of a working man in this State the list is not far out. There is a tremendous amount of minor repair work to electrical equipment that can be carried out by the householder himself.

Although I am prepared to accept the principle of the licensing of electricians, I do not consider we should go so far as to prevent the householder being able to repair normal equipment contained in his house. I do not think we should go as far as to say to a person that he cannot wire his own house or wire any building on his property. We should remember that such wiring would be inspected by an officer of the Electricity Trust. In that alone I think exist all the safety measures needed to ensure that these things are correctly done. I will support the second reading but I

will also be supporting certain amendments along the lines I have indicated in my speech.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I, too, support the second reading of this Bill, but question some parts of it. I believe that the general principle of this Bill is correct; that is, to ensure that those tradesmen who hold themselves out as electricians and contract to do electrical work should obtain a licence. I agree that some protection should be given to the public by licensing such people. However, like many other Bills that start out with, perhaps, an admirable object in view, this Bill appears to have become too restrictive. In many instances the restrictions seem to be absurd. I agree with the remarks made by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris that much electrical work, including the wiring of an ordinary house, is not complicated and that any reasonably intelligent person, with some basic experience, could do a satisfactory job, and in many instances such a job has been done.

On the other hand, when such work is done by a person who makes a charge for the work, I think there should be some trade standard insisted upon. A big difference exists between the principle of protecting the public from people who hold themselves out to be experts in a particular field and the principle of a person being allowed to do something for himself at his own risk. I do not believe we can ever protect everyone from his own actions and I believe that the independent citizen should have some choice in the matter.

I might also say that severe restrictions on the private individual do not ultimately achieve the safety that is reported to be the object of this Bill. Most appliances are connected to the electric power supply by a 3-point plug, which is often removed several times a day. Naturally, this results in considerable wear and tear on a cord, and the screws in the terminals may become loose, and these things can cause serious trouble, especially if the earth terminal is affected. If it is the other terminals, heat can be generated; and sometimes a cord becomes frayed.

These are minor jobs that can be done with perfect safety by any handyman because the power normally would be disconnected. Then it would be a matter of plain common sense. In most instances, if a mistake is made in replacing the wires of a 3-point plug, about the worst that can occur is that it would not work, or, if the wires are crossed, a fuse will blow. If we insist that this sort of work must be done by a licensed electrician, in many instances unsafe equipment will be used by the housewife until the work can be done by the licensed person.

I think it is the experience of most members that the average electrician is very busy and usually fully occupied by wiring new houses and supplying and servicing new equipment, and to get minor jobs done is often very difficult. Often in a small business, particularly a one-man business, the electrician is out of his shop for most of the day. He often has an assistant in the shop who is not a qualified electrician, who often has no knowledge of electrical work, but who is capable of replacing cords and three-point plugs, and doing other minor jobs. This enables the householder who is not capable of doing these jobs to get them done, but if they have to be done by a registered electrician I am sure much unsafe equipment will be used pending its repair by a qualified man. I am convinced that, as this Bill introduces so many restrictive provisions, it will defeat its purpose, which is to make the use of electrical appliances safer.

As this is essentially a Committee Bill, I do not intend to go into great detail: I shall speak only on broad principles. However, I wish to query one or two provisions, one of which is clause 4, which enables the Electricity Trust to delegate certain powers to any officer or employee. I can visualize many instances in remote areas (although perhaps not in the metropolitan area) where personalities will come into the matter, because the average electrician has to work in reasonably close liaison with the trust, and this gives the trust's employees in the district an added advantage in their dealings with electricians and contractors in the area. Where personalities are involved, too much authority can lead to friction.

Another point I raise is the constitution of the committee to be set up. I am not sure that the committee will serve any purpose, because it will be only an advisory body to the trust. It seems to me to be somewhat superfluous, and it comprises people who would tend to favour control over electricians and people doing electrical work. I think this Bill would be better without this provision relating to the committee, because after all the trust will be the final authority. However, perhaps these things are not as important as are the clauses that interfere with the right of a person to do his own minor electrical work, which in many instances makes his house safer to live in. I believe our record of accidents in South Australia compares more than favourably with

those of the States that have control. I support the part of the Bill that relates to the people who do electrical work commercially. I support the second reading, and will discuss the amendments in Committee.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): Let me make it clear at the outset that I, like many other members, believe in the principle of licensing electricians. In fact, I believe it is essential that people working as electricians be licensed. If there had been licensing in the electrical trades I believe we would have had a higher standard of ethics within the industry and people who set themselves up as electricians and performed work not up to the required standard would have had some disciplinary action taken against them. When any person can set himself up as a qualified electrician and charge for his work there is little incentive for young people to become apprentices or take up the trade. However, if electricians were compelled to be licensed there would be some incentive for young people to enter the trade and become apprenticed.

I have some concern about the effect of this Bill on the "do-it-yourself" man who, over the years, has been permitted to carry out small jobs for himself, which he does effectively. Under this legislation he will no longer be able to do these menial jobs around his house, and this may have a detrimental effect upon safety. As the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan has said, there will be a delay in effecting repairs to electrical equipment because licensed electricians may not be readily available or, if they are, the cost of engaging them to do the job will be fairly high. Consequently, there will be a natural tendency for people not to engage a licensed electrician until it becomes absolutely essential that the work be done, and the householder may well be exposed to greater dangers than he is at present.

Another aspect is the effect this Bill will have on insurance policies. If it is compulsory that all work be carried out by a licensed electrician, and if a person disobeys the law by carrying out a simple form of electrical work and pays the supreme penalty, an insurance company may not accept responsibility under a life assurance policy.

Therefore, we place the individual in the position of finding that his life assurance policy may not be effective.

Looking at the Bill, we see there are a number of definitions, one of which is the definition of "electrical work". Part of it reads:

> . . . but does not include work in relation to (*a*) the manufacturing of any electrical installation or the assembling thereof in the course of or in connection with its manufacture for the purpose of producing a new article or (*b*) the oiling, greasing, cleaning or painting of any electrical installation.

There are plenty of handymen who manufacture for themselves electrical appliances. For instance, many people make their own radiograms, which are electrically-driven and therefore must come under the definition of "electrical appliance". If a person produces one of these articles for reward or sale, it must then be approved under the Electrical Articles and Materials Act. It is approved by the Electrical Goods Committee, which is in effect the Electricity Trust, but if he is not doing it for sale or reward he is permitted to manufacture it, connect it to an electric supply and use it. Under this Bill he will be permitted to manufacture the article, but will not be permitted to use it, because, turning to clause 7 (2), we find:

> No person shall, except with the consent of an electricity supply undertaking (*a*) make any connection with wires or by other means between an electrical installation and a source of electrical energy generated or supplied by that undertaking.

So, having made the instrument, which he is capable of doing, he is not permitted to connect it. I ask the Minister whether that man would be permitted to employ a licensed electrician (assuming this legislation becomes law) to make the connection. Then the word "licensed" is defined:

> (1) 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.

With that, I assume that a person would be able to get a licence or a permit to do a specific job, which may be the wiring of a house, as suggested by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris—a job requiring no great amount of skill; it is just a matter of common sense. Will a person in a remote locality far removed from an area where there may be licensed electricians be given the opportunity of obtaining a licence or permit to wire his own house? It is not stated clearly in the Bill that he will be, but I think the Bill intends it. However, when we come to the people applying for permits or special licences to do specific jobs, we may be up against the union putting pressure on the Minister or an approved authority not to grant a permit, because it would deprive some of their members of this type of work. Clause 9, dealing with exemptions, states:

> It shall not be unlawful (3) 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.

When we look at the definition of "township" in the Local Government Act, we find it means:

any Government township and any land laid out as a township, plans whereof have been deposited in the Lands Titles Registration Office, the General Registry Office, or the Surveyor-General's Office.

There are townships in South Australia that, in effect, do not exist. They are townships in the eyes of the Local Government Act, but they do not really exist as townships. The sole building in a township may be the homestead of a primary producer. Under this legislation he is regarded as living in a township. If he is to comply with these provisions, he is not permitted to carry out certain electrical work, as specified in the Bill. There is also the position of a primary producer the whole of whose land surrounds a township area but whose own homestead is situated within the boundaries of the township. In this regard I take it that, if his hot water jug became defective, he could take it to another part of his farm and repair it; or, if the vacuum cleaner went out of action, he could take it to another part of his property and repair it; or he could perform other electrical work anywhere but in his home. Those are some of the anomalies in this Bill, the great weakness of it being that, if it comes into operation in its present form, it will be completely impossible to police. I believe that legislation that cannot be properly and effectively policed is bad. I do not think that we as a responsible Council should pass bad legislation. Although I have not had time to scrutinize the amendments on the files, I believe they will effect some improvement to the Bill. Therefore, I reserve the right to make further comments when the Bill reaches the Committee stage. I support the second reading.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I have listened with great interest to the observations of other honourable members on this matter and I would say that, in general terms, I support the principle set out in the Bill. I believe that if any individual sets himself up in a profession or a trade he should have some qualifications. Therefore, I am not opposed to the licensing of electricians. I will support the Bill in so far as that portion of it is concerned, but generally I am opposed to the Bill as it stands, because I believe it is much too restrictive. The large number of exemptions that have been suggested by various honourable members would point to that fact.

I think it was the Hon. Mr. DeGaris who mentioned the university and secondary schools. It appeared to me that most of the staff and students in certain faculties at the university, as well as those in most secondary schools, would have to be exempted. I believe this indicates that the provisions of this Bill are too stringent. I am inclined to believe, in general terms, that the conditions envisaged should stop at the power point. The policy of specialization can be carried to extremes. Many people of average or above-average intelligence can do simple wiring, but nothing complicated. The Bill, as it stands, prevents many of these people from doing relatively simple work; therefore, some amendment to the Bill is necessary. Control and planning are sometimes necessary, but, however, necessary they should not be too excessive. Where controls are needed it is wise to start off with something in the nature of a minimum of controls then, if it is necessary, further steps can be added. I do not believe that this Bill stops at what I consider to be a desirable minimum; instead, it goes much too far. Although I am opposed to the Bill in its present form, I am prepared to give it further consideration in Committee, in the light of the amendments that have been foreshadowed. I reserve the right to make further comment in the Committee stages. I support the Bill, assuming that in the Committee stages it might be possible to reduce it to a logical and reasonable measure.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): I support the second reading of this Bill, which I believe is quite revolutionary. I have several faults to find with it, one of the main ones being that it is like so many other things the Government has done this session.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Not again!

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. The Government has introduced this most revolutionary measure that goes to the very end of the subject. It does not bite things off in bits, but goes the whole hog. Whether it is hoped that the Bill will be amended and watered down, I do not know, but it is certainly far-reaching in its ramifications. Perhaps the Government thinks it has not very long in office so it may as well get through as much as possible.

I am in sympathy with this measure for licensing electricians, which I think is overdue.

In this matter as in many others, the public must be protected. In his second reading explanation the Minister read a schedule that showed the number of people who had been killed as a result of electrical accidents, mainly in industry, and it was ironical that many of them were working on Government buildings that should have been properly inspected. I do not know whether this measure will solve the problem completely, because this matter is subject to the human element. However, it will enable electrical work to be policed much more effectively than has been possible in the past.

I, in common with some other members, think it is going a little far to restrict people from doing things in their own houses with their own appliances, which I think is their own business. If we prevent people from effecting repairs on wiring that leads to the power plug, we shall have a good Bill. In other words, if we look after the wiring side of it and let people look after the appliance side of it, we shall have made a great step forward. It seems inconsistent to say that a person can replace a fuse and that that operation is quite safe. I have had the experience of seeing what can happen when people put in wrong fuses.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Do they go bang?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: They blow a fuse more loudly than the Chief Secretary has done several times during this session, and the result is very much the same.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I make a bigger bang than that, though.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We get very much the same sort of reflection, too. Probably more people are injured through standing on boxes and chairs to take a globe out of a light socket than people are injured in changing the globe in the light socket. It is a simple process to repair an electric jug: one removes the two screws and replaces the element. It is impossible, as I remember it, to do this with the power switched on, because one has to take off the lid first. Then there are immersion heaters and appliances of that type.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: What about a hot water system?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Anybody who fiddles about with a hot water system is foolish, because that is a specialist's job. It is only the simple jobs that I am talking about. That is where I think we have gone too far. Perhaps we could name the appliances that people should not play around with. On the other hand, there are many things that the ordinary housewife and handyman can do quite safely. I notice that the proposed committee has wide and sweeping powers. It represents all sections of the trade. I am apprehensive once again that we are getting away from what I have always been keen on—putting as many solid provisions into the Bill as we can. We give the committee fairly wide powers. I take it this Bill will be implemented by proclamation, but I think it should not be proclaimed until such time as the necessary regulations are tabled, because the regulations are an important part of this.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: You do not go as far as the amendment?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No. The framework is not very tight, so amendments will have to be made to many of these provisions. Parliament is entitled to look at the regulations. They will be laid on the table and, if they are suitable, they will stand; if they are not, there will be an opportunity for them to be disallowed. If they are not challenged within the prescribed period the Government should then proclaim the Act, but not before, because we should look at them closely.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: I have an amendment on the file.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I realize that but I am saying that this is a good provision, which the Government should look at carefully, because we are going a long way towards meeting the wishes of the Government. We have been doing this consistently since this session started.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: You have missed out a couple of times.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: We cannot always go all the way; we get a little bit easy for a while. Generally, I am not in disagreement with the provisions, but I am adamant that I could not agree to prohibiting people from repairing appliances. The Minister may not say so, but I think he would agree with me that some of these restrictions go a little further than probably was visualized by the Government when it considered this matter as a whole in the first place. I support the second reading and will, if necessary, have some amendments drafted for the Committee stage.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I have listened with interest to what members opposite have said on this Bill. One or two speeches, I am sure, were made more for effect than for a real consideration of the Bill. Some honourable members got political in their references to it, and extravagant statements were made. I do

not propose to reply to some of the more extravagant of them, because I do not think they are worthy of being replied to. We are becoming increasingly aware of the fact that much political propaganda is made of some legislation that we have introduced—and that is fair enough. That is what happened when we were in Opposition: we had some political propaganda in regard to the Government's legislation, I suppose. However, the old cry has gone up again, "We agree with some of it; you have probably got a mandate for this sort of thing but you have gone beyond your mandate."

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I do not think the word "mandate" was used in the debate.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: You said you were going to license electricians.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Yes; we have said that. Honourable members opposite have said the Bill goes too far so they propose to amend it and they have put some amendments on the file. They propose to amend the Bill, I suppose, in line with their interpretation of the mandate given by the people. There is one amendment to limit the provisions of the Bill to electrical work that is done for reward. This, of course, would do little in regard to the so-called competent do-it-yourself man who not only endangers his own life but also the lives of his family and friends.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: How?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Because he is not the only one who uses the appliances off the power supply that he has worked on.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: How will he endanger a person's life?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Perhaps I could read a few authentic figures given to me by Mr. Colyer, the General Manager of the trust. In the 10 years 1955-1964 there were 65 electrical fatalities in South Australia, 25 in the electrical trade, and of the remainder, 10 were women or children.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Can you give any details of the accidents?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Of those not in the electrical trade, 24 (or approximately 50 per cent) were associated with appliances or flexible cords. This is why we say the Bill should go as far as it does. We think we can protect people by the Bill.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Wouldn't this Bill tend to increase the danger, by people using a frayed cord rather than getting an electrician?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Some suggestions have been made that it could be an offence to use an appliance that was faulty.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Don't you think that, if it is going to cost $4 or $5 to get an iron fixed up, there will be a tendency for the housewife to go on using it while it is still faulty?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I think she would be foolish to do that and endanger her life for the sake of a few dollars. Because we are trying to protect people from the folly of their ways and prevent them from being killed, the Opposition has said that we are interfering with the freedom of the individual. This seems to be the cold-blooded attitude of people who say this sort of thing.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Have you any comparative figures of other States in regard to electrical accidents where they have this sort of legislation?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We have reports which indicate that our figures are similar to those of other States. Of course, we may have been lucky in this respect. We may have more accidents this year, but this type of legislation will reduce our figures in the future.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: As it is only evidence over 10 years, it would not be very strong evidence.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We can reduce our accident rate by this type of legislation.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Isn't it desirable to reduce the number of fatalities?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Of course it is. With regard to the freedom of the individual, apparently the people on the other side are more cold-blooded than we are. Taking that argument further that we are interfering with the freedom of the individual if we try to prevent him from killing himself, perhaps we should go to the extent of telling the police not to stop people from killing themselves, as they are interfering with the freedom of the individual. I cannot follow that argument, and I think that is a very cold-blooded approach to this very important matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you consider this principle might go further and be applied to other trades?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No. It is not as dangerous to do certain things in other trades as it is in the electrical trade. I have

a healthy regard, the same as other honourable members, for electrical apparatus, as I have worked with electricity most of my life. I have had shocks from machines that have not been properly earthed or were repaired by people who had insufficient electrical knowledge.

Sir Norman Jude tried to make a little propaganda out of the fact that there was an exemption to people employed in primary industries. He said the Government was not giving the same protection to people in the country as to people in the metropolitan area. This, of course, is rather laying the wood on, for the primary-producing people were the people who came to us and asked for this sort of exemption. He said we were not as concerned with people in the primary industries, but were prepared to exterminate them as they had not voted our way, but the Hon. Mr. Story said that half of them were our way, as spouses did not always vote the way their Liberal matrimonial partners did.

The Hon. C. R. Story: How many bites of the cherry are you going to get? That remark was in relation to a Bill we dealt with on another day.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No, I interjected at that time. Let us come back to the debate on this Bill. The Hon. Mr. Geddes said (and this was getting pretty brutal, I thought) that there were two types of meters on primary-producing properties. He said that it would be a good idea if we made the Bill cover the homestead but exempted the shearing quarters and the dairy. How more one-sided can you get? That would protect the homestead where the employer lived, but, as far as the shearers and the people in the dairy are concerned, it was all right to exempt their quarters. I do not think that will meet with approval in country areas. In certain legislation recently there were references to the fact that the Opposition was looking after all the country people. Now Mr. Geddes only wants to look after the people living in the homestead and not those employed on the property. How far can we get with this sort of opposition to the Bill?

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: I think he was paying a compliment to the people outside the homestead. He thought they were the more responsible people.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: He wasn't concerned about the safety of them. Now he says we should stop at the plug, and that any appliance, no matter how complicated, should not be covered by the Bill, and the handyman, no matter how incompetent, should be allowed to repair it. This includes any type of portable equipment, naturally. The attitude here has been that if he kills himself, why worry? We are told, "If a man inserts a fuse in a switchboard beyond the safe limit and it becomes lethal, why should we worry?" There is no concern by the Opposition, either, that the do-it-yourself man, by making repairs to appliances he does not understand, endangers the lives of all and sundry who handle the equipment. Honourable members do not understand that a do-it-yourself man endangers all people, but the danger that these people cause is shown by the fact that women have been using appliances that have been mended by people without experience or ability.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: You have not given us examples of what happened in the recent cases.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: The point is that, as long as people are killed through using an appliance that has probably been repaired by somebody who knew nothing about it, surely this is enough justification for looking at these matters. The Hon. Mrs. Cooper has said that, with her multitudinous appliances, she will not be allowed to plug any of them into the wall. This is completely wrong. The Draftsman has assured me that the word "operate" in clause 9 (1) in regard to machines, appliances and so on, does cover the position of plugging in, switching on or working the appliances.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: What does clause 7 (2) mean?

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: That clause is overridden by clause 9 (1), as the honourable member will find if he looks at the Bill. The dictionary defines "operate" as meaning manage, work, conduct, or to be in charge of machine apparatus. Honourable members opposite, as is always the case with some people, hold up their hands in horror when there is mention of union representation on this committee.

In regard to the amendment proposed by the Hon. Mr. Potter entitled "Restrictions in the making of proclamations under section 7", it appears to me to be a three-card trick, and I have always been too wary to fall for that trick. This would completely nullify the provisions of the Bill, because it says that proclamations covering clause 7, which deals with the licensing provisions, shall not come into operation until the regulations have been made, laid on the table and not disallowed by either House. In that way, this Council, in which the Opposition has the weight of numbers and is challenging the Bill, could permanently delay the application of the measure. I am not going

to fall for this. We may as well tear up the Bill as fall for that.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Your Party's trouble is that you are inclined to tear up Bills that we do not agree to 100 per cent.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: We have had to tear up some Bills because, despite the fact that we have had a mandate for them, this Council has thrown them out.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Look at the cartoons!

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: One only has to look at the cartoons to see what some people think of proceedings in this Council, and do not tell us that the *News* is our way.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: It is 80 per cent of the time, anyway.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: Don't give me that! The *News* looks at the situation and assesses it, but with a certain slant away from us.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

SOUTH-WESTERN SUBURBS (SUPPLEMENTARY) DRAINAGE BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object, as the long title indicates, is to make further provision for the prevention and control of flooding in the south-western suburbs of the metropolitan area and for authorization of the construction and maintenance of works in connection therewith.

This Bill, which is modelled on the South-Western Suburbs Drainage Act, 1959, is concerned with the construction and maintenance of drain No. 10 in the council areas of Marion and Brighton. This drain will carry floodwaters along Seacombe Road (from a point near Diagonal Road), thence along Brighton Road and Young Street to the sea. The proposed construction of this drain is a continuation of the general scheme to prevent and control floodwaters in the south-western suburbs of the metropolitan area. Stage I of this scheme, as authorized by the South-Western Suburbs Drainage Act, 1959, consisting of drains Nos. 2, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 21, 22, 23, is now in the course of construction and about half the work has been completed. The construction of the proposed drain No. 10 was referred to the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, by virtue of the Metropolitan Drainage Works (Investigation) Act, 1962. The committee has inquired into the questions referred to it, and, by its report dated October 5, 1965, recommended its construction at an estimated cost of $420,000. It reported fully as to how the work should be financed, and, on the assumption that the councils concerned should pay half of the capital cost, what should be the share of each council and how each share should be paid. The committee suggested in paragraph 5 of its report that the administration of the Act should be committed to the Minister of Local Government.

Part II (clause 6) of the Bill authorizes the Minister to construct drain No. 10, as proposed in the committee's report, for the purposes of flood prevention and control. Ancillary powers are conferred by clauses 4 and 5 (acquisition of land and easements), clause 13 (calling for tenders), clause 14 (general powers), clause 17 (delegation of powers), clause 18 (disposal of surplus land and property), and clause 24 (indemnity of Minister against certain claims).

Part III of the Bill concerns the provision of finance by Marion and Brighton Councils. It provides, generally, that these councils shall pay one-half of the total cost of the works with interest, the payment to be spread over a period of 53 years commencing after the Government has expended $200,000. The percentages payable by the two councils are set out in clause 7 (2). The rate of interest is to be 5¼ per cent until the works are completed, after which interest will be at the rate to be struck by reference to the long term loan money rates during the period of construction, subject, however, to a variation every 10 years. The modes of payment and rate of interest are set out in clauses 8 to 11 inclusive. They are based upon the Parliamentary committee's report. The annual payments by councils will, of course, be adjusted both at the time of the completion of the works and at the 10-yearly periods, which have been mentioned, so as to take account not only of the actual total cost when it is known but also of the variation in interest rates as well as variation in costs attributable to unknown amounts of compensation (clause 16).

Clause 12 deals with maintenance. Each council will be directly responsible for the maintenance of drains in its area. This provision, like the rest of the provisions of the Bill, is based upon the committee's report. Clauses 20 to 23 inclusive are of a general nature

covering such matters as remedies for non-payment by councils, penalties for obstruction of construction of works, making of regulations and summary disposal of offences. Clause 25 is inserted to make it clear that the consrtuction of works authorized by this Act in no way is to interfere with the construction of works authorized under the South-Western Suburbs Drainage Act, 1959, which, for purposes of construction, will be read with the present proposed legislation.

This Bill, being of a hybrid nature, has been referred to a Select Committee in another place. The committee recommended its passage in its present form. I commend this Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE secured the adjournment of the debate.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is complementary to the Weights and Measures (National Standards) Act, 1960-1964 of the Commonwealth and is uniform in its terms with legislation already passed by most of the other States. In addition, the Bill provides for the repeal of several obsolete provisions of the principal Act.

Clauses 3, 5 and 7 replace the existing term that all measurements must be made in terms "standards of weights and measures" with the new term "standards of measurement" prescribed by Commonwealth law. Clause 4 inserts several new definitions in section 4 of the principal Act. The new definitions are all modelled on definitions in the Commonwealth Act. In addition, the definition of "inspector" is extended, and I will explain this later.

The Commonwealth Act requires that as from the beginning of this year all standards of measurement that may be legally used throughout the Commonwealth must be copies of the standards maintained by the National Standards Commission of the Commonwealth. The principal purpose of this Bill is to enable the Minister to arrange for the provision and maintenance of such working standards and subsidiary standards as may be necessary in view of the Commonwealth Act, which requires that all measurements must be made in terms of Commonwealth legal units of measurement [new section 6 (1) inserted by clause 6]. The terms "working standard of measurement" and "subsidiary standard of measurement" have the same meanings as in the Commonwealth Act, the former being called primary State standards and the latter secondary State standards or tertiary State standards. The accuracies within which the true value of secondary and tertiary State standards may be stated are set out in the second and third columns of Part I of the new Fourth Schedule (inserted in the principal Act by clause 22).

Subsection (5) of the new section provides for inspector's standards (previously called local standards). The errors that may be tolerated in the case of inspector's standards are set out in Part II of the new schedule. The effect of the amendment of the definition of "inspector", to which I have already referred, is that the powers and duties of an inspector in relation to an inspector's standard will extend in like manner to a Government inspector.

Frome time to time the National Standards Commission may recommend variations in the scale of permitted tolerances, so new section 6a (inserted in the principal Act by clause 6) provides that the provisions of the Fourth Schedule may be amended by proclamation. Existing section 6a of the principal Act relating to the use of Commonwealth standards as State standards is now redundant, and is replaced by new section 6a.

Clause 8 repeals sections 8, 8a, 8b and 9 of the principal Act. Section 8 enables the Minister to provide new denominations of standards and is now obsolete in view of new section 6. Section 8a, which enables the Governor to declare that a standard shall cease to be a standard, is inconsistent with Commonwealth law. Section 8b dealing with coin weights is obsolete and is repealed. Section 9 provides for local standards of weight and measure and is now obsolete, "local standards" being replaced by "inspector's standards".

Clauses 9, 10 and 11 make consequential amendments to the heading above section 18 of the principal Act and to sections 18 and 21. Clause 12 adds three new subsections to section 26 of the principal Act. New subsection (5) is complementary to the Commonwealth Act and will prohibit a pattern of an instrument being approved for use in trade unless it is approved by the commission or has been approved by the Warden of Standards before the commencement of the Commonwealth regulations.

New subsection (6) provides that, notwithstanding any prior approval given by the commission or the Warden of Standards, the Minister may restrict the use of weights, measures, weighing instruments and measuring instruments if he has reasonable grounds for believing that their use in certain circumstances would facilitate fraud. New subsection (7) provides for a penalty not exceeding $200 for a person acting in contravention of any specification given by the Minister. Clause 13 repeals section 28 of the principal Act dealing with coin weights, which is now obsolete.

Clauses 14 and 15 (*a*) make consequential amendments to sections 34 and 36 of the principal Act. Clause 15 (*b*) places the custody of standards with the Warden of Standards, the officer who, under the Commonwealth Act, is given power to verify standards and issue certificates. Clause 15 (*c*) repeals section 36 (2) enabling the Minister to cause standards to be verified with British standards. This is now obsolete. New section 36a (inserted by clause 16) provides for inspector's standards to be stamped as prescribed by regulations.

Section 38 is repealed and re-enacted (clause 17) to provide that certain standards may not be used unless they are verified or reverified as required by Commonwealth law. New section 38a (inserted by clause 18) provides for a penalty not exceeding $200 for a person who damages or destroys any standard. Clause 19 (*a*) and (*b*) makes consequential amendments to section 40 of the principal Act, and clause 19 (*c*) contains a transitional provision in order that existing local standards, if duly verified, may be deemed to be inspector's standards. Section 41 of the principal Act dealing with periodical verification of local standards is now redundant in view of new section 38, and is repealed by clause 20. Clause 21 makes consequential amendments to various sections of the principal Act. Clause 22 repeals the Third Schedule, which is now obsolete in view of the new scheme of State standards. Clause 22 also inserts the new Fourth Schedule, to which I have previously referred, in the principal Act. I commend the Bill for the consideration of honourable members.

The Hon. C. R. STORY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.13 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, March 1, at 2.15 p.m.