LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, November 19, 1968

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

MONEY-LENDERS ACT

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I ask leave to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Honourable members will recall that during the last Parliament, when we were dealing with amendments to the Money-lenders Act, the very important question arose of safeguarding the capital of persons who chose to lend money on mortgage of real estate irrespective of the interest rate charged on those mortgages. Honourable members will recall, too, that I moved an amendment, which was subsequently dropped on the undertaking of the previous Chief Secretary to have a detailed look at the whole Act and, in particular, this provision. Can the Chief Secretary say whether the present Government has had an opportunity of examining the Act and, in particular, this provision? If the Government has had such an opportunity, is any action contemplated?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: As far as I know, the matter has not been raised up to the present. I do remember very clearly the point raised by the honourable member being discussed during the last Parliament. I will raise the matter in Cabinet and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

VETERINARY SCIENCE

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I understand the Australian Universities Commission has seconded an officer of the Department of Primary Industry to make a survey throughout Australia of the need for the establishment of a fourth chair in veterinary science. The officer's survey must also include an investigation of where the chair should be established. During a recent debate in this Council a number of honourable members referred to the need for the establishment of such a chair at a South Australian university. As Dr. Farquhar (I believe he is the person who will be making the survey) will be in South Australia to take evidence, can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the move by various organizations for establishing a chair in veterinary science at a South Australian university has the full support of the Government?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member's question, of course, relates to Government policy. Although no actual discussion has taken place on this subject, I am quite sure we are all very interested in providing the best facilities possible in this State for the protection of livestock generally. I would be very keen indeed to see a chair of veterinary science established. I will certainly take up the matter with Cabinet and will also seek the advice of the Veterinary Board and my own departmental officers.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Many patients in South Australian hospitals are badly in need of occupational therapy but because of the chronic shortage of trained occupational therapists in this State those patients have to go without that treatment. This results in much unnecessary suffering on the part of the patients and an increased burden on the public funds. As the arrangement whereby the Government has provided a certain number of cadetships each year for study in other States has proved quite unsatisfactory, will the Minister ask the Minister of Education to consider the immediate establishment of an occupational therapy school in South Australia to meet this urgent need?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I shall discuss this whole matter with the Minister of Education and bring back a report for the honourable member.

AUSTRALIAN FLAG

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government representing the Minister of Education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I have been approached by the headmaster of the preparatory school section of an independent school with a request for an Australian flag. Does the Education Department provide Australian flags to departmental schools? If it does, will

the Government, through the Education Department, provide an Australian flag to be flown at this school should an official request be made?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I will find out whether the department is the authority that supplies Australian flags to the State schools. I imagine that that is the position. Further, I will ascertain whether these flags can also be supplied to the private schools.

MOTIONS

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I seek leave to make a short statement before addressing a question to you, Mr. President.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Following a debate in this Council last Thursday, I received a number of telephone calls over the weekend from people interested in public speaking and in the rules of debate. These people belong to clubs, many of which adopt Parliamentary rules for debate. Certain interjections by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill have cast some doubt as to the normally accepted Parliamentary procedure or recognized rules in debate, and as a result these people are wondering whether the Parliamentary rules of debate have been altered. I was of the opinion that they had not been. During that debate I said that Sir Arthur Rymill had the opportunity, when he moved his motion, to give reasons why the motion should be carried. I also said that he could have exercised his right to reply to points raised during that debate. Sir Arthur Rymill then interjected:

I think I know a little about Parliamentary procedure, and the honourable member is showing a deplorable ignorance of it.

As doubt has now been cast as to who may or may not have been correct regarding the procedure when a motion has been put before this Council for consideration, I ask for your ruling, Mr. President, on the following questions:

1. Has the mover of a motion to be discussed by this Council the right, at the time of moving the motion, to give his reasons why the motion should be carried?

2. After members have had the opportunity to discuss the motion, has the mover the right to reply to points raised during the discussion before the vote is taken?

3. Was my assumption correct when I said last Thursday that Sir Arthur Rymill had the right, had he desired to exercise it, to reply to the debate that took place following the motion moved by him for the censure of Mr. Klaebe?

The PRESIDENT: I have not got a copy of the honourable member's question, but it is the responsibility of the Chair to see that Standing Orders are observed, and it is the principle of Standing Orders that a mover of a motion has the right of reply.

ROSEWORTHY AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on October 22 in relation to the extensions to the Roseworthy Agricultural College and the envisaged increase in enrolments there?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The Principal of the Roseworthy Agricultural College reports that it is true that through a process of selecting the 45 best qualified applicants for entrance to Roseworthy each year the nominal entrance requirement of five subjects passed at Leaving level is now meaningless. In 1968, if an applicant had passed only five subjects at the Leaving examination, it was imperative that these included English, Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry. With the rising entrance standards the proportion of first-year students passing to second year is also improving and the situation, as it now stands, is that unless some temporary living quarters are provided for students there will be very severe restrictions in 1969. Cabinet has this matter under consideration at the moment.

Cabinet has also had before it a recommendation from the College Advisory Council that accommodation and other facilities be increased to allow a normal first-year class of 65 and a total college of between 180 and 190 students. A decision on this is linked with the decision we get from the Minister of Education and Science in Canberra on our case for Roseworthy to be recognized as a College of Advanced Education. This is being investigated by the Wark Committee at the moment and I understand that some members of this committee will be visiting Roseworthy on November 25. A firm answer to the honourable member's question about the future of Roseworthy must await the outcome of these investigations and we do not expect to know this before about May, 1969.

EASTERN STANDARD TIME

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (on notice):

1. Will the Minister inform the Council whether the Government is considering the introduction of Eastern Standard Time in South Australia?

2. If so, will the Government make announcements in Parliament and the press as to its intention?

3. Will reasonable time be given for the expression of Parliamentary and public opinion before making a final decision?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The replies are:

1. The Government is considering the advantages and disadvantages of such a change.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

STAMP DUTY

The Hon. A. J. Shard, for the Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend to intervene in the case before the High Court in which the Associated Steamship Company is contesting the West Australian Government's Stamp Duties Act?

2. In view of the above case, and that the matter of stamp duties taxation could be regarded as *sub judice,* is it the intention of the Government to withdraw the Stamp Duties Bills now before Parliament?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The replies are:

1. Yes.

2. The matter of stamp duty taxation as such and this particular legislation is not *sub judice,* but there is a challenge as to the application of one particular and restricted facet of somewhat comparable legislation elsewhere. It is accordingly not proposed to withdraw the Bills.

SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) BILL

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government) moved:

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Scientology (Prohibition) Bill be extended until Tuesday, December 3, 1968.

Motion carried.

TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

RAILWAYS STANDARDIZATION AGREEMENT (COCKBURN TO BROKEN HILL) BILL

Read a third time and passed.

WHEAT INDUSTRY STABILIZATION BILL

Bill recommitted.

Clause 15—"Payment by board"—reconsidered.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

In subclause (4) to strike out "(1)" and insert "(5)"; before "an assignment" to insert "any arrangement having effect as"; to strike out "a registered crop lien" and insert "an arrangement evidenced by a bill of sale for the time being registered pursuant to the Bills of Sale Act, 1886-1940, as amended".

In the Bill as drafted, "registered crop lien" is an expression taken from the Commonwealth Bill that passed through the Commonwealth Parliament in the last few days. It has been used formerly in our own legislation. However, it is now found that in South Australia we do not recognize a "registered crop lien" but we do recognize a bill of sale, which does exactly the same thing but gives the Wheat Board an opportunity to act upon it. The Parliamentary Draftsman has drawn my attention to this point, and I would like the necessary amendment made now because it is important that the Bill should be presented in proper terms.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is intended to revise and bring consistency of principle to the administration of the principal Act and at the same time to facilitate its consolidation by the Commissioner of Statute Revision. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 removes from section 4 of the Act references to the register of Aborigines; such a register has in fact never been maintained.

Clauses 3 and 4 propose Statute Revision amendments. Clause 5 repeals section 17 of the Act, which provided for the register of Aborigines. Clause 6 amends portion of section 20 which, in effect, provided for the substantial detention of "trainees" in institutions. Since no person has ever agreed to be declared a trainee it is thought that the provision could be repealed. Clauses 7, 8 and 10 are intended to make it clear that the administration of the Act is in the hands of the Minister rather than the Aboriginal Affairs Board.

Clause 9 repeals a provision relating to compulsory medical examinations since it is felt that this matter is now covered under the general public health legislation. Clause 11 repeals section 30 of the Act, which related to an obsolete provision of the former Licensing Act. Clause 12 repeals a reference to the register of Aborigines in section 35. Clause 13 is an amendment in consequence of the amendment effected by clause 8.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD secured the adjournment of the debate.

AGED AND INFIRM PERSONS' PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

With one exception it is in the nature of a Statute law revision Bill designed to enable the principal Act to be reprinted under the Acts Republication Act, 1967, with all amendments incorporated. When the Act was being prepared for reprint it was discovered that certain provisions were obsolete or referred to obsolete enactments. Clause 2, which is the amendment of substance, extends the jurisdiction of the court to make orders under the Act. Following a recent New Zealand decision on an Act there which is not dissimilar to our own Act, it is thought that the jurisdiction of the court may be limited to cases where the person to be protected is resident or domiciled in the State. The proposed amendment, which seems both necessary and desirable, will extend the jurisdiction of the court to cover the property of persons not resident or domiciled in cases where this property needs protection.

Section 7 (2) contains a reference to the Inebriates Act, 1908-1934, which is now obsolete as that Act has been repealed by the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act, 1961. Clause 3 of the Bill accordingly stikes out the reference to the repealed Act. Section 30 of the principal Act contains references to the Mental Defectives Act, 1935-1939, the title of which has since been altered to Mental Health Act, 1935-1967. The section also contains references to orders under section 10 of the Inebriates Act. These references are also obsolete as it was not intended that similar orders were to be provided for under the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act.

Clause 4 (*a*) accordingly amends section 30 by substituting in subsection (1) a reference to the Mental Health Act in place of the references to the Mental Defectives Act and deleting the reference to an order under section 10 of the Inebriates Act. Clause 4 (*b*) amends section 30 by substituting in subsection (1) (*a*) a reference to the Mental Health Act in place of the reference to the Mental Defectives Act. Clause 4 (*c*) amends that section by striking out paragraph (*c*) of subsection (1). This paragraph is also obsolete as it refers to an order under section 10 of the repealed Inebriates Act.

Clause 4 (*d*) substitutes in paragraph (*a*) of subsection (2) of that section a reference to the Mental Health Act in place of the Mental Defectives Act. Clause 4 (*e*) strikes out paragraph (*c*) of subsection (2) of the section, which is also obsolete as it refers to an order upon section 10 of the Inebriates Act. Clause 4 (*f*) strikes out another reference to an obsolete order under section 10 of the Inebriates Act. With the exception mentioned these amendments are of a purely formal nature and do not alter the policy of the Act in any way.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE secured the adjournment of the debate.

OATHS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is a Statute law revision Bill. The definition of "bank" in the original Act of 1936 refers to the Banking Companies Act, 1935, which was repealed in 1946. The definition is therefore no longer applicable. The Bill defines "bank" as a bank within the meaning of the Commonwealth Act providing for the carrying on of banking business in Australia, but including the State Bank and the State Savings Bank which, being engaged in State banking, are not subject to Commonwealth legislation.

The A. J. SHARD secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2484.)

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I think it would be unnecessary for me to say that I am not in the least enthusiastic about this Bill, and I regret that the Government has found it necessary to introduce such a measure. The Bill is very complex, especially in its application to agents

and solicitors. I propose to deal, in particular, with the clause relating to this aspect. However, I would like first to make the general remark that it seems to be becoming standard practice that Governments should throw on to bodies corporate and private individuals the responsibility of collecting their taxation for them. It seeks to make them unpaid policemen or tax collectors, depending on which way one looks at it. This Bill will inevitably involve a very great deal of expense for people who find themselves in this position. Particularly, of course, many larger companies will find themselves involved.

Thus, I think it behoves us all, if we are going to accept this Bill, to do our utmost to lighten the burden on those people and to reduce their expense and their trouble in any way we possibly can. I think possibly the people most affected by this Bill will be those organizations known as the pastoral houses or, to be more accurate perhaps, the stock and station agents and woolbrokers. I know that they are particularly concerned with new section 84c, the agents and solicitors section, which throws a very heavy onus on them and very difficult problems for them to solve.

The chief executive of one of these companies told me that they have been very concerned about this Bill. Various senior people from those companies have been trying to see how it is possible under this legislation to lighten their task and lighten the expense because, after all, the expense is always thrown back into the arms of the individual. This man told me that he found the Act extremely complex, as did his colleagues in other companies, and he said, "If we senior executives cannot properly understand all the implications of the Act and all the judgments that have to be made by agents, how on earth can we expect our 19-year-old and 20-year-old bookkeepers at our country branches to solve these problems?"

I think this should be given much credence. I have been a practising solicitor for a considerable number of years, and I must say that with all that experience behind me I have found this Bill extremely difficult to follow and interpret. I would not like the task of making a day-to-day judgment not only in one case but in dozens of cases about where stamp duty was or was not applicable. I have received a letter from a very large company involved in this matter, and I should like to read a few extracts from it. Referring to new section 84c, the letter says:

These provisions will apply to the bulk of our business, namely, wool, stock, land and insurance transactions. In this case the company acts as an agent and is a mere intermediary or conduit pipe, and in our view the obligation to pay this duty should be on the person who receives the benefit of the money, not on the intermediary. The effect of the section is to throw on to the agent liability for duty, which really is the responsibility of his principal, and to leave the agent to recover it from the principal if he can.

The letter goes on to explain all the detailed administrative work and the magnitude of it that would be involved in determining in each individual case whether duty is payable and, if so, on what amount it is to be calculated, and, of course, calculating it and endeavouring to recover it.

This letter draws attention to the fact that similar legislation is already operating in Victoria and Western Australia. It points out that the Victorian Act is similar to that proposed here but that, by the wording of that Act and a ruling made under that wording, the woolbroker has been regarded as the agent of the buyer to pay the purchase price to the vendor, and thus has been held to be exempt. This Act has apparently been drawn to close up what some people might regard as a loophole in that regard but what I consider to be a proper provision of the Act.

The letter further points out that the Western Australian Act, in the case of agents, places the responsibility for the payment of the receipt duty on the person who ultimately receives the money, and that it recognizes that the agent is only an intermediary and that the receipt the agent gives is not stampable because the principal, when he gets the money or is notified that an agent has retained it at his request or as a set off, pays the duty.

This is what I recommend should take place here. I think it is extremely unfair that the agents (I am talking not only of the companies I have mentioned but of any agents) should have to undertake this obligation for the Government when there are plenty of other ways in which the Government can see that the duty is paid. Apparently the Bill as originally drawn did not fully provide even that the agent should be able to recover the amount he has paid for his principal, because we have an amendment on file giving him a right to be entitled to recover the money from his principal. I do not know whether that includes a right to deduct it in advance from

the account sales: perhaps the Chief Secretary will enlighten me on that matter in due course.

There are four other related provisions, and they are rather involved. In fact, one has to read each of them two or three times to understand them. I imagine that any person who is daily trying to decide whether or not duty is payable in a particular case would have to keep referring to this Act, and it would be a full-time job for many people to determine whether or not duty was payable. I would go so far as to say that some companies might find it cheaper to pay the duty and have done with it than to try to assess whether or not it was payable and waste all the manpower that would be involved.

I have had a fairly careful look at that, and if the Act remains unamended I think some people will find that is the only way they have of dealing with the matter. It will be extremely costly to innocent people, who will then be paying double duty, which I am assured is not intended by this Act. Let me give a simple example of what I mean. The woolbroker sells many lots of wool for, say, 100 different customers; one woolbuyer buys $100,000 worth of that wool, which is not unusual; when the buyer pays the money, the woolbroker, if he was going to apply the Bill as at present drawn, would first have to re-sort his account sales completely, to sort it out not only into lots but into individuals. He would then have to determine whether each of those individuals would be liable for the duty or whether any of them might be exempt.

Exemptions could take at least two forms. Interstate growers could be exempt from duty under the provisions of this Bill, and people having an S.D. number (that is, people electing to pay stamp duty in bulk) would be exempt. Unless the woolbroker sorts all this out he will be paying duty from which the people otherwise are exempt (in which case I imagine he would not be able to recover it at all) or he will be paying duty which the S.D. people will be obliged to pay themselves under another provision of the Act, in which case I do not know what the position would be. The whole of the account sales would have to be re-processed into another column. I suggest that it would be almost impossible to do this within the available time without the aid of a computer or without enlisting a large staff for this sole purpose, which might cost the totality of companies involved more than the amount of stamp duty that the Government will receive from the Bill, especially when one takes into account all the wasted man-hours that will be involved. I urge the Government to examine this, because I understand it is not its intention to have double duty paid and that it does not intend to involve people in any work other than would be absolutely necessary in applying this in the simplest form. I recommend that for new section 84c the following new section be substituted:

(1) Where money has been received by a solicitor or agent as such from his client or principal for payment to another person the receipt to be given by the solicitor or agent to the client or principal shall be exempt from duty.

(2) Where money has been received by a solicitor or agent on behalf of his client or principal the receipt to be given by the solicitor or agent to the person who paid the money shall be exempt from duty.

(3) Where money received by a solicitor or agent on behalf of his client or principal is credited by the solicitor or agent to an account kept by him for the client or principal the amount so credited shall for the purposes of this Act be deemed to have been received by the client or principal and he shall forthwith after having notice of the credit give a duly stamped receipt therefor.

(4) When a solicitor or agent credits to an account kept by him for his client or principal money received by him on behalf of the client or principal he shall forthwith give notice of the credit to the client or principal.

(5) Where any part of any money which has been received by a solicitor or agent from or on behalf of his client or principal is retained by the solicitor or agent for or in respect of his own charges or remuneration and is tranferred to his own account or is appropriated by him to his own use he shall for the purposes of this Act be deemed to have received the amount so retained in cash at the time of the transfer or appropriation.

This amendment aims at exempting the agent so that the principal, who is obliged to pay duty if an agent is not involved, will be obliged to pay the duty and the agent will be relieved of this tremendously onerous duty which is, in my opinion, a complete waste of manpower. The clause protects the position so that, where a solicitor or agent keeps the money on behalf of a client, he must give notice to the client about the credit so that the client knows his duty obligations. Also, of course, where the agent retains part of the money for himself as remuneration, he must pay duty in respect of that sum. This lines up completely with the intention of the legislation, except that it throws the obligation where in my opinion it should lie: on the person ultimately responsible for the money and not on an intermediary who merely puts

the transaction through. I ask the Chief Secretary seriously to consider this suggestion, because I regard it as a matter of great importance. If he has some alternative to offer, I would be delighted to consider it, because I believe there is a problem here which, in the interest of the State as a whole, must be resolved.

I have one other observation, which arose from a conversation I had with my colleague, Sir Norman Jude, who is concerned about the difficulty of the ordinary citizen, whether he be a country man in business on his own account or even an employee, to give these receipts or their equivalent. New section 84 (6) properly provides that where a receipt for any money has not been requested a duly stamped receipt shall be deemed to have been given if a receipt is made out and duly stamped notwithstanding that it is not sent or delivered to any person. The following subclause obliges, for obvious reasons, the person making out the receipt to retain possession of it for three years. This is indeed a valuable section, but the ordinary individual will still have to do much work over and above what he normally has to do for the purpose of appropriating this revenue to the Government. Anything we can do to help the individual will be valuable, and I hope the Government will consider seriously my amendment to new section 84 (6) so that it will contain words similar to the following:

Provided that a duty stamp for the applicable amount affixed within the specified time to a bank teller's receipt or a bank's monthly statement shall be deemed to be sufficient compliance with the section.

If we could make another dispensation in that regard so that the individual did not have to write out many extra receipt forms but could merely affix a stamp as a matter of his own personal obligation (because it has nothing to do with the bank), it would be of great assistance. Then he would be permitted to put the stamp on one of the documents he ordinarily receives and keep it for three years so that it could be inspected at any time by the investigating officers. This would be valuable to the individual not only because he would merely have to stick a stamp on a document that must be written out anyway, but because he would not have to go to much extra work that he should not be involved in anyway. This would fall between keeping a receipt and not sending it, and having an S.D. number. Something along those lines could be advantageous. I have only thought of this idea and have not worked it out fully yet. However, if something like that could be done we would help the individual concerned. It must be understood that this duty is payable by everyone, not just by companies. If, for instance, an honourable member receives a dividend cheque, he must pay duty. He can do this at present in three ways. He can fill out the receipt form, put the stamp on that and send it to the company involved; or he can fill out the receipt form, put the stamp on it and file it for three years; or he can get an S.D. number and make an accounting of the total duty periodically.

My suggestion would make a fourth method available: he could put the duty stamp on some document (such as one of the nature I have mentioned) related to the transaction that he has to prepare or has prepared, anyhow. I support the second reading of this Bill reluctantly. I do not like it; I do not like all these increases in State taxation. I repeat what I have already said, that the Government should be examining costs before it increases revenue. That is what is done in private business and I should like to see a few efficiency examinations carried out by the Government, just as private business has them. That would be valuable and could well reduce the taxpayers' load. I said I would support the second reading, but what I do after that I shall reserve to myself.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2480.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I rise to support this Bill but must confess that I do so with no great enthusiasm for it, because nobody likes to support a Bill that provides for additional taxation, particularly when it is related to a certain subject matter—in this case, providing that a certain additional fee shall be payable in connection with the issuing of third party insurance certificates.

The Government has found it necessary to do this in an attempt to bring back the State's finances to some sort of order after the mess in which they were earlier this year. I do not think that those of us with some sense of responsibility in this matter feel we are doing the wrong thing when we emphasize this.

I was greatly encouraged to read in last Saturday's *Advertiser* the column supplied by the Liberal and Country League under the heading "Budgetary problems". Those responsible for the preparation of that material did a satisfactory job; I entirely agree with them. The article stated:

It is important that the State Budget be read with a full understanding of the financial position of the Treasury when the L.C.L. took office. As at June 30, 1968, the deficit in the Revenue Account was $8,365,000, built up over a three-year period. In addition, during the year 1966-1967, $6,902,000 usually debited to the Revenue Account was transferred to Loan Account and in the year 1967-68 a further amount of $5,015,000 was so transferred.

Without these transfers, the deficit in the Revenue Account over the past three years would have been near $21,000,000. Obviously this position could not be allowed to continue. The debit of such large amounts to the Loan Account had a serious effect on the volume of Loan works which could be undertaken. Briefly, the position is that, although revenue expenditure had increased tremendously during the three years 1965-68, the Labor Government had taken no positive action to increase Government revenue accordingly. The proposal for the year 1968-69 is for a balanced Budget, and most sensible people agree that there is no acceptable alternative.

So it seems to me that, irrespective of whether an L.C.L. or an A.L.P. Government had been returned last March, this question of balancing the State's finances had to be tackled. Apparently, there is a difference of opinion about the way in which the A.L.P. would have gone about it and the way in which the present Government has attempted to solve the problem. Whilst none of us likes these financial measures and many of us criticize them, I do not think that *in toto* a better solution could have been found; nor do I think the people of South Australia take any other view than that.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You go to them and test them and see what they will do. You will not go back "even Steven" then.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I remind the Leader, who seems to be very chirpy this afternoon—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I have not said a word.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Then I apologize to the Leader, but this is an exceptional afternoon if he has been quiet.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He has a lot to complain about.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: If the Labor Party had been in office for a few months and there had been an election, the result would have been that it would have come back with about 10 seats in the Lower House.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You had the numbers to make it but you did not have the courage. We have not the numbers but we have the courage—and that is the difference. If you put your head out you will get it bitten off.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The Leader is coming into it now.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: If we had the numbers, you would be on the run.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: My point is—

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You make your point and leave us alone!

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: —that the financial position of the State was not good when the present Government took office, and some measures had to be taken to rectify the situation. Generally, I feel the methods adopted would be approved by many people in this State who had given the matter some thought. I do not want to say any more on that on this Bill. I am sorry it is necessary to take these measures. However, we, as a new Government, have to suffer the errors made by the previous Government. We had no alternative but to prescribe this unfortunate medicine in the interests of getting the State going again. Evidence of that is that the employment position today in South Australia is better than it has been for some time.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The unemployment in South Australia is still the highest on the mainland; it is worse than that in any other mainland State.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The State's position is improving and we are getting back on our feet.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: In spite of you, not because of you.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I disagree with the Leader there. I support the second reading.

The Council divided on the second reading:

Ayes (14)—The Hons. M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris (teller), R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, F. J. Potter, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (4)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard (teller).

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Amendment of Second Schedule to principal Act."

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

In paragraph (*b*) to insert the following new exemption:

8. Certificate of insurance where the application in relation to which the certificate is lodged is made by a person who satisfies the Registrar of Motor Vehicles—

(*a*) that he is the owner of the motor vehicle;

(*b*) that he is in receipt of a pension, on account of age or physical disability or infirmity or on account of being wholly dependent on a deceased serviceman or on a person incapacitated as a result of service in the armed forces of the Commonwealth, paid or payable under any Act or law of the Commonwealth;

and

(*c*) that he is, by virtue of being in receipt of such a pension, entitled to travel in any public transport in South Australia at concession fares under any Act, regulation or by-law for the time being in force.

I do not intend to repeat all the comments I made during the second reading debate, but merely some of them. This amendment is to ensure that persons in receipt of a pension who are entitled to concessional travel on public transport are not compelled to pay the additional $2 on third party insurance certificates.

I have listened with interest to members discussing this matter, especially to the Hon. C. D. Rowe, whose contribution seemed to me to consist mainly of political propaganda. He mentioned an article appearing in a newspaper last Saturday morning, but I point out that the article was printed side by side with another supplied by the Australian Labor Party. As one article is for and the other against the matter under discussion, it is purely personal opinion as to who is right. During his comments this afternoon the honourable member made a statement that most public opinion would be in favour of this legislation, and when I interjected he insulted the Leader of the Opposition in this Chamber by questioning him about an interjection that I made. It would be interesting to discover where the majority of electors in this State stand at present on the proposed stamp tax on third party insurance, although I know what the result would be if a vote were taken now: it would not be a case of 19-all as in the last election. I believe the State would revert to a Labor Government, which would not inflict this type of tax on the community.

I was further interested this afternoon in hearing the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill speaking on the other Stamp Duties Act Amendment Bill, and I agree wholeheartedly with what he said about one section of the community that considers it should be exempt from this class of taxation, and the person who would be most affected by it is a person who could ill afford it. The same comments would apply to the tax now under discussion (and I use the term "tax" because it is purely and simply that). One section of the community will be extremely hard hit. The people I speak of receive a fixed income, and it is not really an income but a pension. They have contributed to their pension during their working life in order to provide for their old age, but it is purely an existence allowance.

Such people are not exempt under the terms of this legislation, and in my second reading speech I said that many of them relied on their motor vehicles. To such people a motor car is essential because so many of them are unable to use public transport. In any case, in many areas public transport would be useless to them. Many of these people use motor cars to visit the Royal Adelaide Hospital for treatment from time to time. At present they must pay full registration fees and the full premiums for comprehensive insurance and third party insurance.

This duty is an absolute imposition on the general motorist, but doubly so upon the pensioner. The Government has recognized the plight of pensioners by granting them concession fares on public transport, so the Government should give them a concession in respect of this duty. It could be said, "What is $2 a year?" However, an additional $2 a year is a considerable imposition on this kind of person. I hope the Government will recognize this point and exempt pensioners from this duty, because they thoroughly deserve such an exemption.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I have always admired the eloquence with which the honourable member presses his case in these matters. As the amendment was placed on honourable members' files only a few moments ago, I ask that progress be reported to enable me to study its implications.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2480.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I do not think it is necessary for me to speak at length on this Bill because it is complementary to the Bill we have just dealt with. I should like, however, to say that I am somewhat inclined to support the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Bevan, and I shall be interested to know the Treasurer's reaction to it. I wish to refer to the excellent article to which I referred earlier. Whilst we have had to increase taxation to some degree, we have done it in the context that there are certain areas of Government expenditure where an increase has been absolutely necessary. In particular, in the field of education the Budget provided for an increase of $4,140,000 to $53,267,000; in the Social Welfare Department there was an increase of $222,000 (an increase of 9 per cent); and in the field of mineral development there was an increase of $281,000 to $2,230,000 (an increase of 15 per cent).

I am one of those people who believe that the only way in which South Australia will really come to the fore again is by the discovery of some new mineral or some new resource or by opening up some new sphere of economic development that will be profitable and that will provide more work for more people. This was the emphasis that characterized South Australian legislation for many years, but in the last few years the emphasis has changed and we appear to have been more concerned about what advantages we can give to people rather than where we can spend money to protect ourselves in respect of the future. When we see what the mineral discoveries in Western Australia have meant to the economy of that State and when we look at the position in South Australia, we should recall what the position was in years gone by.

The discovery of copper at Kapunda, Moonta, Wallaroo and Kadina, of iron ore at Iron Knob, of uranium at Radium Hill, and of brown coal at Leigh Creek—all these things have meant much to the economy of South Australia. We should remember the number of jobs they have provided and the expansion in the whole of our activities that resulted from them. In the future we must proceed along these lines to provide the expanding economy that the people need. Consequently, I am delighted to see that this Government has again placed the emphasis on mineral discoveries, and I hope that oil, coal, copper, zinc or some other mineral will be discovered that will give us the shot in the arm that we badly need. This proposed expenditure is very well placed and I hope it will bring results, as it has done in the past. Consequently, I believe the expenditure is justified. In so far as it has to some degree occasioned an increase in taxation, I believe that any responsible Government must be prepared to live with the criticism that comes from the imposition of such taxation. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2477.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I support the second reading of this Bill. The Chief Secretary, in his second reading explanation, said:

The present Act has continued in operation since 1948, and there can be no doubt that it has, in varying degrees, been of substantial benefit to people of South Australia, more especially during those periods when the supply of goods and services was limited, and, as a consequence, there were strong pressures for prices to rise to a degree which could have endangered the ability of South Australian industries to compete successfully in interstate markets.

In 1948, when price control was first handed over by the Commonwealth Government to the State, 385 items were under price control, but unfortunately we find now that very few items are controlled. Although the Chief Secretary said that the Government would retain control over a number of items that constituted basic needs by groups or individuals, some of which were an important part of the household budgets of people who were obliged to plan carefully for their essential needs, the fact is that since this Government came into office it has released from price control many more items, most of which, I suggest, were amongst the basic needs to which the Minister referred. However, that did not stop this Government from discontinuing price control on those items.

We know exactly what happened when certain items were decontrolled. I need refer only to men's welted shoes. In August, before price control was lifted on this item, the price of one particular brand of shoes was increased by $1.50. Immediately this

item was decontrolled in September, the price of those shoes was increased by a further $1.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: What was the actual price of the shoes?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: They were $14.45 in August, and they went to $15.99. That is only one item; I could go on and speak about many others that have been increased as a result of this Government's giving the green light to—

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Were they in short supply?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, but money is in short supply, and the people will be unable to purchase these items. I am pointing out what happens when goods are decontrolled, and they are being decontrolled because this Government gave an undertaking to certain people that it would give them the green light to go ahead and fleece the public in whatever way they could. One particular item was under price control, and after an investigation in August this year the price was increased by $1. We find that less than a month later, for no apparent reason, the price of these shoes was increased by a further $1.09. Surely that was bleeding the public unnecessarily, because an investigation had been made and a fair and reasonable profit had already been given to the manufacturer and to the retailer. However, because the item had been lifted from price control as a result of this Government's action, we find that within three weeks, for no apparent reason at all, the price was increased by a further $1.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: These must be people without a "soul".

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No-one mentioned the honourable member's name, but perhaps people could have been referring to him. However, we do not go into personalities when this happens. Instead of merely carrying on with price control, this Government could have increased rather than decreased the number of items under control. The Government came in with a very good statement on this matter. After outlining the responsibilities of the Prices Commissioner, the Chief Secretary went on to say:

In addition to these responsibilities, the Prices Commissioner exercises other important functions. For example, he fixes the price of grapes. The industry desires this to continue and the Government has given an undertaking to growers accordingly.

Between 1948 and 1965 the price of grapes was never fixed by the Commissioner.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Do you think someone ought to fix the price of sour grapes?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member would go very cheaply in those circumstances. I think he is probably inflated a little bit, because he gives that appearance. The fact remains that for 17 years, during which time we had price control in this State, we had the grapegrowers and the winemakers continually at each other's throats regarding what price should be given to the growers for their grapes. They could not come to any reasonable agreement, and the Government was not prepared to come to their assistance either because if it did it would upset one group from which it thought it had more support. Therefore, it was not until the advent of the Labor Government that the responsibility for fixing the price of grapes was undertaken by the Prices Commissioner, with the result now that the growers are quite happy about the position and the Government is proud to announce that it will continue to do something which it had not been prepared to do for 17 years prior to the Labor Government's coming to office. I regret that this Act does not in any way recontrol the price of goods or services which have been decontrolled. However, as I consider that continuing the operation of the Act is the correct move, I support the Bill.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2477.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): When I think something is not justified, I voice my opposition to it. However, in this instance I consider that this amending legislation is justified, so I support it. The principal Act, which came into operation in 1939, had for its purpose the payment of compensation in certain circumstances to owners of cattle. It also provided for the setting up of a fund to help meet the cost of compensation. One method introduced was a stamp duty on owners of cattle or their agents on the sale of cattle. In recent years the principal Act has been amended, and the more important of those amendments took place between 1962 and 1967.

In 1965 the Act was amended to provide that stamp duty would be payable on every head of cattle or carcass sold, and apparently this has caused the anomaly referred to by the Minister in his second reading explanation. The anomaly is that stamp duty has

been payable both on the sale of cattle and on the sale of the carcass, thus it has been payable twice on the same beast. I am sure that this was never the intention at the time Parliament considered the amendment. This Bill removes the anomaly now existing, and persons who purchase beasts for slaughter will pay the stamp duty on that purchase only and not on the sale of the carcass as well. I support the second reading.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

TEXTILE PRODUCTS DESCRIPTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2478.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the Bill, which amends the Textile Products Description Act, 1953. It is interesting that, apart from one small amendment in 1954, this Act has not been amended since. The amendments before us now appear to have the support of leaders in the wool industry.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It was amended in 1965 and again in 1967.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The present amendment results from an approach by the Australian Wool board regarding the labelling of textiles and carpets. It has been generally accepted that material with up to 5 per cent of fibres other than wool should be labelled as pure wool. This was included in the 1953 Act, and it has been found in the manufacture of suitings and other high quality woollen textiles that it is necessary to use a small proportion of other fibres for decorative purposes or, perhaps, in creating a pattern. These other fibres slightly harden the material; wool, in its pure state, is very soft.

The amendments propose that if the amount of wool in a product is not less than 80 per cent, and the intervening 15 per cent of fibres comprise approved animal fibres as listed in the Bill, it shall be labelled as pure wool. This is a forward step in that the specialty animal fibres listed in the Bill, such as cashmere, mohair or the hair of the alpaca, camel, llama or vicuna or any combination of any two or more of those fibres that are quality fibres, can certainly add to the appearance and the feel of fabrics, particularly fabrics for special purposes. This should assist in the further use of wool in materials not only as a fibre but also as a prestige fibre with the addition of these other specialty fibres. The Bill also amends the original Act in relation to carpets. Since the original Act was first promulgated in 1953 changes in the manufacture of carpets have taken place.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Wool is going out considerably in the manufacture of carpets today.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: True, but wool is still regarded by many as being the quality fibre in carpets.

The Hon S. C. Bevan: It is a pity that was not recognized by the Government in the new Government office building when it put in nylon carpets instead of woollen.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I cannot understand why Mr. Dunstan ordered them.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Regarding carpet manufacture, clause 5 amends section 9 (1) of the principal Act by striking out paragraph (*b*) and inserting in lieu thereof "declaring an article not to be a textile product for the purposes of this Act". This will give the regulation-making powers in this Act a wider field to deal with this difference in the method of manufacturing carpets. The Bill seems to be quite straightforward. I believe it is in the interests of the woollen industry, and I support it.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2482.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I rise to support the Government's Bill although I believe some aspects of it to be ill advised. Over many years there have been attempts to rearrange the State's electoral system; indeed, other Bills, which have not even reached the first stage of acceptance, have been introduced. Now we have this Bill, which I propose to criticize on two points.

First, there seems to have been insufficient explanation given why the Government's offer of a 45-seat House, as promised at the time of the election, has been increased to 47. In fact, it is an ever-deepening mystery why that figure was selected. Perhaps strange portents appeared in the sky or some other ancient magic prevailed. Secondly, it has been recognized that discrepancies and badly unbalanced electorates had developed—but the proposal as contained in this Bill seems, in relationship to city and country representation, to have swung wildly in the opposite direction.

It is well recognized that most of South Australia's production comes from primary industries and, in the past, it has always been the object of electoral distribution to give our primary production areas an equal voice in Government with areas based on secondary production. Whereas two-thirds of the seats in the House of Assembly at present represent areas outside the metropolitan area and one-third of the seats represent areas within the metropolitan area, we are now being asked not merely to adjust discrepancies but to push the balance violently in the other direction.

This proposal, if it produces, as anticipated, about 28 metropolitan seats and 19 country area seats, will have swung the percentage to 60 per cent of Assembly members representing metropolitan areas and 40 per cent representing country areas, a reversal of the old order which, for South Australia, may well be more disastrous than the much maligned present situation.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS BOARD BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2486.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): Big changes have been made in the pattern of education since the first Public Examinations Board was established in Adelaide 30 or more years ago. At that time the State schools had very limited senior facilities for teaching at those levels. Senior teaching was largely in the hands of the independent schools. The explosive growth of the State's population has been shown to be comparable with the increase in the number of scholars at all levels. Naturally, the greater proportional increase has been in the State system.

The Public Examinations Board was set up to conduct Matriculation examinations and such others as were approved by the Minister of Education, to approve and vary the syllabus as considered necessary, and to prepare lists of candidates and results obtained. These are considerable responsibilities and powers. It has been traditional in many parts of the world for universities to conduct, alone or in association with others, their own Matriculation examinations and set their own standards. This has resulted in reciprocity, with comparable standards. The membership of our Public Examinations Board must be important to the State's future, as far as Matriculation is concerned: the future prospects can be either bright or dim. By reason of the independent system, with its associated freedom to experiment with ideas and pioneer new methods, significant techniques are still being introduced by the non-State schools, which are the pioneers of new methods even today when the State system is naturally proud that it is catching up with the independent schools.

May I draw attention to the fact that two or three days ago it was stated in the paper that certain State schools were enjoying the benefits of a special fifth-year course. To my knowledge, at least two independent schools have been providing that for several years—but all credit to the State schools for catching up in this way. It is right that the Public Examinations Board should retain in its membership not only representation of the independent system but also adequate representation. It is stated that the board shall have 32 members, and it is spelled out in detail that six shall come from the independent schools; two from the Headmasters' Association, two from the Headmistresses' Association, and two nominated by the Director of Catholic Education in South Australia.

The State schools are to be represented by a blanket cover for 10 members. The Hon. Mrs. Cooper in the last Parliament and again last week spoke well and eloquently on this point. I will not repeat what she said, but I re-emphasize the point she made. It is stated that there shall be 10 representatives from the State system on the Public Examinations Board, but there is no stipulation about female representation. The appointment of the 10 representatives is at the discretion of the Director of Education. Bearing in mind that a large proportion of our education system is directed towards the training of females, it seems strange that it is not essential to ensure adequate female representation on this board on the State side as there is on the independent school side. Surely it cannot be that, in this day and generation, when women take an equal place with men in the learned professions, the Education Department has a surfeit of male skills and ability and a negligible female component, unworthy of consideration in its own right.

As it stands today, the board is assured of two women members only out of 32. Those two may increase to three if the Director of Catholic Education divides his representation into one male and one female; but only two females are guaranteed places on the board, and both are from the independent schools. Therefore, I give notice that I propose to introduce an amendment in the Committee stage that three of the nominees of the Director shall

MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2480.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I do not think it is necessary for me to speak at length on this Bill because it is complementary to the Bill we have just dealt with. I should like, however, to say that I am somewhat inclined to support the amendment moved by the Hon. Mr. Bevan, and I shall be interested to know the Treasurer's reaction to it. I wish to refer to the excellent article to which I referred earlier. Whilst we have had to increase taxation to some degree, we have done it in the context that there are certain areas of Government expenditure where an increase has been absolutely necessary. In particular, in the field of education the Budget provided for an increase of $4,140,000 to $53,267,000; in the Social Welfare Department there was an increase of $222,000 (an increase of 9 per cent); and in the field of mineral development there was an increase of $281,000 to $2,230,000 (an increase of 15 per cent).

I am one of those people who believe that the only way in which South Australia will really come to the fore again is by the discovery of some new mineral or some new resource or by opening up some new sphere of economic development that will be profitable and that will provide more work for more people. This was the emphasis that characterized South Australian legislation for many years, but in the last few years the emphasis has changed and we appear to have been more concerned about what advantages we can give to people rather than where we can spend money to protect ourselves in respect of the future. When we see what the mineral discoveries in Western Australia have meant to the economy of that State and when we look at the position in South Australia, we should recall what the position was in years gone by.

The discovery of copper at Kapunda, Moonta, Wallaroo and Kadina, of iron ore at Iron Knob, of uranium at Radium Hill, and of brown coal at Leigh Creek—all these things have meant much to the economy of South Australia. We should remember the number of jobs they have provided and the expansion in the whole of our activities that resulted from them. In the future we must proceed along these lines to provide the expanding economy that the people need. Consequently, I am delighted to see that this Government has again placed the emphasis on mineral discoveries, and I hope that oil, coal, copper, zinc or some other mineral will be discovered that will give us the shot in the arm that we badly need. This proposed expenditure is very well placed and I hope it will bring results, as it has done in the past. Consequently, I believe the expenditure is justified. In so far as it has to some degree occasioned an increase in taxation, I believe that any responsible Government must be prepared to live with the criticism that comes from the imposition of such taxation. I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2477.)

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Central No. 1): I support the second reading of this Bill. The Chief Secretary, in his second reading explanation, said:

The present Act has continued in operation since 1948, and there can be no doubt that it has, in varying degrees, been of substantial benefit to people of South Australia, more especially during those periods when the supply of goods and services was limited, and, as a consequence, there were strong pressures for prices to rise to a degree which could have endangered the ability of South Australian industries to compete successfully in interstate markets.

In 1948, when price control was first handed over by the Commonwealth Government to the State, 385 items were under price control, but unfortunately we find now that very few items are controlled. Although the Chief Secretary said that the Government would retain control over a number of items that constituted basic needs by groups or individuals, some of which were an important part of the household budgets of people who were obliged to plan carefully for their essential needs, the fact is that since this Government came into office it has released from price control many more items, most of which, I suggest, were amongst the basic needs to which the Minister referred. However, that did not stop this Government from discontinuing price control on those items.

We know exactly what happened when certain items were decontrolled. I need refer only to men's welted shoes. In August, before price control was lifted on this item, the price of one particular brand of shoes was increased by $1.50. Immediately this

item was decontrolled in September, the price of those shoes was increased by a further $1.

The Hon. C. D. Rowe: What was the actual price of the shoes?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: They were $14.45 in August, and they went to $15.99. That is only one item; I could go on and speak about many others that have been increased as a result of this Government's giving the green light to—

The Hon. L. R. Hart: Were they in short supply?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No, but money is in short supply, and the people will be unable to purchase these items. I am pointing out what happens when goods are decontrolled, and they are being decontrolled because this Government gave an undertaking to certain people that it would give them the green light to go ahead and fleece the public in whatever way they could. One particular item was under price control, and after an investigation in August this year the price was increased by $1. We find that less than a month later, for no apparent reason, the price of these shoes was increased by a further $1.09. Surely that was bleeding the public unnecessarily, because an investigation had been made and a fair and reasonable profit had already been given to the manufacturer and to the retailer. However, because the item had been lifted from price control as a result of this Government's action, we find that within three weeks, for no apparent reason at all, the price was increased by a further $1.

The Hon. L. R. Hart: These must be people without a "soul".

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No-one mentioned the honourable member's name, but perhaps people could have been referring to him. However, we do not go into personalities when this happens. Instead of merely carrying on with price control, this Government could have increased rather than decreased the number of items under control. The Government came in with a very good statement on this matter. After outlining the responsibilities of the Prices Commissioner, the Chief Secretary went on to say:

In addition to these responsibilities, the Prices Commissioner exercises other important functions. For example, he fixes the price of grapes. The industry desires this to continue and the Government has given an undertaking to growers accordingly.

Between 1948 and 1965 the price of grapes was never fixed by the Commissioner.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude: Do you think someone ought to fix the price of sour grapes?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The honourable member would go very cheaply in those circumstances. I think he is probably inflated a little bit, because he gives that appearance. The fact remains that for 17 years, during which time we had price control in this State, we had the grapegrowers and the winemakers continually at each other's throats regarding what price should be given to the growers for their grapes. They could not come to any reasonable agreement, and the Government was not prepared to come to their assistance either because if it did it would upset one group from which it thought it had more support. Therefore, it was not until the advent of the Labor Government that the responsibility for fixing the price of grapes was undertaken by the Prices Commissioner, with the result now that the growers are quite happy about the position and the Government is proud to announce that it will continue to do something which it had not been prepared to do for 17 years prior to the Labor Government's coming to office. I regret that this Act does not in any way recontrol the price of goods or services which have been decontrolled. However, as I consider that continuing the operation of the Act is the correct move, I support the Bill.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2477.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): When I think something is not justified, I voice my opposition to it. However, in this instance I consider that this amending legislation is justified, so I support it. The principal Act, which came into operation in 1939, had for its purpose the payment of compensation in certain circumstances to owners of cattle. It also provided for the setting up of a fund to help meet the cost of compensation. One method introduced was a stamp duty on owners of cattle or their agents on the sale of cattle. In recent years the principal Act has been amended, and the more important of those amendments took place between 1962 and 1967.

In 1965 the Act was amended to provide that stamp duty would be payable on every head of cattle or carcass sold, and apparently this has caused the anomaly referred to by the Minister in his second reading explanation. The anomaly is that stamp duty has

been payable both on the sale of cattle and on the sale of the carcass, thus it has been payable twice on the same beast. I am sure that this was never the intention at the time Parliament considered the amendment. This Bill removes the anomaly now existing, and persons who purchase beasts for slaughter will pay the stamp duty on that purchase only and not on the sale of the carcass as well. I support the second reading.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

TEXTILE PRODUCTS DESCRIPTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2478.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the Bill, which amends the Textile Products Description Act, 1953. It is interesting that, apart from one small amendment in 1954, this Act has not been amended since. The amendments before us now appear to have the support of leaders in the wool industry.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: It was amended in 1965 and again in 1967.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: The present amendment results from an approach by the Australian Wool board regarding the labelling of textiles and carpets. It has been generally accepted that material with up to 5 per cent of fibres other than wool should be labelled as pure wool. This was included in the 1953 Act, and it has been found in the manufacture of suitings and other high quality woollen textiles that it is necessary to use a small proportion of other fibres for decorative purposes or, perhaps, in creating a pattern. These other fibres slightly harden the material; wool, in its pure state, is very soft.

The amendments propose that if the amount of wool in a product is not less than 80 per cent, and the intervening 15 per cent of fibres comprise approved animal fibres as listed in the Bill, it shall be labelled as pure wool. This is a forward step in that the specialty animal fibres listed in the Bill, such as cashmere, mohair or the hair of the alpaca, camel, llama or vicuna or any combination of any two or more of those fibres that are quality fibres, can certainly add to the appearance and the feel of fabrics, particularly fabrics for special purposes. This should assist in the further use of wool in materials not only as a fibre but also as a prestige fibre with the addition of these other specialty fibres. The Bill also amends the original Act in relation to carpets. Since the original Act was first promulgated in 1953 changes in the manufacture of carpets have taken place.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Wool is going out considerably in the manufacture of carpets today.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: True, but wool is still regarded by many as being the quality fibre in carpets.

The Hon S. C. Bevan: It is a pity that was not recognized by the Government in the new Government office building when it put in nylon carpets instead of woollen.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I cannot understand why Mr. Dunstan ordered them.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: Regarding carpet manufacture, clause 5 amends section 9 (1) of the principal Act by striking out paragraph (*b*) and inserting in lieu thereof "declaring an article not to be a textile product for the purposes of this Act". This will give the regulation-making powers in this Act a wider field to deal with this difference in the method of manufacturing carpets. The Bill seems to be quite straightforward. I believe it is in the interests of the woollen industry, and I support it.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2482.)

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER (Central No. 2): I rise to support the Government's Bill although I believe some aspects of it to be ill advised. Over many years there have been attempts to rearrange the State's electoral system; indeed, other Bills, which have not even reached the first stage of acceptance, have been introduced. Now we have this Bill, which I propose to criticize on two points.

First, there seems to have been insufficient explanation given why the Government's offer of a 45-seat House, as promised at the time of the election, has been increased to 47. In fact, it is an ever-deepening mystery why that figure was selected. Perhaps strange portents appeared in the sky or some other ancient magic prevailed. Secondly, it has been recognized that discrepancies and badly unbalanced electorates had developed—but the proposal as contained in this Bill seems, in relationship to city and country representation, to have swung wildly in the opposite direction.

It is well recognized that most of South Australia's production comes from primary industries and, in the past, it has always been the object of electoral distribution to give our primary production areas an equal voice in Government with areas based on secondary production. Whereas two-thirds of the seats in the House of Assembly at present represent areas outside the metropolitan area and one-third of the seats represent areas within the metropolitan area, we are now being asked not merely to adjust discrepancies but to push the balance violently in the other direction.

This proposal, if it produces, as anticipated, about 28 metropolitan seats and 19 country area seats, will have swung the percentage to 60 per cent of Assembly members representing metropolitan areas and 40 per cent representing country areas, a reversal of the old order which, for South Australia, may well be more disastrous than the much maligned present situation.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS BOARD BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 14. Page 2486.)

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): Big changes have been made in the pattern of education since the first Public Examinations Board was established in Adelaide 30 or more years ago. At that time the State schools had very limited senior facilities for teaching at those levels. Senior teaching was largely in the hands of the independent schools. The explosive growth of the State's population has been shown to be comparable with the increase in the number of scholars at all levels. Naturally, the greater proportional increase has been in the State system.

The Public Examinations Board was set up to conduct Matriculation examinations and such others as were approved by the Minister of Education, to approve and vary the syllabus as considered necessary, and to prepare lists of candidates and results obtained. These are considerable responsibilities and powers. It has been traditional in many parts of the world for universities to conduct, alone or in association with others, their own Matriculation examinations and set their own standards. This has resulted in reciprocity, with comparable standards. The membership of our Public Examinations Board must be important to the State's future, as far as Matriculation is concerned: the future prospects can be either bright or dim. By reason of the independent system, with its associated freedom to experiment with ideas and pioneer new methods, significant techniques are still being introduced by the non-State schools, which are the pioneers of new methods even today when the State system is naturally proud that it is catching up with the independent schools.

May I draw attention to the fact that two or three days ago it was stated in the paper that certain State schools were enjoying the benefits of a special fifth-year course. To my knowledge, at least two independent schools have been providing that for several years—but all credit to the State schools for catching up in this way. It is right that the Public Examinations Board should retain in its membership not only representation of the independent system but also adequate representation. It is stated that the board shall have 32 members, and it is spelled out in detail that six shall come from the independent schools; two from the Headmasters' Association, two from the Headmistresses' Association, and two nominated by the Director of Catholic Education in South Australia.

The State schools are to be represented by a blanket cover for 10 members. The Hon. Mrs. Cooper in the last Parliament and again last week spoke well and eloquently on this point. I will not repeat what she said, but I re-emphasize the point she made. It is stated that there shall be 10 representatives from the State system on the Public Examinations Board, but there is no stipulation about female representation. The appointment of the 10 representatives is at the discretion of the Director of Education. Bearing in mind that a large proportion of our education system is directed towards the training of females, it seems strange that it is not essential to ensure adequate female representation on this board on the State side as there is on the independent school side. Surely it cannot be that, in this day and generation, when women take an equal place with men in the learned professions, the Education Department has a surfeit of male skills and ability and a negligible female component, unworthy of consideration in its own right.

As it stands today, the board is assured of two women members only out of 32. Those two may increase to three if the Director of Catholic Education divides his representation into one male and one female; but only two females are guaranteed places on the board, and both are from the independent schools. Therefore, I give notice that I propose to introduce an amendment in the Committee stage that three of the nominees of the Director shall

be women. Independent and State school representation should be based on the offering that each can make on a standard basis of quality, and not just on the relative size of membership. The University of Adelaide, which is bursting at the seams with numbers, is to have seven representatives; the Flinders University, still young, small, expanding, and limited in numbers, is to have seven. The difference, therefore, between the State school system and the independent school system is even more anomalous: there are to be six representatives from the independent schools, with all their experience, pioneering and enthusiastic research, and 10 from the State system, irrespective of whether the Director chooses males or females. Surely it is time we talked in terms of equality of contribution, so I will move an amendment that there shall be eight representatives from the independent schools and eight from the State schools.

I cannot conceive that South Australia, which has pioneered so much legislation, including much that has affected women and their status, should in 1968 pass a Bill of this nature without ensuring that it has written into it definite State school female representation. It would be lacking in responsibility not to ensure that the independent school system was represented equally with the State system on the board.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.9 p.m. the Council adjourned until Wednesday, November 20, at 2.15 p.m.