

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, September 4, 1963.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

BENMARK IRRIGATION TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of the general revenue of the State as were required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

QUESTIONS.

BREAD PRICES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Last week the Premier said that increased bread prices would apply as from early this week, and that if I were dissatisfied with the prices published I should seek further information from him. I have a list of bread prices, but I am more concerned with delivery charges. I do not know whether more time is taken to deliver two or three loaves of bread to one customer than to deliver half a loaf to another customer. Probably the baker would rather sell three loaves than half a loaf or a bread roll. I am concerned about this unfair approach to the increased delivery charges. In the country the charge is 2d. for a 2-lb. loaf and a bigger delivery charge is applied in some of the hilly parts of the metropolitan area. Can the Premier say whether the Government will review the position to see whether the delivery charge cannot be applied to customers, including shops, rather than to the bread?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Many difficulties are associated with this matter. I think I can quickly show the Leader some difficulties that arise. If the delivery charge were applied to customers it would mean that age pensioners would have to pay an excessive sum for a half-loaf of bread. That is one of the problems. Actually the new price was determined after a meeting of the industry committee established under the Prices Act. That committee comprises three representatives of the industry and three representatives of consumers. Its report to me was unanimous, so I could not lightly set it aside. Prior to this matter going to the committee, representatives from the industry pointed out that it was desirable to increase the price of bread sold in shops, otherwise there would not be sufficient turnover for economic delivery of bread, and deliveries

would cease. When I promulgated the new prices I was well aware of the complexities of this problem. The prices are only temporary because under the new wheat agreement there will be a big adjustment in the price of wheat which will, I think, decrease by 1s. 5d. a bushel, so these bread prices will not be of long duration. The increased prices represent an attempt to solve the problem confronting this industry. A similar problem has already affected other industries. In the meat industry, for instance, deliveries are practically non-existent in the metropolitan area. We are attempting to keep the system of bread delivery going, because we believe it would be inconvenient and undesirable for bread deliveries to cease in the metropolitan area. I will see whether the Leader's suggestions have any basis upon which they can be accepted, and when the industry committee considers this matter again I will see that the Leader's remarks are placed before it.

TOWN PLANNING.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns town planning and an aspect that has not been raised as yet during the present session of this House. I have been approached by a resident in my district who owns an area in excess of 300 acres in what will be the Hills Face Zone in the development plan laid on the table of the House. This country at present is virgin scrub, except for a small acreage that has been cleared for pasture. I am told by the owner that a couple of years ago he was offered £250 an acre by a subdivider, but he refused that offer because he did not want to subdivide at that time. He now believes that because this land will be zoned in the Hills Face Zone, which will not permit any subdivision of less than 10 acres, the value of his land has been reduced considerably, probably to a fraction of its previous value, and he is worried about compensation for the decrease in the monetary value of his land. Can the Premier say whether the Government has considered the question of compensating owners, the value of whose property is affected by the zoning proposed under the town plan?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, the Government has not considered that matter, and in fact it has not yet drawn up the zoning proposals to place before the House. I point out that the honourable member's proposal is rather lopsided because the Government does not collect the enhanced value that comes from development and subdivision, even though much of it has arisen from the expenditure of public

moneys. That has always been something of which private owners of property have had the benefit. Since the Government has never collected any money from that source it has no fund from which to pay the suggested compensation. This is one of the problems associated with all zoning plans. I have seen examples in Victoria and I have investigated the matter. As a result of some of the zoning legislation that operates in Victoria, land on one side of a street is worth £2,000 an acre and on the other side of the street it is worth only £40 an acre. I do not know the solution to this problem but we will have to face up to it when we prepare legislation for the House, and it will be considered at that time.

GEPPS CROSS HOSTEL.

Mr. JENNINGS: Very early in the session I asked the Premier a question regarding the future of the Gepps Cross migrant hostel, and in explanation of my question then I pointed out that in a debate last year both he and I had agreed that the type of accommodation afforded there was not the type of accommodation that should be regarded as suitable in this State. In answer to my question the Premier said he was having the matter investigated and he told me subsequently that, as the Commonwealth Government was implicated very much in this matter, he was discussing it with the Prime Minister; and, after he had been in Canberra recently, he told me that he had discussed it with the Prime Minister and was awaiting his reply. As this is my last opportunity to ask the Premier this question before the House adjourns for a short recess, I now ask him whether he has any reply from the Prime Minister on this matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have now been able to reach agreement with the Commonwealth Government, and I can inform the honourable member that the agreement will give him everything he desires.

YELDULKIE RESERVOIR.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: At present the Yeldulkie reservoir contains 164,000,000 gallons and the water is a little salty. Will the Minister of Works ask the Engineering and Water Supply Department to consider raising the retaining wall of this reservoir by three or four feet to increase its holding capacity to about 200,000,000 gallons and thereby reduce the salt content in the water?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I accept the suggestion of the honourable member and will have the matter examined. I point out, however, that the raising of the wall of the reservoir will not increase the flow of water into it, nor will it increase the size of the catchment area from which the flow is derived. I think this is the first year the reservoir has been full since I have been Minister of Works, which is some years now; it certainly has not been full since 1956, if it was full then. However, the Engineer-in-Chief and I are anxious to see that all possible sources of impounding water are exploited, therefore I will have the suggestion examined to see whether it has any physical or economic prospects.

CONSULTING ENGINEERS.

Mr. HUTCHENS: In view of overseas consulting engineers being commissioned in respect of two major prospects, namely, the power station at Torrens Island and the Morphett Street bridge, can the Minister of Works say whether South Australian or Australian consulting engineers have at any time been requested to accept a commission concerning these or other major projects and, if they have not, can he say why?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not able to speak with any knowledge regarding the Morphett Street project, so I cannot advise the honourable member what steps have been taken, if any, to employ the services of a consultant. Regarding the Torrens Island power station, I do not know what the honourable member means when he speaks about consultants, although I presume that he means specialist advisers on equipment and machinery and so on that might be used there. It is the practice of the trust to inform itself at first-hand on all available generating and steam-raising machinery, and (as the honourable member will recall) the Assistant Manager recently accompanied the Premier overseas to bring himself up to date on developments in both conventional and nuclear type power stations.

Mr. Hutchens: My question was about construction.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The construction of the power station depends largely on the machinery to be installed so, the one matter having been resolved, the other is to a large extent an automatic decision. Within Australia there are few suppliers of large generating equipment, and usually we have to look to overseas tenderers to supply equipment

of a size and type to meet the case. In order to give the honourable member further information (if any is available) I will consult the General Manager of the trust to see whether any particular factors are involved in this case and, if they are, I will let the honourable member know.

PULP MILL.

Mr. BURDON: My question concerns the statement made yesterday by the Treasurer, when explaining the Budget, regarding the establishment of a paper pulp industry in the South-East. I was extremely disappointed to hear that negotiations had virtually broken down. This news is also disappointing to many people in my district and to other people, too. Can the Treasurer amplify the remarks he made yesterday concerning the proposed pulp mill?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I could not amplify those remarks to any extent at present beyond saying that it has not been possible to get agreement upon a forestry contract between the forestry authorities on the one hand and the purchasing company on the other. I should not like it to be thought that that means that the Government has abandoned the idea that it could establish the industry. That is not correct. It merely means that the negotiations in which the Government has been indulging have not been successful. Since those negotiations have broken down, the Government has started other negotiations, which are in progress. I think the honourable member will realize that, when one is negotiating for a contract for a supply of timber for 40 years, many interests are involved and it is difficult to get complete agreement. However, the Government still believes in the project and will continue to work for the establishment of this industry.

SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. LAWN: Last week the Premier said the House would adjourn this afternoon until September 17. Can he say whether it is likely to sit in the evenings on the resumption of sittings?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Since the announcement was made last week there has been the tragic death of one honourable member of this House, and the Speaker has announced when the by-election is to take place. The Government proposes to adjourn the House over the period of the election, as requests have been received from honourable members for an opportunity to take part in the by-election campaign.

METROPOLITAN ABATTOIRS.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding the expenditure of £50,000 on the Metropolitan Abattoirs?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I wrote to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board and included the details of the question. I have received the following letter from the Secretary of the board:

In reply to your letter of the 30th ult., seeking information for the honourable the Minister of Agriculture in connection with an announcement by the board's chairman (Mr. David Waterhouse) concerning the expenditure at the works of approximately £50,000, you are informed that the announcement relates to a proposal to change over to a system of dressing of beef on-the-rail as distinct from the present method of bed dressing.

The board's decision to install a system of rail dressing of beef was influenced by the requirements of the United States Department of Agriculture consequent upon recent amendments to the United States meat regulations governing the manner in which meat, to be imported into that country in the future, is to be handled at the point of slaughter of the stock.

NUCLEAR POWER.

Mr. SHANNON: Recently, a statement was made on nuclear energy by, I suppose, the leading authority in Australia on this subject, and that statement was widely distributed through the press. It was to the effect that it was within the realm of practical politics that we could have operating a station so powered within possibly four or five years; and that the first station to be so powered was likely to be sited in South Australia. Although he did not go so far as to select the site, he indicated that such a power station could be established here. On his return recently from the United States of America, the Premier informed the House of what was happening in this field. It might be useful if honourable members were informed how the Government feels about this project, or whether there is any such thing as a project. If the Premier has anything in mind, will it have a bearing on the size of the projected power station on Torrens Island?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The suggestion would not have much effect on the new power station on Torrens Island, except that it might mean it would not be as large as previously anticipated. I doubt very much whether the Electricity Trust would consider putting a nuclear power station on Torrens Island, and there are reasons why it would probably not be desirable to do so. I do not

think there is any real risk of danger, but there are other reasons which, I believe, would make it desirable to establish it elsewhere. As a matter of interest, British authorities, on behalf of the South Australian Government, are examining a site on the sea coast about 10 or 15 miles from Wallaroo. I do not want it considered that this is something that has been determined. It is only a study, but the study is in relation to a site remote from the Torrens Island site.

FRUIT CANNING INDUSTRY.

Mr. BYWATERS: On August 13 I asked the Premier a question relating to the fruit canning industry and suggested that his Government take up with the Commonwealth Government the possibility of subsidizing the industry to allow it to become stabilized and to compete on overseas markets. Has he a reply?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If my memory is correct, I do not believe I actually undertook to take the honourable member's question up with the Commonwealth Government, although I may have done so. If my memory is correct, I did say that a project was being submitted by the industry to the Commonwealth Government for its consideration. I have no further information to that which I previously gave the honourable member. I believe that the project is being gradually worked up by the industry concerned in conjunction with the Commonwealth, which obviously would be the authority to take action.

HAMPDEN WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the commencement of the Hampden water scheme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I can tell the honourable member now that it is intended to commence laying the mains for this scheme early in November and the programme is expected to be completed in three months.

GAWLER RIVER FLOODINGS.

Mr. CLARK: I understand that the Minister of Works has a general report in reply to my recent question on the flooding of portions of Gawler by the South Para River.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a lengthy report, which cannot be summarized, and in which the Engineer-in-Chief states:

South Para and Warren reservoirs, both located on South Para River, have a combined capacity of 48,000 acre feet and cut off the

whole of the flow in the river until South Para reservoir is full, thus making a major contribution towards the elimination of floods in the Gawler River. When South Para reservoir is full water which enters the reservoir must also leave it via the spillway. It is impossible to assess the flow in South Para River sufficient to cause flooding in the Gawler River as this depends upon the flow in the North Para River. However, for comparative purposes a flood flow has been assumed as 3,000 acre feet of water in three days. During the 23 years prior to the completion of South Para floods of this magnitude or greater occurred on 11 occasions. From the completion of South Para early in 1958 up to the end of July, 1963, five floods of this magnitude would have occurred without the reservoir, but all of these were fully impounded. The river flow in the three days ended July 8, 1963, would have amounted to 10,240 acre feet—13 per cent greater than any flood during the previous 28 years. Reserving the extra 1,500,000,000 gallons of capacity provided by the spillway gates for flood control purposes would mean the loss of this volume of water to the water supply system, and even this would only have impounded 55 per cent of a flood equal to that which occurred in July. The policy during the coming season will be to use every gallon of water which can be drawn from South Para reservoir to provide as much space as possible to impound any river flows which occur in the winter of 1964. The honourable member will see from that comment that it is possible to use the reservoir as a protection against flooding, and that that is in the mind of the Engineer-in-Chief and will be done. The report continues:

The effect of South Para and Warren reservoirs may be summarized by saying that each year these reservoirs will prevent all flooding in South Para River until they are full, after which the river flows will be the same as they would have been if the reservoirs had not been built. I think it is a fair assessment of the situation to say that the reservoirs will eliminate at least 80 per cent of the floods which would have occurred under natural conditions.

KANGAROO CREEK RESERVOIR.

Mr. CUMBE: During the recent wet weather the progress of the roadworks construction for the Kangaroo Creek reservoir at the head-waters of the River Torrens has been delayed. I understand this has to be completed before work can be started on the reservoir's construction. Can the Minister of Works say whether the roadwork has recommenced, and what effect the delay will have on the completion of the programme?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Some difficulty arose during the depth of winter in the road construction programme, but I understand that it is now progressing according to schedule.

I will obtain the information for the honourable member and write to him regarding other matters he has raised.

WATER CATCHMENT.

Mr. LOVEDAY: I understand that the Minister of Works has a reply to my recent question regarding the catchment of the maximum quantity of water in reservoirs from small streams by means of channels.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Engineer-in-Chief advises that consideration has been given to augmenting some of the reservoirs in South Australia by collecting flows from small streams which do not discharge into the main stream feeding the reservoir. There are, however, few instances where this can be done and fewer still where it can be done economically. It has been done at the Tod River and Bundaleer reservoirs where the flows from subsidiary streams have been conveyed to the reservoirs by means of channels.

CLEAN AIR COMMITTEE.

Mr. HALL: In this morning's press appeared a report under the heading "Slight Charge over Inquiry", which stated:

An emphatic protest at the Government's failure to have a representative on the proposed 10-man "clean-air" committee is contained in a report from the South Australian Municipal Association tabled at the meeting of the Glenelg council last night. In the report, the Secretary of the Municipal Association (Mr. A. B. Cox) describes this as a slight to local government. The Mayor of Glenelg (Mr. Parkinson) said that he agreed with Mr. Cox's views.

When this matter was considered here last week an amendment, which I moved, was carried adding an eleventh member, representing local government, to the Clean Air Committee. In view of this it appears that it has been too much trouble for Mr. Cox to follow up his own representation and to see that this was so. The only "slight" appears to be his failure to do this and in his own conduct in this matter. Has the Premier anything to add, and does he expect any difficulty in filling this position if the Bill is passed by the Legislative Council?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Evidently the fact that the amendment had been made was not noted elsewhere, but I will see that Mr. Cox receives a copy of the honourable member's statement.

TIME CLOCKS.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about a special rating for time clocks and whether it is compulsory to install them in houses?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Assistant Manager of the Electricity Trust (Mr. S. E. Huddleston) states that a time switch is required with the off-peak water heating tariff in order to limit the hours during which the special low charges are available. No charge is made for either the time switch or the meter in connection with this tariff.

PARA WIRRA RESERVE.

Mr. LAUCKE: I was delighted to hear the Treasurer say yesterday, when explaining the Budget, that a further 702 acres had been purchased adjacent to Para Wirra National Reserve to add to it. Has he more details about this land purchase?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

LAKE BUTLER BOAT HAVEN.

Mr. CORCORAN: I was informed some time ago that it would be necessary to travel some distance to obtain the rock that was to be used for the breakwater at the Lake Butler boat haven. Some concern has been expressed by the National Trust and other organizations that this stone may be procured from the area known as Gyp Gyp Rocks in the Lacepede District Council area. Can the Minister of Agriculture indicate where this rock will be obtained?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The work under this section of the Fisheries Act is undertaken by the Harbors Board on instruction from His Excellency the Governor, and I am unable to give technical details about it. I do not mind asking the Minister of Works for information so that I can pass it on to the honourable member, but I know, in general, that difficulty has arisen in obtaining suitable stone for the breakwater. I shall be heartbroken if I find that this is a national monument, and that we have to go farther afield to obtain the right stone. I will obtain the information for the honourable member.

PEEBINGA RAILWAY LINE.

Mr. NANKIVELL: As several silos are to be constructed on the Peebinga railway line, will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Railways a report on the Railways Department's proposals for work on this line to restore it to a better and safer condition?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

TENANCY AGREEMENTS.

Mr. CURREN: During the Address in Reply debate, when referring to tenancy agreements signed by the occupants of Lands Department houses, I said:

This licence is renewed every year, and the fee for this little piece of paper is 2s. 6d. for the first £50 of annual rent and 5s. for the first £100. However, as most of the houses carry a rental of more than £2 a week, which would bring the annual rental over the £100, the cost of the licence is 5s. per £50 or part thereof, so in addition to the rent increase these employees are saddled with this annual fee of 15s.

Can the Minister of Lands say why it is necessary for these tenancy agreements to be renewed each year, and what Government department levies the fees for these agreements?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I do not know the answer at the moment, but I will obtain it and let the honourable member have it.

VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE.

Mr. CASEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the scarcity of vocational guidance officers in the Education Department?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Guidance officers are concerned with both "vocational" and "educational" guidance. This work is done in primary schools, as well as in secondary schools. Educational guidance leads to vocational guidance, and it is considered that the latter will be better done if preceded by general educational guidance throughout the school career. There are at present three guidance officers on the establishment, but one position is at present vacant. Their work is supplemented by 11 teacher/psychologists, who are teachers seconded to the Psychology Branch for this purpose.

Although the staff has grown in recent years, we are unable to provide a full guidance service to all schools throughout the State. Of necessity these officers have devoted their attention to the schools most urgently requiring their services. A number of country secondary schools have been visited, and some country children come down to Adelaide during vacation time for help. In the smaller high schools where students are well known to all staff members, guidance is a personal matter between the teacher and the student. In larger high schools, particularly in the metropolitan area, members of the staff, especially chosen as careers guidance officers, advise school-leavers on their future careers. In both country and city, arrangements are made with

the Psychology Branch for testing of specific aptitudes in difficult cases where the careers guidance officers feel they need the advice of specialists.

In technical high schools a member of the staff, designated as a careers officer, gives advice and job information to students and also deals with some of their educational problems. Through a series of in service training courses, careers officers—both men and women—are carrying out many of the functions previously discharged by specialist guidance officers and close liaison is maintained between these teachers and the Psychology Branch. In both high schools and technical high schools, assistance is also rendered by the Department of Labour and National Service.

In answer to the honourable member's third question, I am informed that there are very few private vocational guidance specialists in Adelaide. The Deputy Director of Education (Mr. J. S. Walker) expresses his own view that rather than increase the number of guidance officers and teacher/psychologists, we should concentrate upon improving the services given by careers officers in our secondary schools. He will take this matter up with the Superintendent of Recruitment and Training and submit a later report to me on this aspect of the problem.

SPRINGBANK ROAD BRIDGE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Work has recently commenced on the widening and general improvement of the bridge over the railway line at Springbank. Yesterday, the present narrow bridge was closed to traffic; I think, for the first time. I have been approached by a nearby resident who tells me that insufficient detour signs were erected to warn traffic travelling from town and coming up Springbank Road in time to take the proper detours. Will the Minister of Works pass on to the Minister of Railways this comment and ask him to have sufficient detour signs erected to warn traffic in time that the bridge is closed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will direct the honourable member's remarks to my colleague, the Minister of Roads.

FILM ADVERTISING.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Has the Premier a report in reply to my question of August 8 about film advertising?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have a report from the Inspector of Places of Public Entertainment, as follows:

With reference to the question asked by Mr. Hutchens, M.P., concerning the publication in the daily press of offensive motion picture advertising material, I wish to advise that on June 24, 1963, I wrote to Mr. A. Barr, joint General Manager of Hoyts Theatres Limited, who is a member of the Motion Picture Exhibitors' Association "watching committee", and complained in the strongest possible terms about the advertising material published in the daily press. Some of this material is referred to in Mr. Hutchens's question. As a result of this letter a deputation from the Motion Picture Exhibitors' Association intends to wait upon the Minister on Friday, August 16, 1963.

I have, for many years, tried exhaustively, without any legislative power, to make the motion picture exhibitors contain their advertisements within the bounds of decency, but my efforts have only had a momentary effect, and inevitably the standard of the advertisements has gradually decreased with the lapse of time after my warnings. In view of the recent complaints it is obvious that the "watching committee" is incapable of exercising adequate control over the type of advertising material published by its members.

As the Minister is aware, I have been extremely reluctant to recommend legislation to control film advertising as such control would cause an enormous amount of inconvenience to both the film distributors and exhibitors, as well as considerable expense to the Government in the form of extra staff and facilities that would be required by this office to handle the large increase in work that would result from the censoring of all film advertising material. However, I have lost confidence in the film industry's ability or desire to keep their advertising material within the bounds of acceptable standards, and, therefore, if the Government consider it necessary in the public interest to constrain the publication of offensive motion picture advertising material, I feel that there is no alternative but to recommend an amendment to the Places of Public Entertainment Act giving the Government the necessary statutory power.

That report will now be referred to the Chief Secretary.

COPPER.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: When explaining the Budget yesterday, the Treasurer indicated that the Mines Department intended to investigate copper ore deposits at Kapunda. Will the Treasurer ask the Minister of Mines the extent of the proposed investigations?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, I will get that information for the honourable member.

KILLING FEE.

Mr. LANGLEY: The present procedure at the abattoirs is that butchers wishing to have stock killed must pay an amount of £35 in

advance, and that money is not refunded to the butcher until he goes out of business. Formerly this money was held for six months and then refunded. Will the Minister of Agriculture ask the Abattoirs Board if it would be prepared to revert to its former policy of refunding the money after six months?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will refer the question to the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board.

STRUCTURAL STEEL.

Mr. HALL: This morning's *Advertiser* contains a report of a Royal Commission that considered the failure of the Kings bridge in Melbourne. Some reasons given for the structural failure of that bridge were that the contractors failed to carry out proper tests, that the steel used in the construction was unexpectedly variable in carbon content, and that, as it was a high-tensile steel, it was a departure from the normal use of steel. Can the Minister of Works, representing his own interests and those of the Minister of Roads and Railways, say whether proper precautions are taken in this State to ensure that all steel supplies used in public works and in the roads and railways systems are of the highest quality?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am not competent to comment on a problem in another State and have no desire to do so. Regarding construction works in South Australia, and particularly in my own department, I think it is fair to say that the engineers adopt a rather conservative attitude towards any new approach—not an attitude so conservative that it inhibits them from investigating modern practice, but one of a degree of care that prevents taking undue risks. I assure the honourable member that, before embarking on any new type of construction or fabrication, the department would take the most stringent steps to see that no undue risks were taken and no uncertain factors were included in the calculation.

CABLE CAR.

Mr. CASEY: Last week I noticed an article in a newspaper dealing with a proposed cable car for Victor Harbour. The suggestion of a cable car came from the Director of the Immigration, Publicity and Tourist Bureau, who said it would be an added attraction for schoolchildren, particularly during the school holidays. Will the Premier take up the matter with the Director to see if a similar cable car

could not operate in the Flinders Ranges (probably the finest tourist resort that we have in this State) in order to provide a scenic attraction for tourists there?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I did not see the report the honourable member has referred to, and it is a new topic to me. However, I think that a cable car in the Flinders Ranges would be rather incongruous, for I believe that the Flinders Ranges have different attractions which in themselves will always ensure that they will be actively sought by tourists. As the honourable member knows, the Government has backed its belief in this by spending a considerable sum. However, I will inquire and give the honourable member a considered reply.

AFRICAN DAISY.

Mr. SHANNON: I ask this question in the light of the projected programme that has been announced and also in the light of the evidence tendered by the Weeds Officer (Mr. O'Neil) that the time for attacking African daisy, in order to have an effective kill, is September and October. I think the Minister of Agriculture informed a deputation I had the pleasure to introduce that it would need legislative action before the Government could participate in a campaign to eradicate this weed. A campaign is now operating in certain parts of my district for its eradication. Will the Minister make some announcement on where the Government stands publicly—I know where the Minister stands privately—in this field, because I think it might encourage more energetic steps to be taken soon?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: When the honourable member asked me this question last week I think I said that it was a matter of policy and that it would have to be referred to the Government. I point out that even though local government is taking active steps in an effort to combat this weed—and I am glad to see those steps being taken—the results to date have really shown that the weed has taken hold in large areas, and much effort is required. I know that a district council in the honourable member's district has struck a special rate to cope with the weed, and to my mind that is a progressive step. However, the department has spent much money, not in direct subsidies to district councils but in the time of officers dealing with the matter, and it has spent much money in coping with other weeds, too. The Estimates now before the House show an increase in all these respects in the work of the department.

The matter of a direct subsidy to a local government body, as the honourable member has said, is a matter of an amendment of the Act: it could not be done in any other way. That, in turn, is a question that must be referred to the Government, and it cannot be so done until we have had a proper chance to assemble the necessary evidence and facts that will help the Government to make a decision upon it.

CABLES.

Mr. NANKIVELL: At a recent meeting of the Upper South-East Local Government Association held at Tintinara the question arose concerning the installation of underground electricity connections, which could cause inconvenience to councils, particularly in cases where the trust had indicated that it would provide a private connection from a pole on the other side of the road. In such a case, the underground cable would have to be laid under a road and also a footpath. In view of the need for a council to know where such a cable is located in the event of possible roadworks, can the Minister of Works say whether the council has the right to authorize or approve such extensions, or whether such power is to be provided in the Local Government Act when it is amended later this session?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I was not aware that it was the practice of the trust to place power cables underground, particularly in country areas, because it is somewhat costly.

Mr. Nankivell: It is a private connection.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If it is a private connection, an application would be required to obtain the consent of the local council before the cable was placed under a road. That is the case with water pipes and things of that nature. If a private person is not obliged to apply in respect of electricity cables, I shall refer the question to the Minister of Local Government for his attention to see whether an amendment of the Act is necessary.

HOSPITAL CHARGES.

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier a reply to my question of yesterday regarding hospital charges?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have received the following report from the Director-General of Medical Services:

1. In-patients—
 - (a) Pensioners with medical entitlement cards, and their dependants—No charges for hospitalization, theatre fee, pathology, or use of radiology equipment.

- (b) Non-pensioners—Charged 60s. per day ward fees, plus theatre fee charges (£3 3s. major operations, and £1 11s. 6d. minor), plus pathology charges, if applicable. No charge is made for radiological procedures for the use of equipment.
- (c) Non-public patients—Charged 75s. per day bed charge, plus the following additional charges:

Theatre Fee—

£6 6s. major operations.

£3 3s. minor operations.

Dressings—

£1 10s. major operations.

15s. minor operations.

Physiotherapy—

10s. per treatment.

In addition to the above charges, the following are charged to the doctor as a service charge, and he charges the patient his fee for the operation, X-rays, radiotherapy, anaesthetic, and pathology charges.

Use of anaesthetic equipment—

If an outside doctor—£1.

If a hospital doctor—Charge is in accordance with type of operation, as approved in schedule of charges (Minister of Health's approval).

X-rays—Depending on the area X-rayed, charged according to approved schedule of charges.

2. Out-patients—

- (a) Radiotherapy Department—

Pensioners with medical entitlement cards and their dependants—No charge.

Non-pensioners—

Deep X-ray—£5 per course of treatment.

Superficial X-ray—£2 per course of treatment.

- (b) Orthotron—

Pensioners with medical entitlement cards and their dependants—No charge.

Non-pensioners—Superficial and deep X-ray £5 per course of treatment.

Private patients—A service charge of £1 2s. 6d. per treatment for superficial and deep X-ray is made to the doctor who makes his own charge to the patient.

WOOL LEVY.

Mr. HEASLIP: In the *Advertiser* of September 2 appeared an item, under the heading "Plan to double New Zealand Wool Levy", which stated:

The New Zealand Wool Board wanted to double the woolgrowers' levy from 7s. 6d. a bale to 15s. from October next year, the chairman of the board (Mr. J. Acland) said yesterday. The levy would enable New Zealand to contribute about £NZ2½m. to the £NZ10m. (£A12½m.) required by the International Wool Secretariat to increase wool promotion.

Australian woolgrowers are to be asked to raise their contribution from 12s. to 44s. a bale, which is almost four times as much as is now being paid, whereas New Zealand growers are being asked to raise their levy by 50 per cent. Can the Minister of Agriculture ascertain for me how the difference between £NZ2,500,000 to be raised by New Zealand and the £NZ10,000,000 required by Australia arises and how it is to be found?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will have that question examined and get what information I can for the honourable member.

SOUTH-EAST CROSSING.

Mr. BURDON: The Highways Department is reconstructing the highway from eastern Mount Gambier toward the Victorian border. Two or three years ago a couple of serious railway accidents occurred in which two people lost their lives west of Mount Gambier. I am concerned at this stage about safety precautions that may be taken when this road is reconstructed and re-aligned at the crossing on the railway line between Mount Gambier and Victoria. Can the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Roads, say what safety precautions the Highways Department has in mind for this crossing?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will seek information from the Minister of Roads.

PILDAPPA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Can the Minister of Works say whether the investigations show whether the quantity of water available from the Polda Basin is yet sufficient for the extension of the water supply to Pildappa, which has been requested over the years?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The department has been unable to make any really conclusive tests of the capacity of the Polda Basin. This has been satisfactorily replenished during the recent winter because of the above average rainfall. It stood up to pumping last summer very well, but could not be tested by severe pumping because the summer did not continue long enough after the basin was harnessed to really test it by that means. However, the prospects are satisfactory. The Mines Department is conducting extensive exploratory drilling works in the area of the basin to determine its limit, and I have asked the Engineer-in-Chief to arrange for the maximum pumping effort to be undertaken during the summer months this year to test it still further. Regarding the supply of water to Pildappa, the two areas are closely

linked and I have discussed with the Engineer-in-Chief the possibility of extending water to them. At present one of them is not rated, and it would be necessary to rate the whole area if they were connected to the Tod system. I believe that the Engineer-in-Chief intends to recommend that they be connected to the Tod trunk main, but I will verify that and inform the honourable member.

SUPERANNUATION FUND LOANS.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Can the Premier indicate the Superannuation Fund Board's interest charge on existing loans to house purchasers? I understand that it is slightly higher than that of other lending institutions, and that the board has not reduced its rate as have similar organizations. Will the board consider reducing the normal rate of interest for contributors to the superannuation fund who are able to obtain a loan for house purchase?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not have that information but I will obtain it for the honourable member. I understand that the rate of interest is slightly higher than the standard rate, but I will check that statement.

POLICE FORCE.

Mr. HUTCHENS: On August 6 I asked the Premier a question regarding resignations from the Police Force, and drew attention to the concern expressed by many concerning the ability of the force to keep law and order. I understand the Premier has a reply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A report from the Commissioner of Police states:

The turnover resulting from resignations, deaths and dismissals within the S.A. Police Force from July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1962, a period of twelve years, was 6.1 per cent, whereas the turnover for the same causes during the year 1962-63 was 6.2 per cent—a difference of only one per thousand. The rising standards of efficiency and personal conduct demanded of police officers in recent years have presented difficulties for some members in measuring up to requirements. The reasons for the 86 resignations during the year 1962-63 were:

Left, pending departmental disciplinary action	10
Unable to meet requirements <i>re</i> standards, etc.	12
Self assessed as unsuitable to continue in the service	5
Financial reasons	7
Domestic problems and debts	13
Desire to enter other employment or reason not stated	37
Women police—marriage	2

No difficulty is being experienced in recruiting sufficient suitable young men to compensate for the wastage from all causes, and as

soon as additional facilities are available at Fort Largs, the cadet system, which is to provide the majority of future enlistments, will produce a regular flow of well-trained police officers. A very large percentage of the cadets who have entered the service are of an exceptionally high standard, and this is most promising for the future of the force.

COCKBURN ELECTRICITY SUPPLY.

Mr. CASEY: I understand the Premier has a reply to my recent question about a power supply for Cockburn linking with the New South Wales supply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A report from Mr. S. E. Huddleston (Assistant Manager of the Electricity Trust) states:

The original proposal was that a single wire earth return transmission line might be built from Broken Hill to Cockburn supplying the new television station *en route*. The costs of the line would then be shared between the supply for the television station and the supply for Cockburn. The Postmaster-General's Department has now asked that a three-phase supply be considered for the television station, and we understand that new estimates of cost are being determined for this. Since single phase supply is adequate for Cockburn, the cost of the three-phase line should properly be borne by the Postmaster-General's Department. We understand that the department has not made a final decision on whether single-phase or three-phase supply is to be used, but there seems no particular reason why a decision either way should affect consideration of a supply to Cockburn.

PINNAROO TO CANNAWIGRA ROAD.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works ascertain from his colleague the Minister of Roads whether the Highways Department intends to complete the Pinnaroo to Cannawigra road this financial year by completing the link between the southern and northern sections, which have already been constructed?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will inquire and inform the honourable member.

SALES TAX.

Mr. LANGLEY: School committees in my district have complained regarding excessive sales tax on items of stationery required by school students, particularly exercise books, pens and pencils, which carry a sales tax as high as 25 per cent. I am aware that sales tax is controlled by the Commonwealth Government, but because these items are essential educational requirements will the Premier make representations to the appropriate Commonwealth Minister and ask him to consider a

reduction of the sales tax on educational requirements to relieve the financial burden on parents of schoolchildren?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I will verify the information the honourable member has given, because I am not sure it is entirely correct, although I have no doubt that he obtained it from a reliable source. When I have obtained that information, either the Minister of Education or I will approach the Commonwealth Minister.

CIGARETTE SUPPLIES.

Mr. LANGLEY: Last year I referred to a grocer constituent of mine whose cigarette supplies were curtailed because of the price at which he was selling cigarettes. The matter was then investigated by the Prices Commissioner. Today this man called on me to tell me that his cigarette supplies have again been stopped. If I supply to the Premier the name of the retailer concerned, will the Premier refer this matter to the appropriate authority to see that the cigarette supplies are renewed?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes.

WHYALLA WATER MAIN.

Mr. McKEE: Earlier this year I asked whether the Government had decided to lay a main under Spencer Gulf to Whyalla or north of the gulf and I was informed that negotiations were being conducted with the Commonwealth Government on this matter. Can the Premier say whether any decision has been made?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The difficulty of laying a main under the gulf was related to the Commonwealth Government's military training area that the main would traverse. I took the matter up with the Prime Minister and two days ago he informed me by telephone that he had sent a letter to me that he believed would be entirely satisfactory. I have not received the letter yet, but if it is satisfactory I can see no reason why tenders should not be called to determine the cost so that the project may be properly evaluated.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 28. Page 714.)

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I support the second reading. A few minutes ago the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) handed

me the latest issue of the *South Australian Motor*, which is the official organ of the Royal Automobile Association of South Australia. On page 18 is a most dramatic photograph of a road accident. It is contained in an advertisement headed "Living Proof! Driver and Wife Survive this Spectacular Head-on Collision." The article states:

This is the aftermath of a shocking head-on collision between a station sedan and a large truck on Kurrajong Heights, New South Wales. The driver of the sedan, Mr. Eric Royle, of Chatswood, was approaching the first hairpin bend on the hill at 20 m.p.h. in second gear. One minute the road was clear . . . then, suddenly, a truck raced out of control across the double lines. The force of the impact was so great that the car stopped the truck dead. Damage to the car was £600. This accident could have been fatal for both Mr. Royle and his wife, but for the protection of their . . . safety belts.

The advertisement describes the particular benefits to be derived from using a special make of safety belt, but it indicates the principle the member for Mitcham had in mind when introducing this Bill, which is designed to reduce road deaths and injuries resulting from road accidents. This morning I telephoned the Secretary of the National Safety Council of South Australia (Mr. Wilson), and I am in his debt for some figures he has supplied of road accident statistics throughout the world. Figures show that as a world-wide pattern 91 per cent of accident fatalities result from road accidents, 5 per cent from rail accidents, 3 per cent from sea accidents, including yachting, and 1 per cent from air travel.

Some years ago the University of Sydney conducted a survey into the peculiarities of road transport and investigated the causes of the relatively high rate of casualties in road transport as compared with accidents resulting from other forms of public transport. In brief, the report of that university reads as follows:

Rail, water and air transport differ from road transport in five significant ways, in that they:

Operate on their own more or less exclusive right-of-way.

Have relatively little traffic congestion—other than at terminals.

Cater mainly for mass transportation, with a proportionately small number of units each controlled by a fully qualified "driver" operating to rigid safety rules.

Follow pre-determined schedules in the main, and have the benefit of a comprehensive and scientific system of signalling and traffic control.

Comprise large-scale homogeneous units with unified control.

By contrast, the pattern of road transport shows that, in almost every way conditions are unfavourable for the safe and orderly flow of traffic:

No class of road user has any exclusive right-of-way, and all meet for the most part on the same plane.

Congestion is infinitely greater than for any other form of transport.

A high proportion of the units carry only a single passenger, and the majority of the drivers are amateurs who have received no systematic training for their task. What constitutes desirable driving standards is generally a matter of personal opinion.

The road user travels when the spirit moves him and methods of traffic control are only rudimentary.

Road users are heterogeneous. They can vary from an invalid in a wheel chair who can average one mile an hour to a 100 m.p.h. sports car. A 30-lb. toddler may contest the right-of-way with a 30-ton truck.

I think that report stresses the problems peculiar to road traffic. I now turn to actual statistics relating to accidents involving deaths and casualties that have occurred in Australia. To save reading it, I ask leave to have a table incorporated in *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACCIDENTS INVOLVING CASUALTIES (a): ACCIDENTS RECORDED AND CASUALTIES, 1960-61.

State or Territory	Accidents involving Casualties	Persons Killed			Persons Injured		
		Number	Per 100,000 of Mean Population	Per 10,000 Motor Vehicles Registered	Number	Per 100,000 of Mean Population	Per 10,000 Motor Vehicles Registered
New South Wales...	16,599	934	24	9	22,244	574	222
Victoria	12,140	773	27	9	16,757	579	193
Queensland	5,424	353	24	9	7,607	506	183
South Australia ...	6,117	203	21	7	7,665	801	260
Western Australia ..	3,602	197	27	9	4,806	659	223
Tasmania	844	75	21	8	1,157	331	121
Australian Capital Territory	326	7	13	4	513	929	291
Total	45,052	2,542	25	9	60,749	586	209

(a) Accidents (reported to the police) which occurred in public thoroughfares and which caused death, or injury to an extent requiring surgical or medical treatment.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: This table appears in the *Year Book of the Commonwealth of Australia*, No. 48, 1962. I am also indebted to Mr. Wilson for supplying me with figures relating to the relative danger to passengers in seats in motor cars. He informs me that the relative degree of death risk is as follows: 13 per cent for the driver; 75 per cent for the front seat passenger; and 6 per cent for each of the two rear seat passengers. I think that indicates without reasonable doubt that the two most dangerous seats in any motor car are the two front seats. I agree with the member for Mitcham that it will be sufficient for the purpose if only two seat belts, namely, those in the two front seats, are fitted to motor cars. I am pleased to support the second reading of this Bill.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): Although I do not support this Bill in its present form, I commend the member for Mitcham for drawing attention to this important matter.

Mr. Millhouse: That is jolly decent of you.

Mr. HALL: I thought so, too. The one thing that should occupy the attention of honourable members and every responsible person in Australia is the road traffic toll, and I do not think any of us would decry any member's attempt here to reduce that toll.

Mr. Millhouse: You don't deny that this would reduce it?

Mr. HALL: I am not certain at this stage that it would reduce it. If people fitted safety belts and used them, certainly we could expect the road toll to be reduced in aggregate.

Mr. Millhouse: They cannot be used unless they are fitted.

Mr. HALL: That is so, but I believe we will lose the benefit of seat belts if we make them compulsory. Under this Bill those seat belts will be in a car when it is purchased, and the purchaser will feel no obligation to use them because they have not been fitted as a result of his own choice. When it is a matter of free choice I am sure that a driver or passenger of a car will feel that he or she has chosen to fit them and will probably use them. However, if they are forced upon people I believe they will be looked upon as just another irksome condition imposed by Governments, and they may not be used. I say "may", because I understand that this has not been tried, and we do not know, but I personally am not willing at this stage to support legislation that forces the fitting of seat belts in motor cars.

Mr. Millhouse: The honourable member is obviously not aware that similar legislation has been enacted in other parts of the world.

Mr. HALL: I stand corrected. I am given to understand that no legislation exists anywhere to compel the use of seat belts. In certain parts of the world these belts must be fitted, but there is no legislation that says they must be used. Obviously it would be impossible to police legislation that said safety belts had to be used, for it would require a Police Force beyond the realms of possibility to do so. One point that has not been mentioned is that a seat belt used by somebody who chooses to use it is regarded as a safety factor, primarily to safeguard the user's own life and limb. If it is used because it is thrust upon someone to use the user could gain a false self-confidence, and youngish drivers, who cause the greatest number of accidents on the roads, might well become over-confident if they were forced to use safety belts.

Mr. Freebairn: Does the honourable member's own experience indicate that?

Mr. HALL: That is a loaded question, if ever there was one. I happen to have grown out of that age group by whom most accidents are caused on Australian roads. The official organ of the National Safety Council of Australia contains figures indicating that over 50 per cent of the road victims in Australia are under the age of 30 years, and that is an age group which the member for Light and I have left behind. I therefore consider that his comment is hardly valid in the context of my argument. Does the member for Mitcham expect that many people in the under-30 age group will use safety belts?

Mr. Millhouse: Yes.

Mr. HALL: Then I think he is optimistic.

Mr. Millhouse: The Gallup Poll I referred to last week shows a greater proportion of people under 30 in favour of the legislation than people in any other age group.

Mr. HALL: Yes; when this is an academic thing that is not in force many people favour it, but when it comes home to the very people themselves who make up that Gallup Poll it is different. It is easy for a person when contacted in the street or at his door to be on the side of safety, but it is different to put suggestions into practice and to enforce safety measures. In considering this Bill we have to look at all its ramifications, not just the safety features but also the threat in some degree to public liberty it creates by imposing a condition on the manufacture of motor cars that will be passed on to the consumer in the price of the vehicle. I know that other fittings on vehicles are considered to be provided for safety, and that these cost the consumer something. I am sorry that the consumer has to pay as much as he does for a motor vehicle. We have to be sure that what we are doing compulsorily is effective. People are not yet seat-belt conscious.

Mr. Millhouse: We will never know until we try.

Mr. HALL: A survey taken of motor vehicles (I think in Melbourne) showed that well under 10 per cent of the vehicles had seat belts fitted, and I believe that only a small percentage of those people interviewed were at all conscious of the need for them. The motoring public is not conversant with the safety that can be obtained by wearing a seat belt.

Mr. Corcoran: A good article on this appears on page 49 of today's *News*.

Mr. HALL: Although I cannot support the Bill as it stands at present, I commend the member for Mitcham for bringing the matter before the House and before the people of South Australia, and, I believe, through a certain news programme, the people of Australia.

Mr. Millhouse: What would you support?

Mr. HALL: I do not know whether I would support any active legislation of this kind. However, I commend the honourable member for drawing the matter to the public's attention. I would support a programme to educate motorists on the value of seat belts. If legislation such as this is to be effective it must obviously be aimed at the under-30 age group, although we can take all the other

people in, too. Those who are under 30 in this decade will probably be over 30 next decade. Let us not forget that in forcing people to use these seat belts we may be instilling in the minds of careless drivers a sense of false confidence, and it may encourage such drivers to drive faster than they do now. I think that is the main danger in forcing people to wear seat belts.

Mr. Millhouse: That has not been my experience.

Mr. HALL: I know that the honourable member is a careful driver.

Mr. Millhouse: I am not a good driver.

Mr. HALL: It is a question of whether it should be compulsory to fit the belts, or whether it should be by choice. Under the Bill, we must educate the prospective user to fit these belts.

Mr. Millhouse: How can we do that?

Mr. HALL: I suggest that the honourable member introduce his Bill each year so that we can talk about it and then throw it out. There are many factors connected with road accidents, and I believe that lighting is often wrongly blamed. When a person is driving on a faultily constructed road and knows that it is so constructed, he should alter his speed. We know that speed on the road is the main killer. Nearly 60 per cent of road accident victims are driving on country roads at the time. This points to the factor of speed; it is not congestion. We must consider, "Do we want to prevent these accidents, or cure the results of accidents after they have happened?" I suggest that the honourable member's move is to cure and not prevent. It does not get to the root of the cause of motor accidents: it is the prevention of injury after the accident has occurred. Although his efforts here are admirable in their intention, he could occupy his time more profitably by trying to prevent accidents.

Mr. Millhouse: Can you tell me how that can be done, as it has defeated all efforts up to the present?

Mr. HALL: It is hardly fair to say that all efforts have so far been defeated, and that statement cannot be proved. We do not know where we would be on the roads but for the consistent efforts of certain bodies that aim to prevent accidents. We do not know that we would have fewer accidents if belts were fitted, but we might have fewer injuries from accidents. There may be more accidents because of over-confidence resulting from the fitting of belts, although fewer injuries from those accidents.

Mr. Millhouse: Would not that make it worth while?

Mr. HALL: If we concentrated on preventing accidents, we might do more for road safety than by passing this blanket Bill for compulsory fitting of seat belts. No doubt it would be welcomed by the motor vehicle trade. I only hope that distributors of motor safety belts are not tied to a rather restricted system of distribution of spare parts, as they are now. We cannot forgo public safety simply because someone may be getting a rather large profit because of a restrictive distribution system; but of course it does not assist us in our thinking on this matter.

I believe that the honourable member should turn his attention to the provision of safety signs on the roads. The Road Traffic Board considered that a railway crossing about which I am concerned was sufficiently illuminated at night by signs, yet accidents continue to occur regularly. At one crossing where sufficient signs were erected, accidents have ceased.

The honourable member asked in what other ways can we prevent accidents. I think we should look at the system of erecting signs on roads, warning motorists of possible dangers in the path, such as difficult rail crossings and difficulties associated with floodwaters.

Mr. Lawn: There is no need to filibuster yet.

Mr. HALL: Everyone knows what the honourable member is doing. Obviously he is not interested in road safety and I regret this. Probably we could do more for the safety of Australian motorists if we concentrated on putting up decent signs at difficult places on our roads. I do not speak derogatorily of the efforts of Mr. Millhouse in this House. I cannot support his Bill in its present form.

Mr. Millhouse: Will you oppose the second reading?

Mr. HALL: I will carefully study the Bill to see whether it cannot be made more or less harmless. I urge the honourable member to spend more time on the preventive side of accidents than on the modification of injuries once the accident has occurred. If I do support the second reading, I reserve the right to move to improve the Bill in Committee. My present thinking is that, unless the honourable member in his reply can make other suggestions, I shall oppose it.

Mr. HARDING (Victoria): I support the Bill for many reasons, but particularly for two reasons, one of which is that I believe

in the Bill and the use of seat belts. I have been asked by branches of the Apex Club (and these people are doing a good job), and particularly by the Naracoorte branch, to support the Bill, as I have already promised to do. A letter from the Naracoorte Apex Club states:

At our recent zone convention held at Hamilton in October, grave concern was expressed at the high death toll caused through motor vehicle accidents. Considerable discussion took place concerning the advisability of having seat belts fitted to all cars. It was unanimously decided that although seat belts may not be the complete answer to the problem, their use should at least help considerably. Our own club members have discussed this problem at length and we feel that the road accident problem should be tackled from every possible angle. Consequently, we ask that you introduce, if possible, legislation requiring safety belts to be standard equipment in all new cars.

I am not introducing this Bill, but I am pleased to support the request from this club and, therefore, to support this legislation. I did not know that such widespread interest had been taken in this matter, but I have been able to read many newspaper clippings and realize that agitation for the use of seat belts is of long standing. I have not heard any criticism of seat belts in aeroplanes. Those belts are for a special purpose, and so are the belts for use in motor cars. I have heard no criticism of the uncomfortable aeroplane seat belt, and present-day seat belt equipment for motor cars is of light fabric, easy to use, and comfortable. I have used it when driving motor cars and as a passenger and, after a few minutes, one is not conscious of wearing a seat belt. I was amazed at the many extracts from newspapers dealing with this subject. An article in the *Age* dated July 5, 1962, states:

Make Safety Belts in Cars Compulsory: Plea for Legislation. Motoring and road safety organizations, supported by the Victorian Police Surgeon (Dr. J. H. Birrell), have asked that car safety belts be made compulsory, in line with a British Government decision announced yesterday in London. Dr. Birrell last night said the British move was a "major breakthrough in road safety".

"It should be made compulsory everywhere to fit safety belts in cars before they are sold," he said. "I think Britain's move is a tremendous contribution to road safety and it is to be hoped that Australian motorists will follow suit—preferably without legislation."

Dr. Birrell said he realized people still had to be educated to use the belts.

This Bill, if not passed, has sufficient merit to be introduced every year until people are educated to the use of such belts. The article continues:

But their value in saving life was unquestionable. Police, wearing safety belts, had escaped unscathed from wrecked vehicles. The president of the Victorian division of the National Safety Council of Australia (Mr. A. J. Collocott) said:

"Safety belts should be made compulsory in Victoria. Hundreds of lives would be saved every year. Research here and abroad shows that 25 per cent of road fatalities could have been prevented if the occupants of cars had been wearing safety belts."

It was established that 60 per cent of injuries to drivers and passengers could be prevented or greatly minimized by safety belts. In the *Daily Telegraph* of July 5, 1962, under the heading "Seat Belts in All New Cars", an article states:

The British Government proposes to make it compulsory for safety belts to be fitted on all new cars: Front seats only.—One belt will have to be provided for the driver and another for the front seat passenger. The move was announced last night by the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport (Mr. John Hay). He was speaking during a standing committee discussion on the Road Traffic Bill.

In the *Advertiser* of March 6, 1962, under the heading "Interstate Round-up" an article states:

Machinery which will send 7,000,000 pamphlets to insurance policy holders urging the use of approved safety belts in cars was officially set in motion today by the Minister for Shipping and Transport (Mr. Opperman). The pamphlets will be sent out with policy renewal notices by member offices of the Life Officers' Association of Australia. Mr. Opperman, who wears a safety belt in his Ministerial car, said that the plan was the biggest distribution of road-safety literature ever undertaken in Australia.

A further article, in the *Advertiser* of May 8, 1962, states:

New Law on Belts.—New York.—Safety belts in cars will become compulsory within New York State, beginning with new cars registered in the latter half of 1964. The law has been signed into force recently by State Governor Nelson Rockefeller. It is the second major step taken by American authorities within the past 12 months in their efforts to reduce the number of fatal or serious injuries suffered in car accidents. Earlier, New York, with a number of other States, insisted on car makers providing adequate anchor points for seat belts at the factory, but the belts themselves were not mandatory. Now under New York State law, every car built from the 1965 models (late 1964) will not be registered until it has at least two sets of safety belts in the front seat.

That is what we are advocating in this State. We do not advocate that four belts should be compulsory, but we suggest that belts be used in the front seat. Someone may ask, "How can you compel people to do that?"

It has been suggested that unless the car is equipped with seat belts it should not be registered. The same principle applies to car horns and other devices. The *Advertiser* of May 11, 1962, states:

U.S. Enquiry for S.A. Car Seat Belts.—An Adelaide firm which makes car safety belts yesterday received an enquiry from the United States, wanting to know if a minimum of 9,000 belts could be delivered before June 1. The American firm wants between 9,000 and 15,000 belts, valued at between £17,000 and £30,000, for use in B.M.C. and Volkswagen cars.

A spokesman for the South Australian firm, Tudor Accessories Ltd., said that the belts had been on display at the current New York Motor Show, and were in demand because of their unique design. The spokesman added that his firm was seeking further markets in the West Indies, Canada and some Asian countries.

I hope that I have drawn the attention of members to this important matter so we can be up to date with our thinking on it. The article concludes:

The Premier (Mr. Heffron) had safety belts fitted to his two Ministerial cars more than a year ago.

In the *Advertiser* of July 5, under the heading "Seat Belts Required in England Soon", the following appears:

London, July 4.—The British Government proposed to make a regulation requiring all new cars to be fitted with safety belts for the driver and front passenger, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Ministry of Transport (Mr. Hay) said in the House of Commons last night.

Melbourne, July 4.—A General Motors-Holden's spokesman said tonight that his company had decided to fit safety belt anchorage plates to all Holdens as soon as possible. It was likely that by the end of the month all Holdens coming off production lines would be fitted.

I hope that the attention of insurance companies will be drawn to the fact that the use of seat belts is a means of saving life.

Mr. Shannon: They know all about it.

Mr. HARDING: The companies should investigate whether it would not pay them to grant concessions to the users of seat belts who take out policies with them. I support the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I am sorry to disappoint the member for Mitcham, but I cannot support his Bill. I am willing to support any measure that will make motoring safer, and I believe that the wearing of seat belts will achieve that result, but this Bill does not make it compulsory for such belts to be worn. It provides that these belts shall be

fitted to cars, but the wearing of them is entirely optional. I have travelled in many cars here and in other States in which belts have been fitted. The drivers, who have been compelled by law, have worn them, but the other passengers have not. The safety belts have been left lying on the seats. In fact they have caused discomfort in many instances because the passengers have sat on the buckles.

Mr. Harding: They were old-fashioned seat belts.

Mr. HEASLIP: No, they were modern. The buckles are uncomfortable to sit on.

Mr. Shannon: You're not supposed to sit on them!

Mr. HEASLIP: I know. Most people do not wear the seat belts, so this legislation would be ineffective. The Bill compels the manufacturer or driver of a motor car to have seat belts fitted. This will be lucrative to the manufacturers of seat belts.

Mr. Freebairn: A seat belt offers protection to the front-seat passenger.

Mr. HEASLIP: Not unless he wears the belt. The Bill does not compel a person to wear such a belt, therefore I cannot support it.

Mr. Millhouse: Then why not amend it?

Mr. HEASLIP: I should be happy to do so, if I thought that the Bill could be amended.

Mr. Shannon: If you sat on a buckle for a mile or two, you would soon put the seat belt around you.

Mr. Jennings: I think it would leave an impression.

Mr. HEASLIP: It would be good if motorists wore seat belts. This Bill, however, does not go far enough: it does not compel people to wear seat belts. I have driven many miles in motor cars—primarily departmental cars—and the seat belts have been totally ignored. Members have quoted articles lauding such belts. An Opposition member drew attention to an article in today's *News*, but that article does not favour this Bill. It is headed "Belts Prove Worth" and states:

Safety belts have proved their worth to the satisfaction of the Snowy Mountains Authority, which has equipped all its vehicles with them and made their use compulsory.

This Bill does not make their use compulsory. The member for Victoria (Mr. Harding) supports the Bill, but he does not know what he is supporting.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course he does!

Mr. Harding: Half a loaf is better than none.

Mr. HEASLIP: The honourable member said that in aeroplanes all passengers wore

safety belts. Of course they do because they would be put off the aircraft if they refused to fasten the seat belt when requested to do so by the air hostess. Seat belts are not uncomfortable and it is no hardship to wear them, but a person will not wear a seat belt unless compelled to do so.

Mr. Nankivell: I wear one voluntarily.

Mr. HEASLIP: Then the honourable member is one of the few who does. About 5 per cent of Australian cars are fitted with seat belts. I point out that, although these are voluntary fixtures, one out of every five drivers with a seat belt fitted does not use it. Such people are prepared to spend money on fitting belts, but even then one out of every five persons ignores them.

Mr. Nankivell: Don't you think that if seat belts were a standard part of the equipment, people would wear them?

Mr. HEASLIP: My experience is that even where they are fitted they are ignored, except by the drivers required by law to wear them. I cannot see any value in them unless they are around the person in that car. I agree that this is more of an attempt to overcome road accidents.

Mr. Millhouse: It is an attempt to lessen them.

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes. If everybody wore seat belts I am sure it would lessen accidents, but this legislation does not compel people to wear them.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

Mr. HEASLIP: I think we could attack the problem by taking preventive action instead of curative action. I read an article in the *Advertiser* this morning headed "Watching TV in the Back Seat", in which the writer said:

I watched the Beverly Hillbillies on television last night while I was sitting in the back seat of a car travelling along the Anzac Highway. The tiny television set was secured on to the back of the front seat, powered by a car battery, and attached to a living-room type of antenna.

I believe that sort of thing should be outlawed. The Anzac Highway is a busy highway, and it is wrong that people travelling along it in an automobile should watch television, for they could distract the driver's attention. There is a real danger there, because most of our accidents come about through inattentive driving and speed: those are the two big factors. If we distract a

driver's attention by having a wireless or television set in the car we are endangering the lives of people, not only those of passengers riding with that driver but also those of other people on the road. I cannot support the Bill as it stands.

Mr. Millhouse: You disappoint me.

Mr. Shannon: We could make it an offence not to use seat belts.

Mr. HEASLIP: It would be a difficult thing to police.

Mr. Shannon: Would you support that?

Mr. HEASLIP: Yes, if the Bill made the wearing of seat belts compulsory I would support it, because I am sure that many fatal accidents could be avoided and serious injuries reduced.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

FOOD AND DRUGS REGULATION:

MEAT AND MEAT PRODUCTS.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

That Regulation No. 15 (amending the principal regulation No. 40) relating to meat and meat products, made under the Food and Drugs Act, 1908-1962, on April 11, 1963, and laid on the table of this House on June 12, 1963, be disallowed.

(Continued from August 28. Page 727.)

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I move:

That this debate be further adjourned.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has spoken and I think he should move that he have leave to continue his remarks.

Mr. HUGHES: I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

MAINTENANCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 21. Page 619.)

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I am pleased that the Premier has stated that he will support the second reading of this Bill. It is essentially a Committee Bill, and it embraces some laudable provisions. At the request of the gentlemen of the Opposition, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): In anticipation of the fulfilment of the promise given last week, I move:

That this debate be adjourned until Wednesday, September 18.

Motion carried; debate adjourned.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Marketing of Eggs Act, 1941-1959. Read a first time.

PUBLIC PURPOSES LOAN BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, October, 1, 1963.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): On a point of order, *The Practice of the House of Assembly* by Blackmore, at page 77, states:

If it is intended that the House, at its rising, adjourn to any day or hour other than ordinary, such adjournment must be on motion before the business of the day is proceeded with. Notice is usually given of such a motion, and takes precedence on the Notice Paper of all business except questions and formal motions, such as printing petitions and leave to members.

It continues:

This motion is a substantive one, which may be debated, and entitles the mover to a reply. It may also be amended, but the amendment must relate to the time of adjournment only. An amendment to leave out the words "at its rising," in order to insert the word "now" is inadmissible; the question, "That the House do now adjourn," being always put as a distinct question, having no reference to the time at which it is proposed to meet again.

Probably, Mr. Speaker, you would be able in a moment or so to give me a ruling on this matter, because I am particularly concerned with our own Standing Order No. 459, on page 99, reading as follows:

In cases of urgent necessity, any Standing or Sessional Order may be suspended on motion without notice, provided that such motion has the concurrence of an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House of Assembly.

Those two references will do for the time being. In opposing the motion, I am particularly perturbed that it should be submitted for and on behalf of the Government. I remind the Government that on June 12 last, at page 14 of *Hansard*, the following appeared:

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for the appropriation of moneys so that the public services of the State may be carried on in the early part of the next financial year. Clause 2 provides for the issue

and application of £18,000,000 which should suffice to meet normal expenses of the Public Service in July, August and part of September. It will be necessary to introduce another small Supply Bill before the Budget is completed for introduction in this House. Another Supply Bill will be required in mid-September, probably as soon as the House meets again after the Royal Show, and this should enable the Public Service to carry on until Parliament has considered the Estimates of Expenditure and passed the Appropriation Bill for the financial year 1963-64.

Of course, I realize there has been the death of the member for Stirling, and we were most sincere when we paid a tribute to him. Is this adjournment motion of the Premier merely for political purposes? It is certainly not in the interests of the State—far from it.

The SPEAKER: I think that the Leader raised a point of order. Does he want me to give a ruling on whether the House should adjourn to a later date? I think that the honourable member should let me give the ruling first; or is he asking concerning a point of order?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I do not want to embarrass you, Mr. Speaker, but if you gave me a certain ruling on the point I have raised, I might have to disagree with it. I do not want to be forced to do that at this stage. I am concerned with what the Premier has said, and I will repeat the request if I want your ruling.

The SPEAKER: You are not asking for a ruling at this stage?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: No.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member may proceed.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I am concerned with the adjournment motion moved by the Premier and I do not want your ruling, Mr. Speaker, at this stage. I firmly believe that the motion is for political Party purposes only. I am under the impression, as probably are other honourable members, that Stirling is considered a safe Government seat. If it is, why all the sudden rush this afternoon to suggest that we adjourn until October 1? Is it being arranged because of the hesitant policy of the Playford Government? That is the only answer I can find. This is the plea submitted by the Premier, "I should like the Opposition to consider sitting on Tuesday and Wednesday evening." I remind the House that the Opposition is unable to get sufficient sessions of Parliament. I believe that this Parliament is reaching the stage when the most obvious objective is for the Government to keep the House out of session so that its

members may attend social and other functions. I am more than interested in the welfare of the State. The other day when I had the opportunity to speak, unfortunately my voice would not permit me. What I had in mind is worth repeating: if the Government had the real interests of the State at heart, it would not curtail the activities of the railway system beyond O'Halloran Hill, and it would not permit the closing down of other railway services. Will honourable members opposite agree now with the Premier that it is more important to adjourn this House so that members can go to Stirling District to campaign in a by-election in which they are interested? Let me go back a step further. I know that offers were sent to me after the last State elections and I know that a challenge was issued to me to move a vote of no confidence in the Government. How stupid it would have been on my part to move such a motion!

Mr. Ryan: Government members have little confidence in themselves now!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: How stupid when the Government lined up and said it would have 20 members. The Opposition was denied office, and the Government wishes to adjourn the House after what was said a few weeks ago.

Mr. Ryan: Government members are not sincere.

Mr. Curren: There may not be an election yet.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The Government wants to adjourn in the event of an election. Why all this stampede to alter the Constitution to provide for an extra Minister when the matter must now be adjourned?

Mr. Jennings: A few people may be disappointed about that.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Are members opposite concerned at what the Premier said recently: that it is necessary to send all the House of Assembly into Stirling? I wonder if they have thought of it, and of how much the Premier has offended the electors of Stirling, or whether the Government will lose its majority. Are they taking notice of the proposed new farms near Victor Harbour and in other areas? When the Government had the land in the metropolitan area it did not introduce any proposals to retain it for closer settlement with more production. It appeared to be better to subdivide this land, this black soil, and build houses on it. That is all the interest the Government had. So it continued to make errors, and now wishes to send all the

members of the House of Assembly into a district that is recognized as a safe seat for the Government.

Mr. Clark: Perhaps they are safer there than sitting here.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Perhaps the leaders of the sporting fraternity who live in the district of Stirling have been offended at the attitude of the Playford Administration in denying them the right of an inquiry by a Royal Commission into the establishment of the Totalizator Agency Board system of off-course betting. This would not be the first error the Government has made. Suppress! Suppress! Suppress! That is the Government's objective in this case, and free speech is not permitted. Tell the Off-Course Totalizator Committee that there will be no Royal Commission! The Commission could only inquire and make a recommendation, and its report would have to be submitted. I want the people of the Stirling District to note this.

I hate introducing Party politics into this House, but I must on this occasion. I recall travelling many miles in the Yorke Peninsula by-election campaign and seeing how enthusiastically members of the Labor Party canvassed and placed "How to vote" placards in hotels. Those persons who normally voted for the Government, or the Liberal and Country League, forced the issue to such an extent that the hotelkeepers were requested to take down the placards, because the drinkers and supporters may have had different views on a social question from those of the Liberal candidate. The Premier said the House would adjourn to allow members to visit the Royal Show but, within a few days, asked for it to adjourn until October 1 for a political purpose. Is that more important than the matters that were introduced into this House yesterday? Are we going to be asked to sit at night to consider the Budget after October 1?

Mr. Clark: You bet we are!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: If the House adjourns until October 1, I assure Government members they will be sitting here until the end of December.

Mr. Lawn: And perhaps until January 2, too.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I will not agree to sitting on Tuesday and Wednesday evenings. I will finish at 6 p.m., and I expect my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. Lawn: We will.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: If the Government wishes to continue after 6 p.m., its members may find themselves talking to one another. If that is Government by Parliament, then you can have it. I will not use a threat. I was accused on another occasion of not proceeding with the business, but I am not here to engage in a filibuster today. I am here to tell this Government that I am not willing to agree to such an adjournment at this stage. An important matter was introduced into the House yesterday (I hope, with all sincerity) but now it is being repudiated because of the adjournment that is sought. I believe that we are elected to Parliament to meet as a Parliament, to do essential work, but we have not even scratched the surface of this yet. To ask me to agree to the adjournment is beyond all reasonable expectation. Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to exclude necessary discussion, but at this stage I wish to know whether you agree with my interpretation of Blackmore, that the motion before the House is substantive. That is the first ruling I seek.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is asking me to give a ruling whether the Premier is in order in moving this motion?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: No, whether this is a substantive motion.

The SPEAKER: I rule that the motion is in order, and I have several reasons for so doing. At the commencement of this session—and, in fact, every session since 1872—the House has passed the following Sessional Order, namely:

That during the present session, unless otherwise ordered, the House meet on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday in each week at 2 o'clock.

If it is found desirable to otherwise order, as envisaged by this Sessional Order, the practice has been, irrespective of the Government in power, to move this motion without notice. To select one example from a period when only one present member of this House was a member, I refer to the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Assembly in 1931. The usual Sessional Order governing the days and hours of meeting was moved at the commencement of the session on March 17. On April 2, the Premier (Hon. Lionel L. Hill), with Mr. Speaker Shepherd in the Chair, moved without notice:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, June 2.

This example illustrates the principle on which I now give my ruling that this motion to fix the next day of sitting, moved without notice, is in order.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I did not ask for that ruling. I asked you, Sir, to rule whether, according to Blackmore, this was a substantive motion. I did not ask for anything else.

The SPEAKER: The point the Leader is raising is a second point of order: whether on his quotation from Blackmore I should rule that the Premier's motion is a substantive motion. I draw attention to the fact that I do not know from which chapter of Blackmore he is quoting. I point out that Blackmore was published in 1890 and many precedents have been established since then. I think I am still in order in ruling that the Premier's motion is in order.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I do not want to involve the Speaker at this stage, because I am concerned only with the Premier and his followers. I will not at this stage challenge your ruling, Mr. Speaker, because other members may want to debate this motion.

The SPEAKER: This motion is "That the House at its rising do adjourn until" another day. This motion may be debated or amended by any member of the House. It is open for debate and I will not curb any member who wants to speak to it. There may be confusion in the minds of members whether they can debate this motion. It may be debated and amended, but the motion at the end of the day—"That the House do now adjourn"—cannot be debated.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I rise on a further point of order. Mr. Speaker, you have ruled that a motion in the form in which the Premier has moved this motion—"That the House at its rising do adjourn to a date" other than the ordinary day fixed by the Sessional Order—is in order. I now take the point of order that, if that motion is moved without the general concurrence of the members of the House, notice is required. I draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to Erskine May, at page 397 of the 16th edition.

Mr. Frank Walsh: That is later than the edition I quoted from, and is later than the late Lionel Hill.

Mr. DUNSTAN: That is so. At page 397, May states:

Motions may be divided into: 1. Independent or substantive motions;—

and you have ruled that this is a substantive motion, Mr. Speaker—

and 2. Dependent or subsidiary motions

Stated generally, substantive motions require notice, whereas dependent or subsidiary motions do not.

At page 398, the paragraph headed "Waiver of Notice" states:

The House can waive the right of requiring notice for a substantive motion, if the motion is moved under the sanction of the Chair and with the general concurrence of the House.

Several instances are then given, including instances of this particular type of motion, and the debates of the House of Commons and the Journals of the House of Commons are referred to, where, with the sanction of the Chair and with the general concurrence of the House, a motion for the adjournment of the House to a day other than that provided by Standing Order No. 1—which is equivalent to our Sessional Order—was moved and notice was not required. But, Mr. Speaker, in every one of those cases, as in the case which you cited concerning the Hon. Lionel Hill and Mr. Speaker Shepherd, it was done with the general concurrence of the House and notice could, therefore, be waived. However, if members rise in their places and object, then it is not with the general concurrence of the House. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the only way it can then be done is by the suspension of Standing Order No. 226, which states:

No member shall make any motion, initiating a subject for discussion, but in pursuance of notice openly given at a previous sitting of the House, and duly entered on the Notice Paper.

No such notice was previously given, and no notice appeared on the Notice Paper. The only way the Premier can evade the fact that he is moving a motion that has not the general concurrence of the House—and therefore the provisions for the giving of notice of a substantive motion are not waived by general concurrence—is to move under Standing Order 459 to suspend Standing Order 226 to enable him to move the motion he has moved. As members have not indicated general concurrence, but have indicated the opposite, I ask that you, Mr. Speaker, rule that notice is not waived and that notice is required of a substantive motion, in which case the motion is not in order unless the Premier moves for the suspension of Standing Orders under Standing Order 459.

The SPEAKER: I think that what the honourable member is overlooking, although he gave me instances of the motion referred to moved by the Hon. Lionel Hill, is that that motion was moved without leave and without the concurrence of the House being sought.

Mr. Dunstan: That was so in the instances cited in May relating to the House of Commons.

The SPEAKER: Just a moment! Yesterday the Premier, when the House met, sought leave of the House to move a motion—which he did—concerning a deceased member. That is the procedure exactly. I think the point the honourable member has overlooked is that this is a Sessional Order that stands for Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday unless otherwise ordered. This motion is seeking the House's opinion on the question of whether the House should adjourn, and in this case the adjournment would be to an otherwise ordered day. There are plenty of precedents for that.

Mr. DUNSTAN: In each of the cases cited by May, as can be seen if the debates of the House of Commons are examined, the procedure was followed exactly as the procedure which you, Mr. Speaker, have read out of the Hon. Lionel Hill. Leave is not sought of the House. It is taken on the moving of this motion that if there is no objection the requirement of notice is waived. It is not necessary to get the leave of the House for it. I cited as an example the instance that I have examined in the House of Commons debate—1923, vol. 162, column 1639—where the same procedure was followed, and May says that that is a waiver of notice which can take place only with the general concurrence of members.

The SPEAKER: I thought I made it clear that where the general concurrence of the House on questions such as this is sought it is necessary to get leave. This motion is not one for which it is necessary to get leave. The honourable member said that the general concurrence of the House must be obtained, but there is a difference of opinion on that matter. I rule that the House is in charge of its own business, and an adjournment of the House to another day is being sought. The point is, "Unless otherwise ordered". The House is in order in doing that, surely.

Mr. Dunstan: There has been no notice given of it.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I think I would be only wasting time carrying the argument any further at this stage. In the circumstances, seeing that you, Mr. Speaker, persist in the ruling you have given, I move:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER: The Leader must bring up the reasons in writing.

Mr. Lawn: What happened the other day has been taken advantage of by the Government now. They are all running for cover.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has moved:

That the Speaker's ruling be disagreed to on the grounds that it is not in order to move a motion that the House at its rising do adjourn to a day other than that already ordered unless on notice pursuant to Standing Order 226, except upon the waiving of the requirements of notice by the general concurrence of members. Members must understand that this is now a very limited debate. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Coreoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (Teller), and Fred Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (Teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele and Mr. Teusner.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes: There being an equality of numbers, I give my vote in favour of the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

The SPEAKER: The motion before the Chair is that moved by the Premier:

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, October 1, 1963.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In view of the interesting information I have received, I desire to move an amendment to the motion and to nominate Tuesday, September 17, as the date on which the House shall resume.

The SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member would be in order in moving the amendment at this stage.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I move the following amendment:

To delete "October 1" and insert "September 17".

On behalf of my Party, I consider it is most important that legislation coming before the House should not be further delayed. Earlier this afternoon I mentioned what the Premier said on a certain matter—that the Bill was introduced to enable Supply to meet payments, particularly to the Public Service. I was willing to continue the debate today if necessary and to assist the Government. The Government should take notice of what I say about the introduction of legislation in the

interests of the State's future. Must we deal with this matter piecemeal and must we now adjourn until October 1?

Mr. Ryan: Why October 1?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: It is because of a by-election in Stirling District on September 28. There will be three weeks' campaigning, including Show Week. I am prepared to agree even now that there should be a resumption on September 17. I believe in the Party system of government, and I make no apology for it, as I am an advocate of that system.

Mr. Clark: But you do not believe in only one Party?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I believe in the Party system of Government. My Party holds an annual conference and has selected a weekend in June (the holiday weekend) and I know that Government members have selected the Show Week for their Party meeting. I am willing to grant them that to let them have their conference, visit the show, and entertain country people who are in town.

I know that my Party was accused of certain things earlier this week. In this House yesterday I spoke with sincerity about the unfortunate passing of the member for Stirling. If the House doesn't agree to my amendment, then I can only say the consequences are on the heads of members opposite. I am compelled to say that this is the most unfortunate motion I have heard in this place for many a day. Members opposite are willing to use the weight of their numbers. I tried my hardest, Mr. Speaker, to keep you out of this argument today, but I failed. The Speaker has to uphold his ruling. I am not concerned with that, but I am disappointed. I am most concerned with the motion. I could say a thing or two that would disparage the Government on this matter. This is a dishonourable motion and a poor tribute to the late member for Stirling, that the Government should adjourn the House for such a long period when there is so much to be done. I make no apology for this statement. I will do my best to prevent evening sessions to discuss the Budget, so the Government should not ask for them, because it may be disappointed. Government members may find themselves here alone supporting their own legislation because of the proposal made this afternoon.

Mr. Ryan: They may not be a Government when they come back.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: We all know the importance of this; we should not bury our heads in the sand. I am willing to visit the Stirling District every day, including weekends, and hope that we can win that district and govern in our own right, something that we have been denied since the last State election. Members opposite should not deny that or smirk about it, because I may say something that I shall regret. We are disappointed that such an attempt should be made to move for a long adjournment for the purpose of taking part in a by-election in the Stirling District. It is a most dishonourable action and not in the interests of this State.

Mr. LAWN: I support the amendment and am disgusted with the Premier's motion. Last week, when I asked him about the sittings of the House this week he replied that the House would sit on Tuesday and Wednesday—but not in the evenings—and adjourn on Wednesday until September 17. On Monday, because of the unfortunate loss of one of our members on the previous Friday, members of this House attended a funeral. The Premier indicated, when he moved the motion of sympathy yesterday, that he was pleased at the large attendance of members. We went to pay our respects to the late member for Stirling. On the same day, even before the burial service was conducted, the *News* printed on the front page a most despicable story: that the executive of the Party I have the honour to represent was meeting, or had met, in the Trades Hall to discuss action against the Government this week, to take advantage of the sad loss of the member for Stirling. My colleagues and I strongly resented that article, as did our wives. When we went home that evening we were asked, "Surely that is not true; you are not doing this?" We have had other inquiries, and we strongly resent the imputation by the *News* that we were attempting to take advantage of the death of Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Bywaters: We believe in fair play.

Mr. LAWN: Of course we do. Let me remind the House that the Leader made it clear yesterday that we resented the *News* article, which was untrue. The meeting had been arranged last Thursday and had nothing to do with the death of the member for Stirling. I was told about the meeting on Thursday, and I had a meeting on Monday of this week, which had to be put off until Tuesday because of the executive meeting on Monday. We hear so much about the *status quo* when it suits the Government and the people it represents. I have heard these words used in

the arbitration courts and sometimes in the Supreme Court. I have heard the expression here in the 13 years I have been a member, either from the Speaker or from the Chairman of Committees more than once when dealing with a matter, the vote being cast so that the *status quo* would remain. We had no desire to take advantage of recent happenings, but the Government is not prepared to let the *status quo* remain. It now wants to take advantage of the circumstances. The Government is not showing responsibility in governing this State. It is showing irresponsibility now, as it has done previously, and is running for cover. As it comprises the elected representatives of the people, its duty is to govern, and if it has not the courage to do so then it should get out. The Leader referred to another statement of the Premier last week, when, in addition to telling the House what he wished regarding the sittings, he said it would be necessary to have another Supply Bill passed before the Budget was discussed. Was that statement true? Is it necessary for a Supply Bill to be passed to enable the Public Service and other State services to continue before the Budget is finalized, because it will not be finalized now until October?

Mr. Ryan: It is not important any longer.

Mr. LAWN: I am emphasizing the irresponsible statements from the other side.

Mr. Ryan: And we get irresponsible Government, too.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The Premier refused to answer a question by the member for Enfield today, knowing that he wanted to say it on ADS 7 tonight. He treated this House with contempt. Perhaps he should have told the member for Enfield that the member could hear the reply on ADS 7. The Premier told us last week that he wanted to pass a Supply Bill before the Budget was finalized.

Mr. Jennings: What does he expect us to believe?

Mr. LAWN: He expects the people to believe him. The people have heard it since 1938, and they are showing what they think of him by taking one or two members away from the Government side every election.

Mr. Hutchens: Will he be on television tonight? A by-election is pending.

Mr. LAWN: The laws of this country do not matter to this Government. The Premier appears on ADS 7 on the Wednesday night prior to an election, contrary to the rules of the Australian Broadcasting Commission.

Mr. Ryan: Because there is a sympathetic Liberal Government in Canberra.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, because he knows his henchmen in Canberra. He realizes that he will not be prosecuted. He has appeared on television before elections in the past and he will appear again whenever it suits him. He treats Parliament with contempt. I do not want to labour this question. My Party has no intention of taking an advantage of the sad loss of Mr. Jenkins. We did nothing yesterday or today to suggest that we would take advantage. Yesterday a Minister approached me and said, "Are we sitting tonight?" and I replied, "No, last week the Premier said that we would not be sitting on Tuesday and Wednesday nights this week, and that we would adjourn tomorrow until September 17." I won't mention the Minister's name, unless he is prepared to let me. He said, "We were wondering what you chaps were going to do tonight." I told him that the Leader had made our position clear. Government members thought yesterday that we were going to turn something on and take advantage of Mr. Jenkins's death, but we had no such intention, as we proved. We expected to adjourn today until September 17, but now the Government is running for cover, revealing its irresponsibility. I oppose the motion and support the Leader's amendment. I hope that on this occasion we can expect some fairness from you, Mr. Speaker, and that you will support the amendment.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I support the amendment. Last Monday when I heard the announcement that the Labor Party was going to great lengths to have Mr. Riches brought back from overseas I hung my head in shame because I thought that if my Party, which I have been pleased to be associated with, was going to stoop to such tactics, I should not be happy. I immediately communicated with Adelaide and discovered that the announcement was not true. I think that the Leader effectively made our position clear yesterday. He said that we were not prepared to take advantage of the Government in the circumstances prevailing. I was proud of the Leader's statement, which was made sincerely and in a Christian manner. This Government had nothing to fear from my Party, so it came as a great surprise this afternoon to hear the Premier taking advantage of the adjournment because he feared the undertaking given by my Leader. Earlier this year I said the public believed that Parliament was out of session far too long. Several members opposite publicly agreed with me. Did not the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) gain

headlines in the press when he said that Parliament was out of session far too long? Now, just as Parliament is beginning to settle down to the serious consideration of our legislative programme, the Government, despite the Leader's undertaking, wants to adjourn the sittings in defiance of the wishes of the general public. The Government claims that the adjournment is necessary because several of its members want to take part in the by-election campaign for Stirling.

Mr. Ryan: That was only an excuse.

Mr. HUGHES: We know that now, although at the time we did not realize it was an excuse. We do now, because the Premier is obviously afraid to accept the Leader's undertaking. Obviously, if the House adjourns for a month the Government will expect us to sit late at night to rush legislation through before the end of the year.

Mr. Loveday: Which is a bad thing.

Mr. HUGHES: Exactly. The member for Mitcham said that it was a bad thing when he spoke during the Address in Reply debate. It does not make for good legislation. I agree with the Leader that if the Government adjourns the House haphazardly it cannot expect the Opposition to agree to sitting late at night later in the year. It is interesting to note the following statement in *Hansard*:

If we do not meet, and have such long gaps, people will inevitably start asking whether there is any need for us to meet at all. By our not meeting we are to some extent undermining the federal system of government to which all members of this side subscribe.

That statement was made not by a member of the Opposition but by a Government member; yet this afternoon the member who made that statement will vote for the House to be adjourned for a month. I wonder how he (as well as other members opposite) can face his constituents, particularly after stating that the House is out of session far too long. I support the amendment.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I support the amendment. I need not delay the House long, particularly as I support the remarks made by the member for Wallaroo. The excuse given by the Premier for this long adjournment is, of course, absolutely specious. I have taken part in several by-election campaigns, but I have never yet known the House to adjourn to enable members to participate in such campaigns. What about the election in Frome when the present member (Mr. Casey) was elected? That was while the House was in

session, and it was not a seat based on Victor Harbour, 60 miles away; it took in an area up to Alice Springs and across to Radium Hill and such places.

Mr. Clark: Yet it was possible to keep the business of the House going.

Mr. JENNINGS: The House did not adjourn for that period. I make this point, too: whether or not the House is adjourned for the period of the by-election campaign will not particularly worry members on this side of the House, because we will be there every night that the House is not in session and over the weekend. I hope members opposite spend a lot more time there than they are likely to, because that would do us a lot of good. On the other hand, we know that members opposite do not participate very much in by-elections, for the Liberal Party has its own paid hirelings to do its electioneering.

Mr. Lawn: And they bring members along to parade up and down the main street.

Mr. JENNINGS: The member for Wallaroo made a good point when he said that the members for Mitcham and Light, during the Address in Reply debate, trenchantly criticized our present system of keeping Parliament out of session for more than half the year. After that, they came back for a few weeks and introduced the Budget, which had to be introduced by a certain date and which according to the Treasurer had to be finalized by a certain date. Now the Budget will be suspended in mid-air, like Mahommed's coffin, until after the beginning of October. It could not have been so important after all. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn) was much more moderate when speaking this afternoon than he usually is.

Mr. Ryan: He probably was disgusted.

Mr. JENNINGS: The real point is that the Government is not interested in the by-election: it is interested in the fact that if we resume on September 17 and go on with the ordinary business of this House it will not be able to run the show as it has been doing for so long, and it is frightened that the people of South Australia will realize that when Parliament is not controlled by Playford the sun will still rise in the east and always will. That, or course, is what the Government does not want them to realize. I think what the member for Adelaide should have said this afternoon was that this Government had neither the guts to govern nor the grace to get out.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE (Minister of Lands): I want to take away some of the heart throbs, tearful voices, and pulsing blood that have been in evidence here today. Members opposite are charging this side of the House with dishonesty, but I have never heard such dishonest rubbish in my life as has been put over here this afternoon. Every member of this House knows the reason for this adjournment. The Leader, in seeking this amendment, said he was a Party man. So he is: he honours his Party and adheres to it. If he were in the same position as the Government is in today he would be doing precisely what we are doing, and there would be no absolute nonsense and hypocrisy about it, either. This adjournment, if it is until October 1, will mean that the Government will have the numbers. Let us stop all this nonsense and everything else connected with it. Why the need for all this tearful nonsense regarding what is going to happen? The grim reaper took one of our members, and I honour the Opposition for its attitude on that matter. I wish to say—whether members opposite believe it or not—that when it was suggested in the *News* that the Opposition would take certain action I refused to believe that it would do any such thing. Any member on this side of the House will confirm that. My attitude was that no member opposite would do such a thing.

Mr. Clark: What made you change your mind?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I did not change my mind: members opposite have not changed my mind.

Mr. Loveday: "Put not your trust in Parties," you used to say.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think there is any need for heat in this debate. The Leader of the Opposition and other speakers have kept the debate on a very high plane.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Members opposite should be sincere in this matter.

Mr. Frank Walsh: I was sincere.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I doubt it.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Mr. Speaker, I have been most sincere in this debate this afternoon, and I ask that those remarks be withdrawn.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I withdraw unreservedly. The point is that every honourable member opposite knows that the reason for this adjournment is that, as a Party, we are going for the numbers, and an election intervenes in the interim.

Mr. Clark: Why didn't the Premier tell us that?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I am telling members opposite now. The member for Enfield knew the reason, and he told members the reason. Certain things were said about this Government not being fit to govern. The Leader believes in the Party system, and if he were in the same position as this Government is in today he would do the same thing, and not one member opposite can deny it, so what is all this nonsense that members opposite have been yapping about? I can see other members older and wiser in the ways of Party politics who are smiling to themselves; they know perfectly well that they would do exactly what the Government is doing today, and I, for one, make no apology for doing it.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I support the amendment. I would not have risen to speak but for the remarks of the Minister of Lands, who talked about the honesty of another Party and said that the Opposition would do exactly what the Government is doing now. I want to tell members opposite that the Labor Party is a democratic Party and puts democracy above all other things. I express my sincere sympathy to the members of the Government in the loss of their colleague, but I submit that they have found themselves in this unfortunate position this afternoon because they have not bowed to the will of the people. For far too long they have been ignoring the principles of democratic government and of a democratic Parliament. Following the most recent general election this Government had a minority of members and a minority of voters; it was not returned, but it chose to remain in office. This has been the case for a long time. In 1953 the Labor Party received a majority of more than 47,000 of the votes cast in the election; in 1956 a majority of more than 29,000; in 1959 a majority of more than 47,000; and in the most recent election it secured 219,770 formal votes, or 54 per cent, whereas the Liberal Party—those who were Liberals and went to the country as such—received 140,230 formal votes, or 34 per cent. Following the election the Labor Party had 19 members and the supporters of the Government had a bare 18. Later, when the House met, it had a slight majority on the floor of the House, which consisted of the Speaker's casting vote. Now, because of a misfortune that we all regret, it is left without a majority and, because of that incident, the Labor Party has a majority.

Mr. Bockelberg: No, you have not a majority; it is 18 each.

Mr. HUTCHENS: We have a majority of the members living who would be in the House

on September 17. The Government is in charge of the House against the will of the people, and it does not want it advertised. One famous writer has said that no Government should be in office owing to a misfortune, but the majority in the House should be in keeping with the wishes of the majority of the people. Is not that so? If there is any dishonesty in the way this House is constituted, I ask on whose behalf is that dishonesty regarded. The Government is in office for a fictitious reason, and it wants the House adjourned to permit its members to work in a by-election campaign. It was with a sobbing voice that the argument was put forward, but the Government lost sight of the fact mentioned by members on this side.

For other by-elections the House has not adjourned, and the features of those by-elections were far more difficult than those of any by-election that has arisen 60 miles from the metropolitan area. The facts are that Stirling is a blue ribbon Liberal seat, and it would be most unusual to consider it otherwise. The Government knows that after the by-election it will have restored its numbers to 19.

Mr. Frank Walsh: How do you know?

Mr. HUTCHENS: I am not unhappy in one respect that such a move has been made in this House, because I consider that the people of South Australia believe that Parliament should govern, and that Parliamentarians are employed by them, and they should be in the House doing their job. If this motion is carried, it will defeat the cause of democracy. I hope that honourable members will be democratic enough on this occasion to vote for the amendment and thus allow Parliament to operate in the interests of the people, as it should.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): We have this afternoon had a lesson in *real politik*. As honourable members have said, after the last elections the Government was returned to this House with a minority of members and a small minority of votes. The overwhelming majority of people supported the Party sitting on this side. Undoubtedly, South Australians wanted a Labor Government. A majority of Labor members were returned to this House, yet the Premier would not resign, as most men would do in these circumstances. When he was told that his Party was defeated at the election he said, "Oh no. We are not going to resign at this stage. We will allow the House of Assembly to decide. Parliament must decide on the Government. Its members will be the arbiters. We must meet the Parliament and

abide by its decision. That is the advice we will give to the Governor."

Mr. Ryan: It is not accepted today, though!

Mr. DUNSTAN: When things are different they are not quite the same. When Parliament faces the issues of the State as to what kind of legislation should be passed in the interests of the people members here represent, the Premier says with kindness in his voice that he is concerned for those members who want to spend some time contesting the by-election in Stirling. Therefore, out of sincere consideration for their desires and wishes he says, "I will adjourn the House to enable them to take part in that most important issue."

Mr. Loveday: They love campaigning, don't they?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. They move down the main street in monumental undecoration to the horror of the local citizenry while their paid mercenaries tramp around in the mud and mire. The Premier says the House must adjourn because of the by-election campaign. That is the sentiment on which the Premier bases his announcement to this House. It is not a question of how this House should deal with legislation: he is concerned for the convenience of honourable members in their great interest in the by-election. All that was blown to the four winds when the Minister of Lands rose to give us the dinkum oil. He said, "Let us have no nonsense about this." In fact, he trotted out the old adage: "We on this side believe in the logic of numbers, and when we have the numbers we do not worry about the logic."

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: It is the only thing that counts in Parliament.

Mr. DUNSTAN: I am interested to hear that. Numbers are everything. It is not a question whether the majority of people are able to cast a vote to elect the representatives they want or get the legislation or the Government they want in this place. It is all a question of whether the numbers can be manipulated to keep a minority in power: that is the only thing that determines who is the Government and whether Parliament should be kept in session. There is a minority Government ruling in defiance of the wishes of the people of this State.

Mr. Loveday: The Minister should be an authority on that.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: He has to be.

Mr. DUNSTAN: The Government is determined to see that a dictatorship is kept here and Parliament matters not a cuss. We are in

the middle of the Budget debate and we have to pass a Supply Bill to maintain the Public Service; but those things don't matter. I am reminded of another dictator in another House of Parliament who strode into the House and, pointing to the Mace, said, "Take away that bauble." The Premier does not need to take the Mace away: it is his already. In this State he manipulates the numbers so that he controls it anyway and makes the House a sham front for an effective dictatorship against the wishes of most of the people of the State.

He is trying to maintain a minority dictatorship in defiance of the wishes of the people and to their eternal detriment, because he denies them the social justice and the democracy they have the right to demand, and he denies them on every occasion he can do so. One such occasion is now. We should all be grateful to the Minister of Lands for having been so candid with the House. He has revealed to the people of this State, and not merely to members of this House, in terms that were a little embarrassing to members opposite as they listened, the principles of this Government. Numbers are all: right is nothing! Well, if this is the way the State is to be governed in the future, I hope that there are members in this House who will continue to stand up for the right because eventually, despite the action of members opposite, right will prevail in this State.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: (Premier and Treasurer): I know that several members have appointments for tonight and that it is not desirable for the House to sit after dinner, but there are some things I should say on this matter. I assure the House that the procedure that has been taken is not unusual. Mention was made of the death of Mr. O'Halloran and of the consequent by-election. It was pointed out by an honourable member that the House did not adjourn on that occasion. I can say why. As the seat was normally a Labor seat, had honourable members opposite sought an adjournment it would undoubtedly have been granted; but the House did not adjourn and honourable members opposite were able to leave it at their discretion.

Mr. Ryan: So were Government members.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the House is sitting during a by-election campaign honourable members opposite may come and go at will.

Mr. Ryan: Didn't your Ministers go to Frome?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I wish the honourable member would listen to

me. The Government has to keep the House during a by-election campaign, while honourable members opposite have a free hand to come and go. May I, in connection with the death of Mr. O'Halloran and for the information of honourable members, read from the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Assembly of September 22, 1960, as follows:

1. The House met pursuant to adjournment. The Speaker (The Hon. B. H. Teusner) took the Chair.
2. The Speaker read prayers.
3. The Treasurer (The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford), without notice, moved—That the House at its rising, do adjourn until Tuesday, October 4, at 2 o'clock.
Question put and passed.
4. Ordered—That Notice of Motion No. 1 be made an order of the day for Tuesday, October 4.
5. Ordered—That orders of the day No. 1 to No. 15 be orders of the day for Tuesday, October 4.
6. The Treasurer, by leave, informed the House of the death of Mr. M. R. O'Halloran, and moved without notice: That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of Mr. M. R. O'Halloran, member for Frome and Leader of the Opposition, and places on record its appreciation of his public services; and requests the Speaker to send a letter of sympathy to his widow.

That is a case where the Government immediately on the death of an honourable member opposite adjourned the House for the convenience of the Labor Party. We knew that members opposite had to appoint a new Leader and that it would be grossly unfair to bring a new Leader into the House at short notice to debate the matters on the Notice Paper. This is not unusual. In fact, on occasions without number the Government has met the Opposition's varied requests for the House to meet or not to meet, and what I said today is correct. It is necessary for the Government to contest this seat, as it is one of absolute importance to the Government.

Mr. Ryan: You have said that at every by-election.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Further, it is absolutely important to the people of South Australia. I go further than that and say that, when the votes of the House are so evenly divided and when important matters are under consideration, a particular district should not be disfranchised. In all these circumstances, I ask that the Leader's amendment be not carried.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn,

Loveday, McKee, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes, and so it passes in the negative.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move—

Mr. FRANK WALSH: On a point of order! What is the question before the House?

The SPEAKER: I was just going to put it. The question before the House is that the motion of the Premier be agreed to.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (18).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (18).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

The SPEAKER: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes I give my casting vote in favour of the Ayes, and so it passes in the affirmative.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:

That the sittings of the House be extended beyond 6 o'clock.

Motion carried.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: On a point of order! For my information, and for the information of my Party, can you, Mr. Speaker, say how many times you have found it necessary this afternoon to uphold your own rulings?

The SPEAKER: I do not think that is a point of order at all.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved:

That remaining Orders of the Day be Orders of the Day for October 1.

Motion carried.

At 6.7 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 1, at 2 p.m.