

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Tuesday, February 18, 1964.

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

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTS (TREATMENT) 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 all the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE BILL.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

DEATH OF MR. WILFRED STEELE.

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

That the House of Assembly express its deep regret at the death of Mr. Wilfred Steele, the late husband of the member for Burnside, and that, as a mark of respect, the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I am sure that members will join me in expressing regret at the death of Mr. Steele, the husband of our colleague. Although not a member of this House, he had a wide interest in the pastoral industry and was widely known and respected by everyone who knew him. I am sure that all members join me in expressing sympathy to the member for Burnside in her loss. Previously, when the wife of a member of the House has died, we have expressed our sympathy, and I believe that every honourable member will support my motion. Although, as I have said, he was not a member of this House, Mr. Steele was a most worthy citizen of this State. His work in the pastoral industry was known not only in South Australia but throughout Australia, and his passing will be regretted by his many friends and acquaintances in that industry.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I join with the Premier in expressing the sympathy of this House to the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) in the loss of her husband. Personal sympathies have already been conveyed to her, as well as regrets from the two Parties. I think that this is the first occasion on which sympathy has been tendered to a member whose husband has passed on; normally the House is acknowledging the

passing of a member's wife. I am sure that all members will agree to the suspension of the sitting as an indication of our sympathy.

The SPEAKER: As Speaker I should like to add my support to the motion conveying sympathy to the member for Burnside in the sad loss of her husband. It is a great shock when a person loses, as it were, a right hand. It is an added loss to Mrs. Steele because of her public career and the part she has played in expressing the woman's viewpoint in this Parliament. I convey to her our deep sympathy.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

(Sitting suspended from 2.8 to 2.18 p.m.)

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) laid on the table the report of the Betting Control Board on inquiries into Totalizator Agency Board betting in Victoria and Queensland.

Ordered to be printed.

QUESTIONS.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAMME.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Can the Premier indicate the proposed legislative programme for the rest of this session, the expected duration of the session and the likelihood of night sittings? Can he also say whether the Workmen's Compensation Act will be amended to provide cover in respect of Q fever, which disease was not included in the last amendment to the Bill?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Several members asked me privately how long I believed the session would last, and I told them that I thought it would conclude next week. The legislation it is intended to introduce is, I think, not controversial, except for perhaps one matter. The Bills are mainly concerned with urgent matters but do not alter the basic law. Certain things being investigated will be dealt with in the normal session starting in June or July. The Minister of Agriculture has a Bill concerning potato marketing; the Attorney-General has a Bill concerning land agents; and the Minister of Works is to introduce a Bill dealing with pollution of the beaches. Those three matters are of some urgency. In addition, the Government has been asked to investigate requests concerning matters that would normally be the subject of private members' Bills. They include a request from the Trades Hall for a Bill to enable the present

Trades Hall to be disposed of and more suitable premises erected. The Returned Servicemen's League has asked for a Bill concerning the Semaphore Community Centre. A request has been received for an investigation of the problems connected with the Morphett Street bridge, and it is considered desirable that this work be formally approved by Parliament, although it is not definite that such approval is necessary. A hybrid Bill to provide for the construction and financing of the bridge will be introduced. In addition, small amendments are to be made to the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act. Further, I will give notice today of a motion asking for leave to introduce a Bill dealing with electoral reform and the reconstitution of the electoral districts. I hope to bring it down tomorrow. The hybrid Bills will have to go to Select Committees, and as the session will be short and the authorities concerned are anxious that the Bills be not delayed, I suggest that I be given permission to suspend Standing Orders so that I may give the second reading explanations on the day the Bills are introduced. If it appears to Opposition members that certain matters are straightforward, I suggest that Select Committees be constituted forthwith to investigate them. Regarding other Bills, non-controversial measures could be introduced today and I hope the second reading explanations could be given. In the meantime, the Bill on the Notice Paper that the Government desires the House to attend to is the Constitution Act Amendment Bill dealing with the establishment of an additional Minister. Although I should not like my remarks to be considered to be absolutely conclusive, they are a general summary of the legislation members will have before them. I should like members to be prepared to sit in the evenings so that the session can conclude by the end of next week.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members will realize that the suspension of the sittings of the House today has taken much of the time that would ordinarily be taken up by questions. A terrific number of questions is to be asked, and to give every member an opportunity I ask each member to keep his question down to a limited time.

CAMBRAI WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Will the Minister of Works say whether a decision has been reached in connection with the proposed water reticulation scheme for Cambrai and Sedan and adjoining districts? If the decision

is unfavourable, will he refer the scheme back to the councils concerned with a view to seeing whether substantial modifications can be made thereto to reduce the costs and to enable a rate to be struck that will be economical to landholders concerned?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: At the end of the sittings just before Christmas I undertook to pursue the matter, which I have done. I cannot say that a decision, favourable or unfavourable, has been reached but, so far as we have been able to develop it, no more favourable aspect has emerged. If the honourable member considers that further discussions with the councils will be fruitful, I shall arrange for them. I suggest that he further inquire of the councils whether they are prepared to reconsider the matter and to inform me because, if they are, I have no objections to their reviewing the scheme again to see whether they can make suggestions that may enable a better aspect to be presented.

BASIC WAGE CASE.

Mr. HUTCHENS: In 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959 and 1961, while other State Governments supported or remained neutral in the trade unions' basic wage claims then before the Commonwealth Arbitration Commission, the South Australian Government opposed these claims. Because of the difference in the attitude between this State and that of the other States, can the Premier say whether the Government intends to oppose the basic wage claims set down for hearing this month by the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I would not quite accept the information the honourable member conveyed to the House regarding the attitude of the South Australian Government over the years, because his statement is not correct. In some instances, the Government has not opposed claims but has given information which it believed would be helpful to the commission; in other instances, it has supported claims. The honourable member's initial statement, therefore, cannot be accepted, and I should not like it to appear in *Hansard* as establishing a fact. The South Australian Government is a party to the current proceedings and is bound by them. The awards made are applied to servants of the Government in many instances, and the Government has every right as a Government to state what it believes to be the proper procedure. I make no apology for approaching the commission and asking it to consider certain points

of view that we may have to put before it. I have never denied unions the same right. If the commission cannot be approached by both parties and cannot receive evidence, obviously its whole purpose is nullified. Regarding the current hearing, I considered the matter with my colleagues in Cabinet, and we decided that we would not at this stage make any representations in the matter but that we would have our industrial officer available to attend the sittings from time to time to see whether any matters arose upon which we desired to comment. We are not making formal submissions but we are reserving the right to hear what is being said and, if necessary, to correct any information supplied and to comment on any award that might be determined. The Government will, of course, have the right to express its views. We are not formally opposing submissions to the court, but we intend to send our industrial officer with a watching brief.

ANTI-SMOKING CAMPAIGN.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Today's press refers to a recent decision in Melbourne by State Ministers of Health with particular emphasis on the use of television and radio in an anti-tobacco campaign. The report states:

The Federal Government will be asked to give assistance in a Commonwealth-wide health campaign against cigarette smoking.

Can the Premier indicate the extent of that campaign?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister of Health has not yet returned from that important conference and, consequently, has been unable to tell Cabinet of the work the conference has undertaken. I am sure that I speak for my Cabinet colleagues and for honourable members generally when I say that considerable disquiet has resulted from the report of the direct connection between cigarette smoking and lung cancer. Every honourable member realizes that it is not possible by Act of Parliament to change people's habits arbitrarily. All members would agree that any educational campaign, particularly if it has an impact on young people, would be of great future benefit. My Government will strongly support any educational campaign which has for its purpose a reduction in cigarette smoking, particularly by young people. It is not possible to change people's habits by legislative action, but I believe that over a period an educational campaign may effect some benefits. It will be beneficial if we can dissuade teenagers from automatically taking up smoking.

NORTHFIELD SCHOOL FIRE.

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Education any general information on the recent unfortunate fire at the Northfield Primary School when six classrooms were destroyed? Further, why has he suspended from school two six-year-old children who were allegedly responsible for the fire? Does he not think that his action constitutes an open invitation to six-year-old children to burn down their schools and so get a holiday from school? On the other hand, if six-year-old children are more sensitive than we think they are, has the Minister considered the possibility that when they return to school they may be subjected to feelings of guilt? In any case, what good does the Minister consider he has possibly served by interrupting the education of these young children at a very formative age—indeed, at such a tender age that no legal action can be taken against them? Further, can the Minister explain how two six-year-old children were able, on a Sunday afternoon, to get into a classroom and take matches from a teacher's desk? I understand that the arrangement for alternative accommodation at the new Strathmont Primary School is as good as can be arranged in the circumstances, but it is obviously a temporary expedient, so can the Minister indicate what arrangements are being made for the replacement of the burnt out classrooms at the Northfield Primary School?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: In reply to the comprehensive series of questions it is, I think, common knowledge that the fire on the afternoon of last Sunday week completely destroyed six classrooms, severely damaged two more, and less severely damaged another two. It was fortunate that members of the school committee were working nearby on completing a new swimming pool which I am to officially open next Saturday. They played fire hoses on the burnings immediately and helped the Fire Brigade. I believe that the school committee and the Fire Brigade made a splendid save in isolating the fire, which could easily have destroyed several of the classrooms accommodating the more than 1,300 students of the school.

The two boys concerned made an unauthorized entry on to the school grounds that afternoon. They entered the classroom—their own classroom—by an unlocked door and they took a box of matches out of a drawer of the teacher's desk and set alight numerous papers and books. Having got that fire under way they went outside and set alight papers in

several rubbish bins. Cabinet has requested me to make a searching inquiry into the reasons for this fire in particular and into the powers, functions and responsibilities of caretakers, cleaners and other persons controlling schools and similar buildings. It baffles me how a large school with a paid caretaker in control should have an unlocked door. It is somewhat surprising also that a teacher should leave a box of matches in the classroom. However, the fact remains that these things happen, and I shall be supplying a full report later on this and similar fires that have occurred.

I went to this school early on the Monday morning with the Director of Education and the Superintendent of Primary Schools. We made immediate arrangements for at least four classes of children to be transported to the nearby Strathmont Primary School, which was recently opened and which has accommodation in excess of immediate requirements. Mr. Slade (Director of Public Buildings) assured me that he would immediately plan for the replacement of the classrooms destroyed.

Although the two boys were aged only six years, one was an extremely smart, precocious and arrogant boy. Neither of them gave any reason for lighting this series of fires nor did they express any contrition. They came along blithely to school as though nothing had happened. The Minister of Education has power to expel from school a pupil who has been guilty of a serious breach of discipline or similar conduct if the Minister considers it to be in the interests of other pupils. I did not expel these two boys, but I suspended them temporarily in the interests of the other 1,300 pupils and as a salutary lesson to those two boys and to thousands of other boys of all ages who might be tempted to do the same thing. Rather than the boys having a holiday, I know that their parents are extremely upset that the boys were suspended, because it has exposed the boys. They are no longer two anonymous boys: their guilt has been exposed to the whole of their class and to the neighbourhood. I think that is a reply to most of the questions that the honourable member asked. I hope that a start will be made soon on erecting more rooms to replace those that were unfortunately burned down.

GIDGEALPA GAS.

Mr. LAUCKE: Can the Premier say what significance he attaches to the recent discovery of gas at Gidgealpa?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I make it clear that I do not recommend that

any honourable member either buy or sell shares in the companies concerned. However, this find is undoubtedly the first significant success we have had with oil exploration in South Australia. Speaking from memory, this is the ninth hole that the companies have drilled either in South Australia or just over the Queensland border. Although in the other eight holes, and particularly in the first seven, the information obtained was rather poor, the companies persevered with a most expensive programme. The eighth hole provided interesting geological information and led to the immediate drilling, within two miles, of the ninth hole where the discovery was made. I witnessed the tests for two days at the end of last week. Undoubtedly, a large volume of gas would come from this bore if it were allowed to flow freely. Actually, all the tests have been made with a small vent. The custom in the Eastern States has been to use a $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch vent, whereas most of the tests in South Australia have been through a $\frac{1}{4}$ -inch vent, which is only a quarter as large as the choke being used in the Eastern States. The gas is pure and of high quality. I think four of the sections of the well have been tested and, speaking from memory, the figures for those sections are: for the first, 2,800,000 cub. ft. of gas a day; the second, 3,200,000; the third, 5,000,000; and the fourth, 3,200,000. It now has to be determined how big the gas-producing area is, and no doubt that will take some time. With the qualification I have mentioned, I believe that this is indeed a most significant find and that it could lead to something important in the development of this State.

TENNYSON-GLENELG BUS SERVICE.

Mr. FRED WALSH: The suspension of the regular private bus service between Tennyson and Glenelg has caused much controversy, a fact which has come to my notice through correspondence, and through discussions with people. No doubt the Minister of Education knows something of this matter, because he was approached regarding it and the position was alleviated to some extent following the provision by the Municipal Tramways Trust of a school bus. Considerable inconvenience has been caused to residents along that route. A letter that I received from the Northcote Home Incorporated reads:

On behalf of Northcote Home Incorporated we feel that now is the opportune time to express concern at the cancellation of the bus service between Port Adelaide and Glenelg via Tennyson. We have read with much apprehension of the discontinuance of this service. As

you must realize, staff is always a problem in institutions of this nature; it is now doubly so because of no transport other than the train service and Municipal Tramways Trust buses which only extend to the Grange railway station. This terminal is exactly one mile from Northcote Home and after being on duty all day, should any of the staff desire to go out at night, they have this walk to and from the bus in front of them. We have no means of transport at the home and are very concerned for the welfare of our staff during this long trek to transport.

Trips to the Adelaide Children's Hospital with children needing treatment are always difficult, necessitating the use of a taxi more often than not, as these toddlers cannot stand up to the long walk. This transport is a problem to all the residents along the route, and we feel sure you will have their backing in every way should you have the time to take the matter up with the proper authorities on our behalf. We will be very grateful to hear from you in due course.

I think the whole matter of intra-suburban services, and this route especially, should be considered by the Municipal Tramways Trust. Will the Premier take up with the trust the question of running a regular bus service between Semaphore and Glenelg?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Premier has asked me to accept the honourable member's question because this matter has been investigated by me. I do not want to go over the history of the matter, which the honourable member knows. I recall that he asked a question some time ago about the cancellation of the service from Glenelg to Port Adelaide. When the school problem arose, I saw the General Manager and the Traffic Manager of the Municipal Tramways Trust, and we discussed possible ways of overcoming the problem. Apparently the first solution was not very satisfactory to residents, but a later re-organization was made which I believe, as the honourable member suggested, overcame the school problem fairly satisfactorily. The matter he now raises concerning the public generally and general travel is another thing. If he will let me have the correspondence, I shall be happy to discuss it with the General Manager of the trust to see if we can meet the problem. The licensed service operating from Glenelg to Port Adelaide became unprofitable for various reasons, and that is probably the main reason why the operator decided he could no longer continue it. I do not know whether the public is prepared to support the reopening of such a public service to the extent necessary to justify it, but I shall be happy to discuss with the General Manager the problem now raised.

ROAD FUNDS.

Mrs. STEELE: I understand that within the next few weeks the form of the new Commonwealth Aid Roads Act, which will operate until 1969, is to be considered. In view of the concern of local government authorities (amongst which are the two municipalities I have the honour to represent) which are being called upon to meet, out of allocations geared to meet only the normal requirements of councils, tremendous demands for road construction, maintenance and traffic aids caused by the ever-increasing traffic flow, will the Premier say whether the Government intends to urge the Commonwealth Government to consider providing special assistance to allow the construction of a road system capable of meeting the most urgent demands of the future, a task of such magnitude that it seems to be beyond the combined resources of local government authorities and State Governments? Will the concern of local government authorities, particularly in South Australia, be stressed by him and the Minister of Roads with a view to assisting such authorities in their future road construction and maintenance problems?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The policy of the Commonwealth Government in this matter has not yet been determined. I know this because the Commonwealth Government has asked each State Premier to make a submission on what Commonwealth policy in this matter should be. South Australia has made a submission, and I have no doubt that the Premiers of other States have also made submissions. The South Australian submission in the first place was to the effect that we did not believe that the overall amount suggested by the Commonwealth would be sufficient to meet traffic problems that would arise in the period within which the agreement would operate. If I may elaborate on that: in the first place we have had the big undertaking of improving communications into the country, and we are now confronted with the much more expensive job of starting to construct freeways in the city. Everyone who has any experience of this type of construction knows that freeways are an expensive road problem. I inspected a freeway in one of the larger cities in the United States and found that a 20-mile stretch of road cost no less than £18,000,000. When there is dense traffic and an attempt is made to give the travelling public some chance of avoiding congestion, there is a very severe restriction. Regarding our general policy, we believe that the money should be provided to the States, which should have a free hand in its allocation. The States

have various ways of doing it. South Australia gives a large percentage of the money to local government, and I believe we get good value from it. We believe that all moneys provided by the Commonwealth for roads should come under the agreement. We should not have an agreement and at the same time have other States getting special allocations outside the agreement. This completely nullifies the original basis of the allocation. We do not object to special amounts being provided for outback areas, which has been a feature of Commonwealth legislation in the past; we believe that this provision is desirable, as certain outback areas justify improved roads not because of the traffic count but because of other considerations. We do not object to the present provision for outback areas being maintained, but we believe that the sum provided apart from this should be increased. A suggestion has been made by other States that an additional 3d. a gallon be levied upon the motorist, but we do not believe there is at present any justification for increasing taxation paid by the motorist. He is already paying more than is being spent on roads and until that position is rectified we do not believe it is desirable that special taxation be applied. We believe that the States' road authorities are the best authorities to determine these expenditures. Although we do not object to interstate consultation, we object to any provision to establish an overall organization that would be operating from some other place and directing this State's road policy. That policy can best be determined in South Australia, where honourable members can voice the needs of their districts and have them considered.

WHYALLA MAGISTRATE.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Will the Minister of Education, representing the Attorney-General, consult his colleague about the appointment of a resident magistrate at Whyalla? As I wrote a letter on this matter to the Attorney-General on October 24, will the Minister ask his colleague whether it has been considered and what is being done about it?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I am pleased to say "Yes" to all three questions.

MINGARY SCHOOL BUS.

Mr. CASEY: The Minister of Education may recall that last year I made representations to him on behalf of schoolchildren at Mingary in the North-East of this State for a school bus to travel to Cockburn. Unfortunately his department decided not to provide a school bus

last year when 11 children were of school-going age. I took up the matter again at the end of last year after a subsidized school bus was provided by a local resident of Cockburn (the only permanent resident), but unfortunately this person withdrew his bus so that this year no bus is available for the children. I have since received a letter from the Acting Minister of Education (in the absence of the Minister) stating that the committee recommended that a departmental bus be not provided this year but that the offer to subsidize the service be reaffirmed if a suitable operator were available. It is impossible to get a subsidized bus service or a private operator in that area, and the only way—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot debate the question.

Mr. CASEY: —is to provide a school bus. I should be pleased if the Minister would allow me to present a case to him and officers of the Education Department, so that a satisfactory solution might be reached whereby the children could attend school at either Olary or Cockburn.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall be pleased to receive representations from the honourable member, and suggest that he arrange to see me at my office, when I will have the chairman of the School Bus Contracts Advisory Committee present to consider how we can iron this thing out once and for all.

WATER RESEARCH FOUNDATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I understand that this question should be addressed to the Premier as it is a matter of policy. Last Thursday there appeared in the *Advertiser* a report of a meeting of the Water Research Foundation of Australia. As South Australia is the driest State in the Commonwealth I was surprised to see that the report stated that every State Government in Australia, except the South Australian Government, contributed money to the foundation. I have since inquired about the Water Research Foundation and have seen a copy of its Eighth Annual Report and balance sheet and, from that information, I gather that it is a body that should be supported. Can the Premier say whether it is the policy of the Government to support and encourage the activities of this foundation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I suggest that the honourable member put that question on notice. We have received certain information about this matter and I understand that officers of the Government have recommended that the Government do not contribute towards this foundation. I do not want the

honourable member to mistake the Government's policy in this matter. It is not against water conservation; I want that to be clear. The Government is undertaking a special programme, which was discussed only last week when I was in the Great Artesian Basin, for better conservation methods in that area. As the honourable member knows, the Government is undertaking at present an important water conservation scheme on the River Murray. Obviously the Government does not oppose water conservation, but it does not necessarily believe that it is the function of the Government to support every organization which decides to call itself a foundation, but which, having done that, then suggests spending the taxpayers' money without any control by Parliament in the matter. We believe that direct control should be imposed on the expenditure of the money, rather than that the control be given to some other authority. That is what is involved in this matter. If the honourable member desires further information I shall obtain it and let him have a report.

WATER RESTRICTION.

Mr. LAWN: This morning a constituent of mine complained to me that on January 31 an officer from the Engineering and Water Supply Department turned off his water supply and placed a restrictor in the meter. This was done without the knowledge of the householder, who ascertained from his neighbour that the neighbour's supply was not interfered with. After this person spoke to the office at Kent Town, an officer called on him and asked whether he had paid his rates. He told the officer that he had paid them last September or October and produced the receipt. The water supply was then reconnected. As a result of this incident, I ask the Minister of Works whether he will instruct officers that, before interfering with water supplies, they tell the householder what is intended to be done? If that had happened in this case the person would have produced the receipt and there would have been no interference. It is reasonable for a householder to expect that he should be told prior to any interference with the water supply. Will the Minister give these instructions in future?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Obviously there has been an error in the information supplied to the waterworks officer who shut off the water, and some misunderstanding between that officer and the Revenue Branch has occurred regarding the premises concerned. I assure the honourable member that the department never restricts

a water supply without previous warning to an owner. In cases where rates are seriously in arrears (and I emphasize "seriously"), it is only after repeated warnings that the department restricts a supply. The supply is not cut off entirely, but a restrictor is placed in the service to allow toilets and essential functions to operate. At least it acts as a reminder to the householder that he has not paid the rates, and that the restriction of the supply will continue until that is done. This is a case where the Revenue Branch has given certain instructions to the turncock, and somehow the wrong property has been named in the instructions. I am sure that that is the position, and I apologize to the honourable member's constituent for the trouble caused.

WAROOKA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FERGUSON: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Mines a report on the progress being made with the boring for further water supplies south of Warooka on Yorke Peninsula, and will he ascertain whether any worthwhile supplies have been discovered?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I know that the Engineer-in-Chief has been carrying out investigations through the Mines Department to determine whether the Warooka water scheme can be augmented. At present the capacity of that scheme is fully tapped. I will obtain a progress report and let the honourable member have it.

KANGAROO MEAT.

Mr. BYWATERS: Many butchers and suppliers of kangaroo meat are confused by Regulation 9 issued under the Food and Drugs Act. This regulation was tabled in this House last year and I gave notice that I would move for its disallowance. I withdrew my notice of motion because I was assured legally that it did not apply to kangaroo meat. However, when Regulation 40 was rejected in the Legislative Council the definition of "meat", which included game, was also disallowed. Regulation 9, which now applies to kangaroo meat, prescribes the use of methyl violet, which is an obnoxious dye, in such meat. I understand that only two firms in Adelaide supply this dye. One is out of stock and the other has intimated that it will not replenish supplies of this dye, which it claims is a cancer-promoting substance. In view of the chaos that has resulted, will the Premier ascertain from the Minister of Health whether instructions will be given to the health authorities not to

enforce this regulation until the position is clarified, particularly as kangaroo meat is used extensively for pet food?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have no personal knowledge of this topic but as soon as the Minister of Health returns from Melbourne I will refer the question to him to ascertain what action can be taken.

SOUTH-EAST PULP MILL.

Mr. HARDING: Can the Premier say what are the present and future prospects of a paper pulp mill being established in the South-East?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Negotiations are proceeding, but I should not like to say more now other than that I am hopeful. Satisfactory progress is being made in the negotiations and I believe that as a result there will be a substantial increase in industrial development in the South-East.

FERRIES.

Mr. CURREN: In reply to a question I asked on October 2 last year concerning new ferry approaches at Kingston and Berri I was informed that tenders would be called for the work during December. This morning I noticed that the work at Kingston had reached an advanced stage but that no work had been undertaken at Berri. Will the Minister of Works obtain a report from the Minister of Roads on the estimated time of completion of work at Kingston, when work will commence at Berri, and why there has been a delay at Berri?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

FRUIT FLY COMPENSATION.

Mr. RICHES: Householders at Port Augusta have assumed that the Government will follow the previous practice and compensate them for the fruit removed from their premises during the recent fruit fly infestation. Will the Minister of Agriculture confirm that this is so? Further, can he say whether it is necessary to introduce legislation for every outbreak of fruit fly in order to authorize compensation payments? If it is necessary, will legislation be introduced during this session so that Port Augusta householders will not have to wait until the end of the year for compensation?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: During every outbreak of fruit fly records are made of fruit taken from householders, in the ensuing Parliamentary session money is appropriated for compensation, a committee is appointed to consider claims, and ultimately householders

are recompensed. Records have been made during the Port Augusta outbreak and I will duly recommend that a Bill be introduced to enable householders to be fully compensated for their losses. It will not be possible to introduce such legislation this session, but I expect to bring it forward in the coming session.

LAKE ALBERT.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Some years ago the Meningie-Narrung area was incorporated in the city milk licensing area as it was a district able to supply milk in the off-peak period because of the ease with which large areas could be irrigated. The ability to irrigate has depended entirely on the levels in Lake Albert, which is a shallow lake. Slight movements in the level considerably affect the ability to pump water. During the last two summers there have been considerable variations in the levels of the lake, and this has caused embarrassment to those people who depend on this source of water to irrigate their lucerne and other summer pastures from which they are able to produce milk out of season. It was thought that prevailing winds affected the levels of the lake, but observations indicate that variations are not due entirely to wind effect but are in some way associated with other factors, including the relative level of Lake Alexandrina and the movement of water through Albert Passage between Lakes Alexandrina and Albert.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member is quoting his own opinion he is out of order.

Mr. NANKIVELL: In view of the lack of recorded information regarding the lake levels, will the Minister of Works consider providing recording equipment in the eastern end of Lake Alexandrina, at Narrung and Meningie, in order to establish the movement of the water in the lakes, so that action can be taken to ensure a supply to the people dependent on water from Lake Albert for irrigation purposes?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: As the honourable member's question implies, the area of the lakes is substantial, particularly Lake Alexandrina. I discussed this matter with him recently and, as he said, he believes that the wind is not the only factor affecting the lake level. In view of what he has said I shall confer with the Engineer-in-Chief to ascertain his views on whether the establishment of recording equipment can in a reasonably short time produce significant data upon which to base conclusions. Obviously it is both a short and a long term proposition. I shall discuss it with the Engineer-in-Chief and let the honourable member know his views on the suggestion.

MOUNT GAMBIER PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. BURDON: My question concerns an announcement by a Government spokesman late in 1962 regarding the building of a courthouse and other public buildings at Mount Gambier. Can the Minister representing the Attorney-General say how far the plans have progressed for the erection of the buildings?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I shall endeavour to obtain the information and let the honourable member have it as soon as possible.

ARMY HOUSING.

Mr. RYAN: It has been brought to my notice that a large number of Housing Trust houses in the Woodville North district have been leased to the Department of the Army. This area comprises mainly Housing Trust houses, and there is an extremely long waiting list for the allocation of such houses. Is the Premier aware that many of these houses have been leased to the Department of the Army and, if so, can he say on what terms, the length of the leases, and whether it means that the allocation of urgently required houses for people whose names are already on the list will be delayed for a considerable time? Some people have been allocated houses in the district but have been told that they cannot get them.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Under the Commonwealth-State Housing Agreement the Commonwealth Government makes money available to the State and consideration is given to the allocation of the funds. I have no doubt that the allocation referred to by the honourable member is in accordance with the provisions of the agreement. Our Government has some obligation in meeting the special requirements of the Army, the personnel of which have to go where they are sent and accommodation must be found. The honourable member will see that in those circumstances it is not unreasonable for the Commonwealth Government, as it provides the money, to have the right to make requests. Until I make a check I will not believe that the money provided in this connection will seriously alter the normal allocation of houses to civilians. The allocation referred to by the honourable member has been made to various Commonwealth Government departments over many years. I do not believe that it will dislocate the ordinary housing programme, but I will get specific information for the honourable member.

TIMBER IMPORTS.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier an answer to my earlier question concerning the

use of timber known as jelutong in house construction? Can he say whether there has been an investigation into its use and inform me of any report on the matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall have to make a check before I can reply to the honourable member. If he asks the question tomorrow I hope to be able to give him some information. Personally, I have not seen the report.

PORT PIRIE DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. McKEE: Last year I asked the Premier questions regarding development at Port Pirie, and he informed the House that he had sent the Under Treasurer to Canberra to discuss the matter with Commonwealth Treasury officials, and that as a result he had made a new approach to the Prime Minister. Can the Premier say whether the new approach has been successful or not?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I am not able to give the honourable member that information. The last letter I had from the Prime Minister on the matter was about 10 or 12 days ago and it was to the effect that my representations were being considered by the Commonwealth Government, and that it was hoped an early decision would be made. I cannot tell the honourable member more than that now, except to say that a decision by the Commonwealth Government appears to be fairly imminent.

THIRD-PARTY INSURANCE.

Mr. HUGHES: The following is an extract from one of three letters I have received from constituents concerning compulsory insurance of motor vehicles:

I bring before your notice the difficulty I am experiencing in an endeavour to have my car registered. I have approached all the local representatives of insurance companies for a third-party insurance coverage and have been refused unless I take out other insurance, such as property or a comprehensive policy.

The letter then gives the names of the companies and asks whether the matter can be examined. Is it correct that the Treasurer must approve all insurance companies that take compulsory insurance and, if so, will he examine the letters I have received and if the companies mentioned have been approved will he act to put an end to this practice of refusing compulsory insurance unless other insurance is taken?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The honourable member is correct, because under legislation the insurance companies authorized

to take third-party insurance are approved by the Treasurer. One condition I have made is that the companies will take all insurance reasonably offered to them. I do not get much trouble through companies refusing to take insurance. Only on one occasion have I had to take rather drastic action and strike a company off the list of approved insurers because I found it was not taking insurance fairly and squarely. Having said that, I think the honourable member will realize that where the rate is strictly controlled and the risk is high, and the company liable to make a loss, third-party insurance is something it would not want to take unless it had other insurance offered to it by the person concerned. Personally, I do not hold it to be unreasonable that the company that operates the unprofitable insurance should also be able to operate the profitable insurance.

Mr. Shannon: One can't have all the skim milk and the other all the cream.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That is so. If the honourable member will give me the three letters he has mentioned I shall have each case investigated and shall then be able to inform him specifically of the difficulties involved. If necessary, I will issue an instruction to clear up the matter.

MILLICENT SOUTH SCHOOL.

Mr. CORCORAN: On January 24 there appeared in the *South-Eastern Times*, printed in Millicent, a report which I believe originated as a result of a letter the Minister of Education wrote to that newspaper concerning the construction of the Millicent South Primary School. That letter stated that there would be an alteration in the number of classrooms, as a survey of the school-going population had indicated that the eight classrooms intended to be built would not be sufficient and that in fact it was thought that 12 would be required. I believe that it was intended that this school would be completed and ready for occupation by February 1965. As enrolments at the Millicent Primary School now total 680, can the Minister say whether this planned alteration is likely to delay the construction and occupation of the Millicent South school?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I very much hope that it will not do so, because I realize the urgency for this school to be constructed in time for the beginning of the next school year. I will make immediate inquiries and let the honourable member have a reply as soon as possible.

BAROSSA VALLEY TOURS.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Premier a further reply to my question of November 14 last relating to Transport Control Board permits for all road bus tours to the Barossa Valley?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Since the honourable member raised this matter in the House I have discussed it with members of the Transport Control Board, and I now have a report from Mr. Jackman, the recently appointed chairman of the board, which sets out the position fully. The report is somewhat lengthy, but in view of the public interest in the matter I believe I should read it in full. It states:

The Transport Control Board in 1961 proposed to introduce all-road tours of the Barossa Valley but this was strongly opposed by the Barossa Valley Tourist Association, representatives of district councils, commercial and civic bodies, as well as business firms. This association stated its objections to the discontinuance of co-ordination when it waited on the Minister of Railways with a deputation on April 27, 1961. In view of the obvious conviction of the districts concerned that continued co-ordination was in the best interests of tourism, the board did not force its proposals and since that date the parties operating the service, namely, the Railways Department and Nuriootpa Community Services Limited at Nuriootpa, have incurred special expenditure on the co-ordinated service, assuming they had the support of the Barossa Valley area. The board has always honoured any franchise granted for a road service and considers Nuriootpa Community Services Limited (the co-ordinated tour operator), which was so avidly supported in 1961, should not be peremptorily discarded after having provided efficient service for over 17 years. Before Nuriootpa Community Services Limited's authority expires this year, the board will, as is usual when licences are expiring, review the position on the Adelaide-Barossa Valley route. The board also submits the following:

(a) As interstate tourists can be through-booked from other States to the Barossa Valley (paragraph 2 of the report of the Director of the Government Tourist Bureau) tourists in Adelaide should have similar opportunity of undertaking the all-road tour.

(b) All-road tours be introduced on October 1, 1964, when the authority of Nuriootpa Community Services Limited expires.

(c) That prior to 1/10/64 the board advertise for a licensee or licensees to conduct all-road tours of the Barossa Valley.

(d) The Barossa Valley Chamber of Commerce be reminded that the Barossa Valley Tourist Association (on which the chamber is represented) and not the board has displayed change of heart. There is no difference in the relative merits of the two types of tours as between today and that obtaining in 1961 when co-ordination was so strongly supported.

PORT PIRIE WEST SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: I understood that paving and draining of the Port Pirie West Primary School grounds would be carried out during the Christmas recess. The Minister of Works told the House last year that he realized the urgency of this work, but nothing has been done. The grounds of this school are in a disgraceful condition and are unsafe for the children to play on. Will the Minister now give this matter his urgent attention?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I gave this matter my urgent attention several weeks ago. From memory, I think a problem that arose regarding the contractor required some negotiations. In any event, there was a rather unexpected delay. As pointed out, it was hoped that the work would be done during the school holidays. The honourable member can be assured that the matter is well in hand. I will let him know the position as soon as possible.

WINE GRAPE PRICES.

Mr. LAUCKE: Will the Premier table the report submitted to him by the Prices Commissioner in which the Commissioner recommends certain price levels for grapes from the current vintage?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know that honourable members have expressed some interest in this matter, and I have brought down several copies of the report. I have no objection to tabling the report, and I now formally do so. It is headed, "Wine Grape Prices and their effect on the Wine Industry". I do not think it is necessary to have the report printed. I have several copies, and if any honourable member wishes to see the report it will be made available to him.

SNOWTOWN AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. HALL: Can the Minister of Education say who is responsible for cancelling the Leaving class in the Snowtown Area School, which would be a repudiation of a promise given to me on November 21 last year by the Minister in this House?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: A short while ago today I received from the Director of Education the following report:

Last November I reported to you on the suggestion from Mr. R. S. Hall, M.P., that travelling teachers should be appointed between Snowtown, Brinkworth and Port Broughton Area Schools. I pointed out at the time that there were certain difficulties from the point of view of the time and distances involved in falling in with the suggestion and expressed the opinion that it would be better to establish

a Leaving class at Snowtown where it seemed likely that eight students would be available. Unfortunately our expectations have not been realized and at the beginning of school this year only four such students presented themselves. Of these four one came from Brinkworth and another one had failed in the Intermediate examinations. I feel it is impossible to establish effective instruction for so few children. It appears likely that the parents concerned share this view as the parents of one child had arranged for him to board at Clare, the parents of another are sending him to college in Adelaide and a third has asked that his son should repeat the Intermediate year. I greatly regret that this situation has arisen and feel it necessary to report the facts to you in this way especially in view of the fact that Mr. Hall may raise the question again. I still hope that if sufficient children are available it will be possible to establish a Leaving class at this school in 1965. That is the report I have just received. I shall discuss the matter with the Director tomorrow and shall be only too pleased to discuss it with the honourable member today or tomorrow.

BELAIR RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: About three weeks ago I was told that one car was to be taken off the 5.15 p.m. Adelaide to Belair train. I telephoned Mr. Rogers of the Railways Department and found that this was so. He told me that a passenger traffic count showed that more people were standing for longer on a slightly later service to North Gawler and that therefore it was more equitable to take a carriage from the Belair train and attach it to the train going to Gawler. The change was in fact made on February 4, I understand. Apparently, the railways do not have sufficient units simply to provide an extra one on a train where passenger loading makes that desirable. Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague, the Minister of Railways, whether there are any plans to increase the number of "red hen" units so that the circumstances that have arisen in this case can be avoided in the future?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD.

Mr. FRED WALSH: The press reports that the Betting Control Board has completed its inquiries into Totalizator Agency Board operations in the other States, as requested by the Premier, and that the Government has considered the report or was considering it yesterday. I do not know whether it has completed its consideration of it. As a result of a review of the report, can the Premier say

whether the Government contemplates introducing legislation in regard to T.A.B. in this State?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The discussion in Cabinet yesterday concerned merely the disposal of the report (if I may use that word)—whether it would be appropriate to issue it to the public or whether it would be appropriate first to have it tabled in Parliament. I pointed out to my colleagues that a committee was investigating this matter and I thought it would be appropriate that the report should first be tabled in Parliament. That action was approved and the report has been tabled today. The Cabinet members themselves have not seen the report. In fact, I had only one copy handed to me and I had to have other copies typed in order to provide the press with them today. So no determination has yet been made about the contents of the report. All that has been determined here is the method by which it would be made public.

WATERVALE WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I understand that the Department of Mines has now completed its investigation and testing of the bore at Watervale. Will the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Mines, get me a report on this bore?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Recently, I was at a meeting of a local government body, attended by the Town Planner and one of his assistants, and the question arose whether regulations submitted by local government bodies through the Town Planner would have to be submitted to the Subordinate Legislation Committee before coming to the House. There was a difference of opinion about this (I have my own opinion) so, to clear the matter up, will the Premier say whether town planning regulations in accordance with the amendments recently made have to go before the Subordinate Legislation Committee prior to coming before the House?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: In my opinion, yes.

TELEVISION ADVERTISING.

Mr. LAWN: My questions relate to two matters both involving television advertising. One matter is the glamorized advertising about smoking. I mention this because of the medical reports about the possibility of smoking causing cancer. We see on television advertisements of

people travelling around the world, diving into swimming pools and picnicking and then pulling out some cigarettes. Secondly, from a humanitarian point of view and bearing in mind the money we are spending in South Australia on road safety, I refer to television advertisements of special grade petrols and oils. We see on television cars speeding along the roads, one overtaking another, speeding around bends and travelling on the right-hand side of the road. Has the Premier noticed these things, and will he consider taking them up with the appropriate authority, the Australian Broadcasting Commission, to see if something cannot be done in connection with both matters?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The first topic mentioned by the honourable member was the subject of a question by another member today, which I answered. If the honourable member looks at today's *Advertiser* he will see that the co-operation of the Commonwealth Government is being sought in connection with an education campaign. That obviously would include television, which is a Commonwealth-controlled service; there is no doubt that that is the basis upon which the Commonwealth will probably be approached. I shall not go further than I did in reply to a previous question. I will have the second matter examined to see whether any effective action can be taken; I shall have it examined by the Traffic Branch of the Police Department to see if it can be more effectively controlled.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (GOVERNOR'S SALARY).

His Excellency the Governor, by message, notified Her Majesty's assent to the Bill.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

- Balhannah and Mount Pleasant Railway (Discontinuance),
- Book Purchasers Protection,
- Churches of Christ, Scientist, Incorporation,
- Highways Act Amendment,
- Licensing Act Amendment,
- Local Government Act Amendment (Poles and Rates),
- Maintenance Act Amendment,
- Marine Stores Act Amendment,
- Mining (Petroleum) Act Amendment,
- Opticians Act Amendment,
- Physiotherapists Act Amendment,

Prices Act Amendment,
Real Property Act Amendment,
Road Traffic Act Amendment (Seat Belts),
Scaffolding Inspection Act Amendment,
Second-hand Dealers Act Amendment,
Statutes Amendment (Mental Health and Prisons),
Statutes Amendment (Public Salaries) (Public Servants),
Statutes Amendment (Public Salaries) (Members),
Succession Duties Act Amendment,
Weeds Act Amendment,
Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment (Benefits),
Australian Mineral Development Laboratories Act Amendment,
Business Names,
Elder Smith & Co. Limited Provident Funds,
Industrial Code Amendment,
Local Government Act Amendment (General),
Marketing of Eggs Act Amendment (Producer Representation),
Nurses Registration Act Amendment,
Road Maintenance (Contribution),
Parliamentary Superannuation Act Amendment,
Road Traffic Act Amendment (Diamond Turns),
Town Planning Act Amendment.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Alcoholics Centre,
Divisional Headquarters and Police Station at Port Adelaide,
Elizabeth High School (New Wing).

Ordered that reports be printed.

DECENTRALIZATION OF INDUSTRY.

The SPEAKER laid on the table the final report of the Industries Development Special Committee on decentralization of industry.

Ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION: ELECTRICITY SUPPLY BILL.

Mr. BYWATERS: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. BYWATERS: When I was speaking on the Electricity Supply Bill last year on November 12, I drew comparisons between the charges in the country and those in the city, referring

to my personal account that had been rendered and claiming that it was more than 10 per cent (as I suggested) in excess of the metropolitan rates, despite the Government's assertion that country rates were only 10 per cent above metropolitan rates. I have found out that I was in error in my calculations and that it was only something over 5 per cent in excess. I apologize to the House for that statement.

The Minister rightly drew my attention to this, as did Mr. O'Halloran Giles of another place, in a letter to the *Murray Valley Standard*, the local newspaper, pointing out, exactly as the Minister did, the error in my calculations. I did not answer either the Minister or the letter from the honourable member of another place because I felt that, I having made this statement in the House, this was the right place in which to correct it. This I am now doing. I apologize for my error. I do, however, state that this does not detract from the rest of my speech wherein I claimed that it was the wish and policy of my Party to have the same electricity charges for both country and metropolitan areas.

POTATO MARKETING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Agriculture) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Potato Marketing Act, 1948. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is primarily designed to clarify and strengthen the position of the South Australian Potato Board to enable it more efficiently to regulate and control the sale and distribution of potatoes and to ensure the continuance of orderly marketing in the State.

In a recent case decided by the Full Court of the Supreme Court in this State, an order of the board prohibiting a grower from selling potatoes grown by him except to the South Australian Potato Distribution Centre Ltd., an agent of the board, was held to be invalid on the ground that it exceeded the power of the board to "regulate" and "control" the sale and delivery of potatoes. The Bill strengthens the board's powers to overcome this situation and to enable the board's orders to be more effectively policed. The Bill also contains provisions for the control and regulation of the washing of potatoes and the marketing of washed potatoes, which is now an integral part of the industry in this State.

The proposed amendments, which have the support of the growers' organizations and of the industry generally, have been recommended by the board on the advice of its legal advisers. Clause 3 contains definitions which would assist the interpretation of its provisions. That clause also repeals section 3 (2) of the principal Act, which provides as follows:

- (2) This Act shall not apply to potatoes the subject of trade commerce or intercourse between States, or required or intended by the owners thereof for trade commerce or intercourse between States.

Although this subsection was intended to preserve the constitutional validity of the principal Act, it has been found to go much further than originally intended and renders the policing of the Act extremely difficult. The constitutional validity of the Act is adequately taken care of by section 22a of the Acts Interpretation Act, and the repeal of the subsection would not affect the freedom of interstate trade guaranteed by section 92 of the Commonwealth Constitution.

Clause 4 merely makes a formal amendment to section 15(3) of the principal Act. Section 16, which deals with the general powers of the board, is repealed and re-enacted by clause 5 with amendments that confer on the board the additional powers of buying and selling potatoes and entering vehicles and premises for the purpose of policing the Act. Clause 6 amends section 19 of the principal Act so as to give the board power to cancel a wholesale potato merchant's licence for a breach of the Act or of any statutory order of the board. Under the Act at present there is no power to cancel such a licence even if the licence holder repeatedly and persistently contravenes the Act or any order made under the Act. The cancellation of a licence under the new provision would be subject to appeal to the Minister under section 23 of the principal Act.

Clause 7 enacts a new section 19a, which requires potato washers to be licensed but exempts from licensing any grower who washes the whole or any part of his crop and any retailer who washes any potatoes held or offered for sale by him by retail. Section 20 (1), which deals with the control of the sale and delivery and with the fixing of the price of potatoes under the Act, is repealed and re-enacted by clause 8, which also strengthens the powers of the board in order to overcome difficulties arising out of the decision of the Full Court referred to by me earlier. The clause also gives the board power to prescribe conditions with which premises used for potato washing must comply, to fix maximum and minimum

charges for washing potatoes and to require merchants and potato washers to keep records relating to potatoes in their possession.

With regard to the provisions of the Bill relating to the control of potato washing, I should like to mention that the demand in this State for washed and packaged potatoes has steadily grown, and it has been estimated that one-third to one-half of South Australian grown potatoes are washed before retailing. The board considers that the cost of washing, which has become an important factor in the price structure of potatoes, should be controlled and be allowed to become a charge not against the producer but against those desiring the service. With the development of bulk harvesting, bulk deliveries of potatoes from farm to washing plants if not controlled could lead to irregularities in quality, weights, price, deliveries, distribution, etc. The separation of the functions of the merchant and washer for administrative purposes is essential for the board to assess the legitimate charges incurred for washing and marketing as well as the fair retail margins. As the board fixes the wholesale and retail prices, it must be prepared to deal with washed and unwashed potatoes. For these reasons, it is considered that potato washers and washing must be brought within the scope of the board's authority as merchants and growers are at present.

Clause 9 increases the maximum penalty for offences against the Act from £100 to £200. This is supported by the fall in money values since the principal Act was passed in 1948. Clause 10 strengthens the regulation-making power to assist the board in policing the Act. This legislation has been submitted to interested organizations, particularly growers' organizations, and I have been urged by them to introduce it as soon as possible as they support the Bill.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

TRADES HALL BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to empower the sale of the Trades Hall, Adelaide, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Before explaining this Bill I point out to members opposite, so that there will not be any mistake about it, that this is not a sinister

attempt to close down the Trades Hall. Actually, it is an attempt to make the Trades Hall a bigger and better institution.

Mr. Shannon: Why not put it on North Terrace?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This is not something with any sinister intent. The object of this short Bill is, as its long title indicates, to empower the sale of the Trades Hall at Adelaide. As honourable members know, the present Trades Hall was constructed some time during the 1890's on certain land situated in Grote Street, Adelaide, and I understand that an addition was made to it at the back on another piece of land at a later date. The original piece of land was acquired by some eight persons who, by a deed made in 1895, placed the land and certain moneys that they were holding under trust for the erection of a Trades Hall. The piece of land at the back was subsequently acquired by the same persons, who apparently declared certain trusts by a further deed made in 1899 that cannot be found and, although it may be assumed that the trusts were identical with those under the first deed, this is not known or ascertainable.

For this reason alone it may be thought there are limitations regarding the disposal of the hall. Be that as it may, the body known as the Trades Hall Adelaide Incorporated became incorporated under the old Associations Incorporation Act, and as such became registered as the proprietor of both pieces of land upon which the hall now stands. I do not go into the details as to the rules and regulations governing the conduct of business of this body. It may be enough to say that the deed of 1895 forms part of or is incorporated in them. The managing committee of the Trades Hall has, I understand, decided, with the consent of resolutions passed at special meetings of the unions concerned (the Labor Day Celebrations Committee, formerly the Eight-Hours Celebration Union, and the United Trades and Labor Council), to erect a new hall at South Terrace on certain land which the incorporated body has acquired for the purpose, and desires to dispose of the present land in Grote Street on which the present Trades Hall is erected with a view to using the proceeds of the sale towards the erection of the new hall.

Having regard to the fact that the trusts governing the second piece of land under the deed of 1899 are not known and to certain other doubts respecting the power of sale of the Trades Hall, which have been expressed as I understand it from time to time, the United Trades and Labor Council has asked the

Government to introduce the present Bill to make it clear that the Trades Hall Adelaide Incorporated may sell the premises freed and discharged from existing trusts. The Government acceded to this request and accordingly introduced this Bill. Clause 2 is the usual interpretation clause. Clause 3, the main operative clause, provides that the land in Grote Street and the piece behind it is from now on to be vested in the Trades Hall Adelaide Incorporated, freed and discharged from all the trusts and conditions in the trust deeds and to the intent that the trustees under both deeds shall be freed and discharged from all such trusts and conditions. The land is to be held henceforth upon trust to sell it with the usual powers to postpone, sell in part, sell by auction or private contract, for cash or on credit and with or without special conditions and generally on such conditions as the Trades Hall Adelaide Incorporated shall think expedient and to give a free title to the purchasers. There is a proviso that pending sale the incorporated body is to hold the income upon the present trusts.

Clause 4 provides that the proceeds arising from the sale are to be held on trust to apply them towards the erection of a new Trades Hall at South Terrace and not otherwise. Clause 5 applies the trusts of the 1895 Trust Deed (which are known) to the land upon which the new Trades Hall is to be built. The reason for this is that the 1895 deed is incorporated in and forms part of the present rules of the Trades Hall Adelaide Incorporated and it would appear to facilitate the transition to apply those same trusts or conditions to the new land without however, the (unknown) trusts and conditions of the 1899 deed. Members will realize that the Bill gives effect to a request that the Government received from the Trades Hall. As far as I know it contains nothing controversial. The Bill must be referred to a Select Committee, so I suggest it is appropriate to defer any debate until such time as the committee has brought down its report.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I support the second reading. I know that responsible officers of the Trades Hall approached the Government to introduce this Bill.

Mr. Lawn: Is the Government going to provide a new Trades Hall free?

Mr. FRANK WALSH: No such provision is made in the Bill and I do not intend to press for that.

Mr. Lawn: We can amend the Bill in Committee.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: The Trades Hall is not large enough to accommodate those seeking to be its tenants. A section of land is to be purchased but the building of a new hall is conditional on the passage of this Bill. I support the Bill to enable a Select Committee to make the necessary investigations and to report before this session concludes so that an early start can be made on the building of a new Trades Hall that will be in the interests of the city.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Loveday, Ferguson, Freebairn, Jennings and Bywaters; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place, and to report on February 25.

SEMAPHORE COMMUNITY CENTRE TRUST DEED BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill to vary the trusts of the Semaphore and Port Adelaide R.S.S. & A.I.L.A. and Citizens' World War II Memorial Community Centre Trust Deed. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

In 1953 certain land at Semaphore, which was formerly part of the old Semaphore signal station, was sold to the Port Adelaide and Semaphore sub-branch of the Returned Sailors' Soldiers' and Airmen's Imperial League. Later, portion of the land was sold to ex-servicemen. In 1958 a special trust was constituted to build a citizens' community centre as a memorial to servicemen and service-women of the Second World War. The trust fund comprised the balance of the land and some £3,000 raised by public subscription. The trustees included officers of the Corporation of the City of Port Adelaide and of the sub-branch.

The trust fund, however, is inadequate for the erection of a suitable memorial centre and the Bill seeks to vary the trusts created in 1958 so as to permit the trustees to transfer the land to the Poppy Day Trust Fund to enable the trustees of that fund to erect "Darby and Joan" cottages for ex-servicemen and their wives in accordance with the provisions of the Act relating to that fund passed in 1962. As to the balance of the fund, it is intended to authorize the trustees to expend such amount as they think fit in the erection of a building and provision of suitable amenities for the Semaphore Youth Club on

land owned by the council and adjacent to the sub-branch clubrooms. The youth club is sponsored by the sub-branch. Any portion of the trust fund still remaining will be paid to the sub-branch for its own use. Agreement on these proposals has been reached by the council, the trustees, the sub-branch, the youth club and league headquarters.

As the trustees are unable to attain the primary objects of the trust owing to lack of finance, the Government considers that the alternative proposals should be authorized. They are consistent with the intentions of the initiators of the scheme and the terms of the trust in so far as the sub-branch will be charged with the duty of performing a service to the aged and to the youth of the community, both urgently needed public services.

As this is a hybrid Bill it should, in accordance with Joint Standing Orders, be referred to a Select Committee for investigation and report.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): Normally, the member for Semaphore (Mr. Tapping) would have continued the debate, but unfortunately he is indisposed this afternoon. The building of "Darby and Joan" cottages in his district will help aged people. It is a worthy proposal and I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Bockelberg, Corcoran, Harding and Ryan, and Mrs. Steele; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place, and to report on February 25.

MORPHETT STREET BRIDGE BILL.

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

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act relating to the construction of new bridges in the place of the Morphett Street and Victoria bridges, the re-alignment of certain public streets in the City of Adelaide, the financing thereof, and matters connected therewith and incidental thereto, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to give effect to arrangements which have been made between the Government and the Adelaide City Council regarding the widening of what I may call the Morphett Street to Montefiore traffic route of the City of Adelaide. Negotiations have been in process, as honourable members are no doubt aware, for some time concerning this project, which appears to be clearly necessary in the interests of facilitating the movement of traffic to and from the city by what will become a direct route. I think that it is hardly necessary for me to elaborate upon the necessity for an additional wide outlet from the city and the removal of a known bottle-neck. The proposal envisages a widening of the present Morphett Street, demolition of the existing Morphett Street bridge (which was constructed in the 1880's) and the erection of a completely new and wider bridge in its place, the demolition of the present Victoria bridge over the River Torrens and the erection of a wider bridge in its place, with the attendant widening of the road between both bridges and the widening and straightening of the present route between Victoria bridge and Jeffcott Street. In this connection, I would refer honourable members to the plan in the schedule to the Bill which shows in general form the proposed new roadway from the northern end of Victoria bridge to Jeffcott Street and the present roadway between those two points. It is estimated that the total cost of all the works required, including necessary acquisitions of property between Light Square and North Terrace, will be of the order of £1,500,000. It has been agreed that the Government should make all of these funds available in the first instance to enable the work to be undertaken, the council to repay one-half over a period of 30 years after the completion of the works with interest at the normal loan fund rate.

This, in short, is the proposal. Legislation to enable the proposal to be carried out is necessary for several reasons. In the first place, legislative authority is required in connection with the financing of the project. Secondly, legislation is necessary to enable demolition of the present Morphett Street bridge because it was built under statutory authority. Legislation is also required in connection with the new bridge because it will pass over railway property, and clearly statutory authority is required for this purpose as well as for the purpose of preserving the position of the Railways Commissioner in respect of his railway lines. Lastly, legislative provision is required to declare the widened new roadway

between Victoria bridge and Jeffcott Street to be made a public road, and for the reversion of that part of the present road which goes around Montefiore Hill to the park lands. Specific authority is not required in connection with road widening as such, or with the demolition and re-erection of the Victoria bridge, as the council already appears to have the necessary powers over these matters under the Local Government Act. This Bill is accordingly introduced to give the necessary statutory authority.

Clause 3 authorizes the erection of the new Morphett Street bridge over North Terrace and across the railway yards, with power in the council to make the necessary contracts in connection therewith. Clause 4 provides that the plans and specifications of the bridge are to be submitted to and approved by the Minister, a reasonable requirement in view of the financial assistance which is being given by the Government in the matter. Clause 5 relates to works over the railway yards. It expressly gives the council power to enter the railway yards and perform works thereon but with two provisos. The first is that nothing is to be commenced until the council and the Commissioner have agreed as to the manner and conditions under which the works are to be carried out, including conditions providing for payment by the council to the Commissioner for any works and services necessarily provided by him. Members will appreciate the need for such a provision. It is clearly necessary that no outside body should be empowered to operate over railway property without agreement with the Commissioner as to the manner of operation, otherwise considerable dislocation in the railway services, to say nothing of accident risks of a high order, could occur. The condition regarding payment for necessary works and services stems from the fact that certain works, such as the removal of buildings on railway property, must necessarily be undertaken by the Commissioner himself; furthermore, it is the Commissioner's practice to exercise general supervision over works undertaken on his property, as well as to provide overseers and the like to warn operators of the approach of trains and other possible sources of damage. The second condition, a usual one inserted in contracts with the Commissioner, is that the council is to indemnify the Commissioner against all claims arising out of or by reason of the exercise of the council powers. For example, the Commissioner could become liable to pay workmen's compensation or damages in circumstances which would not have arisen but for the presence of outside contractors upon his

property. Any dispute upon the subject will be determined by the Commissioner of Highways.

Clause 6 empowers the council to demolish the existing Morphett Street bridge, after which the Act of 1881 is repealed. Clause 7 provides that after the works have been completed the new Morphett Street bridge is to be under the care, control and management of the council (as was the old one). It provides, further, that the maintenance of the bridge is to be at the expense of the council. The reason for this last provision is that, without it, section 88 of the South Australian Railways Commissioner's Act would make the Commissioner liable for maintenance expenses. The last sentence of clause 7 provides that the bridge (like its predecessor) is to be exempted from rates and taxes. Clause 8 is in the nature of a machinery clause, in the usual form, providing for the declaration of the new roadway between the Victoria bridge and Jeffcott Street as a public street and the reversion of the portion which is to be closed around Montefiore Hill to the park lands.

Clause 9 is the financial clause. Subclause (1) sets out that the cost of the works (which includes the whole scheme as outlined at the beginning of my remarks) will be shared between the Government and the council, with the proviso that the Government shall bear only so much of the excess over £1,500,000 as is approved by the Treasurer. I think every member realizes that with work of this nature it is almost impossible to accurately determine what the cost may be under certain circumstances. The Government does not intend to shelve any of its responsibility for the works I have outlined. If, for instance, the total cost amounted to more than £1,500,000, and it was not unnecessarily incurred, the Treasury would undoubtedly accept responsibility for a fair part of the extra cost, and would provide the additional finance for the council on the terms that I have outlined. It would not be involved without my consent in some cost that could not be considered ancillary to this project. I want the House to understand that this clause sets out, first of all, that the cost is anticipated to be £1,500,000. The Government will find 50 per cent of that and provide by loan the other 50 per cent. Also, the Treasurer can approve of an excess beyond that sum if it becomes necessary.

Subclause (2) empowers the Treasurer, on the Minister's certificate, from time to time to meet all the costs in the first instance out of the moneys from the Highways Fund or

moneys appropriated by Parliament for the purpose. I am not sure yet which is the most advantageous way of providing the money for this job—whether it is more advantageous for the State to provide it through the Highways Fund or by Loan moneys. That will depend on a number of circumstances, one of which will arise from the conferences taking place in Canberra on the new roads agreement between the Commonwealth and the States. Under that agreement we shall undoubtedly have to provide a fairly substantial amount of matching money. In that event it may be necessary for this money to be provided from the Highways Fund; but that will be determined in the light of future circumstances.

Subclause (3) provides for repayment by the council of one half of amounts paid by the Treasurer with interest determined in accordance with subclause (4). The indebtedness of the council with interest is to be paid in equal annual instalments beginning on a date to be determined by the Treasurer but so that total liability will be extinguished over a period of 30 years after June 30 in the year in which the works are completed. Honourable members will see from that that the Government could in fact be bearing more than half the expense of this project. Details of the instalments are to be determined by the Treasurer.

Subclause (4) is a machinery clause stating that the rate of interest is to be the average rate payable by the Treasurer upon all new loans with a currency of 10 years or more raised by him in the relevant financial year. As this is a hybrid Bill and must be referred, in accordance with Joint Standing Orders, to a Select Committee, I need not go into farther details at this stage, but commend the principle of the Bill to honourable members for their approval.

I think every honourable member cannot but be impressed by the rapidity with which the traffic problem in the metropolitan area is growing. If we are to prevent really serious traffic bottlenecks in the future, we must be alert to the sharp rise that is taking place in the number of motor vehicles on our roads. Undoubtedly one problem arising in the city of Adelaide is that of the north-south communications, which can in my opinion materially and effectively assist in removing the congestion that takes place close to this building every night, because the Morphett Street bridge and the associated bridge take the traffic unimpeded over North Terrace: it is raised above North Terrace. For that

reason it will provide, in my opinion, a significant outlet to the west end of the city. I commend the Bill to honourable members. The fact that the Government has been prepared to be so liberal in the financial provision it has offered to the council is a strong indication that it believes this work to be of high priority and that it is necessary for it to go ahead as quickly as possible.

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): Were it not for the fact that this is a hybrid Bill I should have sought the adjournment of the debate because there are many facets that require further consideration by honourable members, not necessarily in opposition. One important and striking feature of the Bill is the provision for the appointment of the Highways Commissioner to be the arbiter in any dispute that may arise between the Adelaide City Council and the Railways Commissioner, the council being the constructing authority and the Railways Commissioner the instructing authority, in many instances. That arrangement has much merit. I do not say that in condemnation of the Commissioner but I know how agreeably he can be disagreeable. I am pleased to know that provision is made for the Highways Commissioner to be appointed in that capacity.

Another outstanding feature of the Bill deserving of favourable comment is that at least within 30 years of its completion the bridge will have been paid for and will not continue to be a financial burden as some prominent bridges in the Commonwealth are. Also, two honourable members of this House are to be involved, one on the south side of the river and one on the north. It is to be hoped that they will work in harmony on this.

I do not know exactly what type of bridge will be constructed but questions of property acquisition must be involved and serious complications can arise if great attention is not paid to the foundations of the bridge. To make one bridge where two now exist is an undertaking of real value. There will be further road improvement for traffic to get round Montefiore Hill. Including property acquisition, I think that the amount of £1,500,000 is reasonable. I hope that that figure is not exceeded, but it may be, particularly having in mind the costs of property to be acquired and the soil structures which may include faults not visible to the eye. As I said at the outset, this measure could give rise to much discussion. To meet the increasing demands of traffic, this bridge is long overdue.

However, as I have said on other occasions, once the traffic problem has been met we will still have the serious aspect of there being insufficient space for vehicles to park once they have reached the city. When this bridge is completed there will still be parking problems.

Mr. Lawn: Not on the bridge.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I did not say that, but there could be problems close to the bridge. Probably some of the deficits being incurred by the railways could be met if there were a parking station over the Adelaide railway station, which would help to balance the Railways Commissioner's budget.

Mr. Lawn: Hear, hear!

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I support the second reading in the hope that the Bill will come before a Select Committee and be approved.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I am not one who fears that there will be any difficulty with the authorities that will have to reach agreement over this big project—the Adelaide City Council and the Railways Commissioner, and the Highways Department, which will be involved to some degree. From my experience of officers in the Highways and Railways Departments (with whom I have had much personal contact) I think there will be close co-operation. I have no doubt that the Town Clerk of the City of Adelaide, who is a qualified engineer, will be able to put to his fellow engineers and the engineers of the Highways Department a case that they will be able to understand, so I do not think any troubles will arise there.

I did not rise to mention that; I did so more to draw the attention of the House to what might become a difficult problem. The traffic that will use this bridge will not all go straight through the city and finish up somewhere south of it; many of these vehicles will be destined for the city proper. I have not seen the plan, so I am speaking with possibly too little knowledge of what is contemplated and any criticism of my statement could be justifiable. I think the approaches to this bridge will be south of Hindley Street. This will create a problem for Hindley Street, which is a highly developed street that is becoming even more highly developed as time passes and certain types of business site in Rundle Street become prohibitive in cost or not available. I do not know how the approach to the bridge from Hindley Street will be made. It could be brought about by fairly extensive acquisition of properties adjacent to the Adelaide terminus of the new bridge to provide ample manoeuvring space so that people who

wanted to come back could go into Hindley Street instead of going first into Currie Street and having to use the unfortunately narrow streets that connect these two main streets. I am hoping that the planners of this scheme have given full thought to these problems. After all, this measure tackles only the present problem of people wanting to get into the city. What the Premier said—that we are very short of north-south accesses—was obviously correct, and this proposal will be of great advantage.

Well qualified people have put to me that an extension of West Terrace across railway property and the river, making an entirely new thoroughfare linking up with West Terrace, should have been considered. West Terrace is a beautiful boulevard and has ample room for any traffic that can be envisaged. Such a scheme would not pose any problems, such as those I see in this scheme because of the topography in the Hindley Street area. These aspects were put to me and I thought they had some merit. Possibly the reason for adopting the line of the Morphett Street bridge is that it is not thought desirable to interfere too much with the development of the municipal golf course that has taken place in the park lands. I do not doubt that this has been considered, but I doubt whether it is a justifiable attitude. I do not suggest for one moment that it is not desirable to have sporting facilities of this nature conveniently sited, but I suggest that the sporting aspect should take second place to the interests of the State as a whole. If I were dealing with this problem I should not allow a desire not to encroach on a golf course to interfere with a traffic plan that will operate for 100 years. When freeways are constructed in the country, we do not worry about vested interests: we run across other people's interests and knock down very nice houses or take roads through pastures. The people concerned have little redress. They can sell their properties at perhaps slightly enhanced values, as the Highways Department is not niggardly, but generally these people do not want to sell homes after enjoying living in them. Apparently these aspects do not weigh in country areas, but, as there is an established golf course in the area that would be used for the suggested new road, this may have influenced the overall picture. Although I do not expect that at this late stage my suggestion will have any effect, I am not ashamed of putting my ideas on record and of repeating advice from people of whom I have a high opinion. It is not my own opinion

that I am expressing, because I am not an engineer. Competent people in this field have suggested that a link with West Terrace would obviate many of the problems resulting from the linking of the existing Morphett Street bridge with Adelaide. In the future it might be said that a bottleneck had been caused which could not be eliminated because a bridge was in the way and Hindley Street had been cut in half. A subway might have to be built if Hindley Street west developed as it could in a 100 years' time and required ready access from its eastern end.

These are factors that should be carefully sifted. If they have been, I make no apology for raising them again, because they have not been mentioned today. I do not oppose the Bill for I am in favour of improving our city approaches.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I am pleased (as no doubt, is the member for Adelaide) to see this legislation introduced. This is a move that I have suggested for some time and it is pleasing to see it come to fruition. As I use this bridge more than any other member, I know it has become extremely congested. I am delighted to see by the plan that the road is to be re-aligned as it approaches Montefiore Hill and continues into Jeffcott Street to provide a clear outlet rather than the present devious and dangerous outlet of Montefiore Hill. An important aspect of the Bill, which I know all members appreciate, is that if the ratepayers of the City of Adelaide had been asked to pay the whole cost, the bridge would still be there in its present form for many years. Obviously, it is unfair for the council to have to pay the whole cost. I commend the Government for its generous offer and hope that the Bill will have a speedy passage through the Select Committee and the House so that the work can begin immediately.

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): I support the Bill at this stage. I was impressed by the remarks of the member for Onkaparinga about West Terrace being a point of take off, as it were, for a bridge that would then by-pass possible congestion at a point in Hindley Street. The references by the member for Onkaparinga contain much merit. I have had referred to me, by folk whose opinions I respect, ideas similar to those expressed by the honourable member. I endorse the expression of the honourable member because I consider that when huge sums are to be spent we should plan not only for a decade or two ahead but for generations.

It is possible that the forgoing of lands now used for certain purposes might, in the long run, be an excellent policy if acted upon now. I have had referred to me in respect of the West Terrace extension a suggestion by a gentleman who writes to me in these terms:

In the next few years we will require "Inner Circle" and "Outer Circle" routes linking our main outlets to the country, and the bridge, which I suggested to you, would nearly complete the inner circle. A view of the map would be—Fitzroy Terrace then south-east along Robe terrace; south along Hackney Road and Dequetteville Terrace to Victoria Avenue; then turn west along Park Terrace to West Terrace; turn north along West Terrace then over the proposed new bridge to the new road linking Jeffcott Street which the Adelaide Council is proposing to build on the left of Montefiore Hill.

That would completely circle the area and, looking to the future, I consider that there is merit, even at this stage, in having another look at the desirability of making certain alterations to the plan, bearing in mind the congestion that will arise and the expense involved in the present proposals. Although I do not have the topographical details before me, I am speaking in general terms of what would be a commonsense approach to a major problem.

Mr. Shannon: It may be cheaper in the long run.

Mr. LAUCKE: Yes. This gentleman's letter continues:

Before the Government passes money for the old Morphett Street project could not a survey be made by the police as to the number of cars which divert off West Terrace to pass over the present Morphett Street bridge to North Adelaide and *vice versa*?

I support the suggestions of the member for Onkaparinga as they have some merit and have been borne out by the thoughts of the gentleman for whose judgment I have great respect.

Mr. FRED WALSH (West Torrens): I, too, endorse the remarks of the member for Onkaparinga, as I am not in accord with the plans that are contemplated for the construction of the bridge across the railway lines and the River Torrens at Morphett Street. I consider that we are not looking far enough ahead, because the logical site for a bridge is from West Terrace. I believe that those in authority after the City of Adelaide had been planned by Colonel Light did not look into the future as Colonel Light had done, and did not give effect to what was intended for the development of the outer city. The railway station should have been built in West Terrace,

not where it is at present. Colonel Light's object in having wide streets east and west with the other arterial roads north and south would have been suitable for the future needs of the city. However, probably because of their need of water and the shorter carrying distance, the early pioneers concentrated on the northern part of the city. They did not look to the future, nor did my generation when it transferred the goods yards from immediately west of Morphett Street bridge to Mile End. That was when the Adelaide railway station should have been relocated in West Terrace. Had that been done we would not have to face up to the problem that will confront us soon. I do not know how Adelaide will provide for its railway needs in, say, 40 years' time. Not much development can take place in the restricted area between North Terrace and the river. Unless a change in railway operations occurs the present site will not be able to meet requirements. It seems that we are bound to accept the proposal to construct a bridge across the railway line at Morphett Street and over the river. I believe that the road should be widened each side of the bridge to cope with the volume of traffic that will be proceeding into and from North Terrace.

Mr. Shannon: You realize that traffic from North Terrace will have considerable difficulty in getting on to this bridge?

Mr. FRED WALSH: Yes. I should be the last to suggest any interference with Holy Trinity Church, which is one of the oldest landmarks of Adelaide, but it should be feasible to acquire land west of the bridge to cope with any increased volume of traffic.

Mr. Shannon: West Terrace would present no acquisition problems.

Mr. FRED WALSH: I know that. West Terrace is a level area and it would be simple to proceed from West Terrace across the river. I was born and reared in Adelaide and know the area well. I have witnessed the developments that have occurred in the last 60 years. I am pleased that the city has progressed so well. I can remember when a person had to walk his horse and buggy around the post office corner. The position has changed remarkably since then. The present Morphett Street bridge must be replaced by a modern structure, but I urge that care be taken to provide for the additional volume of traffic that will be entering North Terrace from Hindley Street and other side streets.

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): I share the opinions expressed by the member for West Torrens about the Adelaide railway terminal.

I believe that eventually that terminal will be shifted to West Terrace. When that happens it will be realized that the proposal before us was short sighted. When railway gauge standardization is effected in South Australia the terminal will have to be transferred to West Terrace. I do not think the authorities responsible for gauge standardization will perpetuate the mistake that was made in siting the Adelaide railway station in its present location. Having in mind that West Terrace will be its future site, I believe that the proposed bridge should not come down to ground level at Memorial Drive but should continue through to North Adelaide. With the removal of the railway lines traffic from North Terrace could proceed by means of another bridge around Memorial Drive, thus relieving the main bridge of traffic that wants to traverse Memorial Drive. North Adelaide traffic would use the main bridge. It is only because of the present location of the Adelaide railway terminal that we are considering this measure. But for the location of the terminal I am sure that the planners of this bridge would have suggested returning it to ground level at Montefiore Hill instead of at Memorial Drive.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Messrs. Coumbe, Hutchens, Lawn, Millhouse and McAnaney; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place, and to report on February 25.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTS (TREATMENT) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON (Minister of Education) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act, 1961.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It gives effect to the recommendations of an advisory committee appointed by the Government last year to consider and report on the principal Act and to recommend suitable amendments to that legislation before it is brought into operation. The Bill will also enable the recommendations of the Public

Works Standing Committee, contained in its report dated December 17, 1963, to be put into effect. The basic principles embodied in the principal Act, passed in 1961, are considered sound, but further consideration has been given to administrative details and the Government feels that greater efficiency can be achieved by placing the administration of the legislation in the hands of a board of three persons, one of whom is a medical practitioner.

The main purpose of the Bill is to alter the administrative machinery contained in the principal Act, firstly by making provision for the board in lieu of the Director and, secondly, by providing safeguards for addicts who wish to receive treatment voluntarily, distinguishing between committal centres (which are institutions to which an addict may be committed by a court) and voluntary centres (which are institutions to which an addict may be admitted on his own application or that of a relative or welfare officer). The Bill also provides for the establishment of any type of institution which is designed for the treatment or for the admission and treatment of addicts. Thus, an institution could be a voluntary centre or a committal centre or even an out-patients' clinic.

Although the advisory committee had considered the division of institutions into various types to suit the needs of each class of patient, the committee has recommended the establishment of two main types of institution, namely, voluntary centres and committal centres, for reasons of administrative simplicity and economy. The voluntary centres will deal with patients admitted at their own request, with patients referred by relatives and with those who enter voluntarily as a result of recognizances entered into upon a direction from a court, while persons who are committed by courts will be received into committal centres. The Bill does not refer specifically to clinics and similar treatment units, but the legislation will enable the board to establish such types of units if and when the need arises.

As the principal Act has not yet been proclaimed to come into operation, provision has been made in clause 1(1) for the Bill to become law on the day on which the principal Act is brought into operation.

Clause 3 is a purely formal amendment. Clause 4 enacts the new definitions necessary for interpreting the amendments. Clause 5 enacts a new Part which deals with the constitution of the board and provides that the board is to be a body corporate consisting of three members appointed by the Governor one

of whom shall be a medical practitioner (new sections 4a and 4b). Each member will hold office for such period not exceeding five years as the Governor may fix at the time of the member's appointment (new section 4c). The Public Service Act will not apply to a member by reason only of his being a member of the board (new section 4e), and a member will be entitled to such fees and allowances as prescribed (new section 4f).

Clause 6 amends section 5 of the principal Act to provide for the Minister, on the board's recommendation, to establish institutions and for the Governor, on the like recommendation, to declare an institution or part of an institution to be a committal centre or a voluntary centre. Clause 7 repeals and re-enacts section 6 of the principal Act to make provision for the Governor, on the board's recommendation to appoint officers of the board, such as superintendents, medical officers and welfare officers, and for the minister, on the board's recommendation, to appoint other employees of the board. Unless the Governor otherwise determines, all officers shall be subject to the Public Service Act and Superannuation Act. Clause 8 amends section 7 of the principal Act by providing that the board has the control, supervision and management of all institutions and is responsible for the treatment and discipline of patients. It makes the board responsible to the Minister, and sets out the other functions and responsibilities of the board. The clause further provides that in cases of emergency the Chairman may validly act without the board's authority, but such action is subject to the board's ratification.

Clause 9 amends section 11 to provide that of the two official visitors for a centre one must be a special magistrate or a medical practitioner. Under the Act at present, one must be a special magistrate and the other a medical practitioner. Clause 10 amends section 13 of the principal Act to enable a person to be admitted to a voluntary centre on his own application or on the application of a relative or welfare officer and abolishes the power of a member of the Police Force to make such an application. The clause also makes it unnecessary for a personal application to be supported by two medical certificates as at present. Clauses 11 to 16 make drafting improvements or consequential amendments to the principal Act, but provision is made that a person who is committed by a court to a centre shall be admitted to a committal centre and not a voluntary centre. The Bill, however, provides that a court may release an offender on his entering

into a recognizance on condition that he undergoes treatment at a voluntary centre.

Clause 17 amends section 21 by giving the board (in lieu of the Director as at present) power to transfer a patient from one institution to another, but prohibits the transfer of a patient from a voluntary centre to a committal centre. Clauses 18 to 22 make certain drafting and consequential amendments to the principal Act. Section 33 of the principal Act, as re-enacted by clause 23, provides for gratuities to be paid to patients at such rates and subject to such conditions as are prescribed, and abolishes the maximum rate of 4s. a day under the existing provision.

Clause 23 also repeals section 34 of the principal Act which requires all patients of a centre to be classified by the classification committee of the centre. The advisory committee considers the section unnecessary, as the classification of patients of an institution will be done administratively according to the needs of that institution. In place of existing section 34 a new section is enacted empowering the board, with appropriate Ministerial approval, to employ the services of officers and any facilities of the Public Service, and to use services and facilities provided by other persons and bodies. The provisions of this section will enable the board to make economical arrangements for the use of existing facilities without having to duplicate them unnecessarily. The board will also be able (with Ministerial approval) to co-operate with any body for the furtherance of the objectives of the legislation.

Clauses 24 to 26 make drafting and consequential amendments to the principal Act. In order to give full effect to amendments recommended by the advisory committee referred to earlier, a number of additional amendments of a formal and consequential nature are necessary. These are detailed in the schedule which is incorporated in the Bill by virtue of clause 27.

Mr. FRANK WALSH secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINISTERS).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 29. Page 1291.)

Mr. LAUCKE (Barossa): It cannot be said with any degree of fairness or truth that there has ever been any undue haste or precipitate action to increase the size of the Ministerial ranks in the South Australian Parliament over the years. Under the first Constitution Act in South Australia there were five Ministers.

The number was increased to six in 1873, reduced to four in 1901, and then increased to six again in 1908. It remained at this figure of six until 1953, when the number of Ministers was increased to eight.

The issue before us this afternoon is a simple one. If we relate the continuing expansion of activities generally in this State to those members of the Government who direct the activities of the State, then it is obvious that there should be more Ministers to direct the State's affairs. When we look at some figures that are available, it is quite revealing to note just how South Australia has progressed, in both sections of the economy, over the last 25 years. In the primary sector great advances have been made. The recent harvest has been the biggest in our history, and likewise our sheep population is the largest in our history. Indeed, record levels apply throughout the whole gamut of activity in the rural side of our economy.

We have also reached record levels in the secondary sector of the economy. In 1938-39 South Australia had 2,067 factories, employing some 43,371 people. In 1953-54 we had 3,577 factories, employing 85,503 people, and in 1960-61 the number of factories had increased to 5,042, employing 99,955 people. The gross output of factories has increased tremendously. In 1938-39 the output was £35,000,000, or £58 16s. 5d. per capita. In 1953-54 the gross output was £275,311,000, or £337 10s. 6d. per capita. The latest figures available are for 1960-61, by which time the gross output of our factories had reached £401,628,000, or £419 13s. per capita.

Mr. Jennings: What about the national debt?

Mr. LAUCKE: Unfortunately, that has increased in proportion, or even more than that. However, we have certainly advanced greatly in respect of our assets and in the creation of opportunities for employment. I regard government of the State as being similar to the direction of any business enterprise. With the growth of any enterprise, greater numbers are invariably needed in the top administration of the business, as well as in the staff. Efficiency has to be ensured, and it is only right to expect that those who direct the whole of the affairs of a given business should be assisted from time to time with more personnel to enable the overall directions to be carried through efficiently. This is necessary so that there will be no undue strain on those who are called upon to direct from the highest levels.

Mr. Riches: This proposal is for an increase in the executive without an increase in the number of members.

Mr. LAUCKE: It proposes an increase in the executive, which must, I feel, reduce the burden on the shoulders of those who now carry the entire responsibility of direction. Our Ministers in South Australia have over the years done remarkably well to keep so close to their departments, we not have a bureaucratic type of Government or the departments running themselves. The Ministers have applied themselves intimately and personally to the direction of the departments under their control, which is most desirable.

I have the highest regard for our South Australian Public Service. We are indeed blessed to have such excellent departments, be it the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Education Department, or the Hospitals Department. Wherever we look at the public interest in South Australia we appreciate that we have a first-class public service, and they have not become a bureaucracy in themselves: they are directly responsible to a Minister, which Minister has invariably maintained a personal touch with his department. But with the great growth of population in South Australia and with the increased tempo of our business activities (and I use the word "business" in its broadest sense) it is unreasonable, in my opinion, to expect eight Ministers to do that which six Ministers did in 1908. It does not make sense to me.

Mr. Clark: The honourable member realizes that he is also putting up a very good argument for an increase in the size of Parliament?

Mr. LAUCKE: At the moment my remarks are directed towards the number of Ministers; I am not looking beyond that for the moment. I make my point as one who has had a little experience in business. As any enterprise grows, so does its administration grow to ensure efficiency within that business and not to impose undue burdens on the management.

I was rather surprised at the Leader of the Opposition's attitude to this Bill when he spoke on it. I thought it rather a reversal of past advocacy on his part. Here we have an opportunity to facilitate State development and I thought, and still think, that this gentleman really desires the growth of industry and the utmost increased activity within the economic circle of South Australia. Yet I heard him say that he would not support this legislation. The points made by the Premier in his second reading explanation were valid and telling.

Mr. Ryan: Careful now!

Mr. LAUCKE: He said that he hoped this Bill might enable greater emphasis to be placed on the attraction of new industries to the State. There was a time when we had a happy hunting ground for new industries, when we were possibly the first State to go out and look for new industrial interests to come here. Other States have been equally as keen as we ourselves have been in recent years to attract industry to their States, for obvious reasons: the more industry there is, the greater are the employment opportunities available. One hand washes the other continuously. An industry of a certain type once established has ancillary industry, and so there is an ever growing and strengthening economy.

Mr. Ryan: We read about that every Thursday in the *Advertiser*, don't we?

Mr. LAUCKE: We note the effect of it in the State's general condition all the time. Nobody can deny that in this State (I am not saying that it is entirely as a result of any one Administration) there has been a fine climate that has enabled certain things to be done. It has been a good community pulling together that has given South Australia a mighty good place in the scheme of things among the States of Australia. The growth of our factories alone indicates that there has been a strong and purposeful seeking out and obtaining of new industries. Our factories have increased in 25 years from 2,000 to 5,000, which is good.

Mr. Jennings: Firstly, this Bill will not go through. Secondly, you will not get the job anyway.

Mr. LAUCKE: I am speaking of this quite dispassionately.

Mr. Ryan: What were you told this morning?

Mr. LAUCKE: With regard to new industries coming to this State, there should be a set-up to attract to South Australia industries that we have not at present. I do not believe in existing industry in any part of Australia being taken over by any outside interest; nor do I believe in capital being used to take over existing Australian industry. But we need assistance to introduce new industries. When we seek out new industries that will not duplicate existing industries, then we are approaching the stage where we can enjoy the continuing expansion of our economy for the welfare and the general betterment of the whole people.

Mr. Ryan: Will this Bill do that?

Mr. LAUCKE: It will, I think, assist in the general administration of the State. I think we do sometimes overburden our Ministers with excessive duties. We do not do it intentionally but it springs from our present system. I have endeavoured to indicate that it is desirable to have an Administration in keeping with the volume of interests within a State. In South Australia at present we need to be fair to those Ministers now directing its affairs. They should be assisted. I support this Bill.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I oppose the Bill. Would I be in order in asking for leave to continue my remarks?

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has only half a minute to go before the adjournment.

Mr. JENNINGS: In that case—

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

Mr. JENNINGS: I remember saying before the dinner adjournment that I opposed the Bill.

Mr. Ryan: You haven't changed your mind, have you?

Mr. JENNINGS: I certainly have not. I have been canvassed about it, but I have not changed my mind, and I do not intend to change it. I was interested in the remarks of the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke).

Mr. Lawn: Do you think he is a likely candidate?

Mr. JENNINGS: It was an interesting speech—the speech of an aspirant. I understand I will be followed by the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe).

Mr. Lawn: Another aspirant!

Mr. Ryan: They are all aspirants.

Mr. JENNINGS: It will be something like the garbage cart following the Lord Mayor's procession! Nevertheless, I know that the member for Torrens is also an aspirant. There are many others.

Mr. Shannon: Don't forget me!

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think the honourable member has much hope. I will tell the House who the new Minister will be. There is not the slightest doubt that the member for Barossa has a case because he must have his waning electoral support bolstered. The member for Torrens knows he will not be the member for Torrens next year, irrespective of any electoral rigging that may go on.

Mr. Shannon: This was said on November 10 last year.

Mr. JENNINGS: I believe—and I am telling members opposite more than they know

about their own business—there is not the slightest doubt that the member for Eyre will be the new Minister.

Mr. Lawn: Will he be the Minister for Air?

Mr. JENNINGS: He might as well be. There is only one Minister in this Cabinet, anyway.

Mr. Lawn: You said it!

Mr. JENNINGS: I am going to quote someone else who said it—someone who is sitting on the other side of the House now. The last time a measure like this came before the House was in 1953. Then every member on this side supported it. There were only two dissentients—the then member for Stanley and the member for Chaffey. The Labor Party has always believed there should be an increase in the size of Cabinet. This has not been unconditional, however. It has always been our attitude that we need a larger Cabinet because we need Ministers in charge of departments not now under the control of Ministers, but, on the other hand, we have not wanted to see more front benchers than back benchers. I will quote from what the Premier said when he introduced a similar Bill in 1953. His speech on that occasion was interesting. Mr. O'Halloran, in reply, said that the second reading explanation covered only three-quarters of a foolscap page, but that the Premier spoke for 40 minutes to justify an increase in the size of Cabinet—and, as I have said, no member on this side of the House opposed it. If we had known whom the Premier intended appointing perhaps we might have done so.

Mr. Bywaters: He was a 100 to 1 shot!

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think the Premier is in the least interested in increasing the size of Cabinet.

Mr. Heaslip: Are you? Are you supporting it?

Mr. JENNINGS: I think I mentioned before the honourable member came in or before he took out his ear pads that I was opposed to it.

Mr. Lawn: The member for Rocky River just woke up!

Mr. JENNINGS: Not completely.

Mr. Lawn: But he has been asleep.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not believe the Premier is in the least interested in increasing the size of Cabinet because, as far as he is concerned, he is the Cabinet.

Mr. Ryan: Without doubt.

Mr. JENNINGS: However, even the Premier at times gets into the position where he gets a little irritation from back benchers, and I am sure the elevation of the member for

Burra to Cabinet caused a little dismay in the ranks of the aspirants on the other side and, as a consequence, the Premier has to make a job for someone to placate some of those who were disappointed. However, he is making it difficult for himself because of all the aspirants only one cannot be disappointed, and I have nominated that person. In his 1953 second reading explanation the Premier said:

It is not possible, nor desirable, to put the clock back to the good old days when it was regarded as the function of Parliament to make laws, the duty of the Government merely to administer them and of the judiciary to interpret them. Whether we like it or not there has grown up in the community a demand—which in any democratic society—

Fancy that coming from this source!—must be met—that the Government shall do more than those things, and therefore we are faced with the alternative of establishing various semi-governmental activities under their own self-constituted boards not answerable directly to Parliament, or creating a larger Ministry to ensure adequate supervision and direct responsibility to Parliament.

I applaud the Premier for those remarks; I only wish he believed them. I only wish he meant them, because he was merely echoing what we on this side of the House have said for years. Mr. O'Halloran interjected and said:

Something that is very desirable.

The Premier went on to say:

There are two very sincere points of view on that matter, but I confess that I believe that the bulk of such activities should be under the control of a Minister of the Crown and that the Minister should be in his place in Parliament to answer questions and be accountable for the conduct of his departments.

Shades of the Electricity Trust, the Housing Trust, and the rest of them! He went on to say:

The alternative to a growing bureaucracy is a democracy.

Once again I wish he meant it. Later on in this interesting debate the member for Stanley had something to say. He started by quoting Winston Churchill; I do not think we should go far with that, but he said something later that was interesting, something that we were accustomed to hearing from him. He said:

Surely that epitomizes my attitude towards this Bill. I do not intend to be mealy-mouthed in debate, neither do I intend to be chicken-hearted when it comes to voting. The Bill provides for an alteration of the Constitution to allow two extra Ministers and to make provision for paying them. All attempts in the past to increase the size of the Ministry have had a rather stormy passage. Except in one instance, in the day of the Peake Government, every

attempt has been by Labor administrations, but they have been frustrated in another place. There is not the slightest doubt that this Bill will pass. We will have two extra Ministers because it has been pre-ordained that it shall be so. Today Parliament no longer makes or unmakes Governments, but Governments in the form of Cabinets direct Parliament, and because of that Parliament has lost its old function. The Bill will pass and we will have two extra Ministers. As far as I am concerned, in the light of existing conditions they will not add one atom of good or make the slightest difference to South Australia. The Premier, in his second reading speech, said that it was not possible to put the clock back to the good old days when it was regarded as the function of Parliament to make laws, the duty of the Government merely to administer them . . . Then there is a second danger he mentioned, and it applies with great force in South Australia where we have the dominating personality of one man, a completely subservient Cabinet, Government and Government Party, which do precisely as they are told—

Mr. Ryan: They still do.

Mr. JENNINGS: I do not think that the Cabinet is any less subservient now than it was then.

Mr. Lawn: The Premier is lapping up the honourable member's words like chocolate.

Mr. JENNINGS: I certainly do not intend to bore the House or to delay proceedings for very long. In the last alteration to the Constitution Act in regard to Ministers, shortly after my election to this Parliament in 1953—

Mr. Clark: That was a very important year.

Mr. JENNINGS: It was for me, and consequently for South Australia. Things stuck in my memory then better than they do now.

Mr. Millhouse: You were younger then!

Mr. JENNINGS: I think that is a reasonable assumption. In 1953 the Act provided:

The Ministers of the Crown shall respectively bear such titles and fill such ministerial offices as the Governor from time to time appoints, and not more than five of the Ministers shall at one time be members of the House of Assembly.

That leaves it pretty wide open because this Bill merely says that there shall not be more than six Ministers in this House, which means of course that there could be five in the Upper House. I do not think there should be any Ministers in the Upper House. In fact I do not think there should be an Upper House for any Minister to be in. On the occasion in 1953 to which I have referred—and this was one of those times when *Hansard* was rather kind to him—the Premier said in reply to an interjection from Mr. Riches that an extra Minister was needed in the Upper

House because sometimes a Minister might be in another State or somewhere else on official business.

Mr. Bywaters: Away duck shooting!

Mr. JENNINGS: I think it was before that occasion. The Premier said that for natural reasons it might be difficult for only one Minister to maintain the House. However, as the Legislative Council sits for only short periods any Minister who cannot contain himself in continence is physically unfit to be a member of even that Chamber. Surely he could move for the suspension of the Council until the ringing of the bells.

The Labor Party has always advocated an increase in the Cabinet, but it has always been conditional on an increase in the size of Parliament. In the Commonwealth Parliament there are 184 members and 22 Ministers which is 8.4 members to Ministers. I have had these figures worked out by the Commonwealth Statistician. In New South Wales there are 154 members and 16 Ministers (a ratio of 9.6); in Victoria there are 100 members and 14 Ministers (a ratio of 7.1); in Queensland, where there is not the incubus of an Upper House, there are 78 members and six Ministers (a ratio of 13.0); in Tasmania there are 54 members and six Ministers (a ratio of 9.0); in Western Australia there are 80 members and 10 Ministers (a ratio of 8.0). In South Australia, if this proposal is carried, there will be a ratio of 6.6 members to each Minister

If this Bill passes we shall have a greater preponderance of Ministers to members than any other State except for Queensland, where there is no Upper House. The Labor Party does not object to an increase in the size of Cabinet, but it certainly disagrees with executive control of Parliament, which is precisely what this Bill is leading us towards. Let the Government bring in some measure to increase the size of the Parliament with the proper democratic means of electing an increased Parliament and nobody on this side will oppose an increase in the size of Cabinet. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. CUMBE (Torrens): We have just listened to another sarcastic and flippant speech from the honourable member for Enfield. We have come to expect from him—and certainly recognize—his lighthearted approach to such rather important measures as the Bill before us and I for one regret his treatment of such Bills. Some people may think it funny. I do not. This is an important Bill, although, amazingly enough, it contains only three clauses. In South Australia, with a population growing

and the State expanding so rapidly, we find that the volume of work to be handled by Cabinet—and by individual Ministers—has increased enormously over the last few years. It has already been stated that the last increase in Cabinet was in 1953. However, Ministerial duties have certainly increased considerably in the past 11 years: the Budgets this Parliament is asked to approve each year have increased tremendously and greater responsibility has been thrust on Ministers. For instance, in 1953 the Budget presented by the Treasurer totalled about £50,000,000 whereas last year it totalled almost £100,000,000. The eight Ministers in 1953 were expected to handle £50,000,000, but now they are handling £100,000,000. I mention those figures to show, apart from anything else, the increased financial responsibilities of the Ministers to Parliament and to the public. Three major moves are necessary to correct the present position. First, we must relieve Ministers of some of their heavier individual duties. Secondly, we must re-organize several Government departments by regrouping, amalgamation and division. In other words, that is re-organization of some Public Service departments under the control of various Ministers. Thirdly, we must provide greater assistance to industry.

These improvements can be achieved, if the Bill is passed, by the appointment of an additional Minister, who would be the ninth Minister. The increase in size and variety of projects coming before Cabinet is indicated by the reports of the Public Works Committee, which projects are becoming more extensive and varied. They indicate the magnitude of departmental works being handled by individual Ministers. I listened with some interest to the member for Enfield quoting certain figures. Frankly, I did not follow him. I may be at fault but, on the other hand, I presume I was not the only member who could not follow him. I have figures that I consider are germane to this argument and more relevant. I have taken out examples of the Lower Houses only, because we are talking in this Bill about appointing another Minister who shall be a member of this Chamber.

Mr. Jennings: It does not mean that at all. Have a look at the Bill!

Mr. CUMBE: If the honourable member reads the Bill and studies the second reading explanation he will see that there will be a sixth Minister in this House.

Mr. Jennings: It does not say that at all. Have a look at the Bill!

Mr. CUMBE: I will look at the Bill. Perhaps the honourable member should do so. I have taken out figures for the Lower Houses of the various State Parliaments. In South Australia we have five Ministers in a House of 39 members, giving a proportion of one Minister to 7.8 members. In New South Wales (the largest State Parliament) there are 14 Ministers in the Lower House of 94 members, a proportion of one in 6.1. Victoria has 11 Ministers in a House of 66, which is one in six. Tasmania, the smallest House, has eight Ministers in the Lower House of 35 members, which is one in 4.37. Queensland, a one-chamber Parliament, has 11 Ministers for 78 members, which is one in 7.1. Western Australia has eight Ministers in a House of 50, which is one in 6.25. It is apparent that South Australia has the smallest ratio of Ministers to members. If a sixth Minister were appointed the figure would be reduced to one Minister for every 6.5 members.

Mr. Clark: You can make figures mean almost anything.

Mr. CUMBE: Possibly the honourable member can make them mean anything.

Mr. Clark: You are doing that.

Mr. CUMBE: I am giving the number of members in the Lower Houses and the number of Ministers in those Houses.

Mr. Clark: Why ignore the remainder?

Mr. CUMBE: The figures I have given are more reliable than the horrible collection of figures given by the member for Enfield, because they included Upper Houses. Look at the position in the Upper House of New South Wales.

Mr. Shannon: That State has a Labor Government, yet still has an Upper House.

Mr. CUMBE: All the members are not elected; many are nominated.

The SPEAKER: Order! Too many members are making speeches. There should be only one at a time. The honourable member for Torrens.

Mr. CUMBE: I sum up by saying that even with an additional Minister in this House the ratio will still be the lowest, with the exception of Queensland; a one-chamber House, of any State Parliament in Australia.

Mr. Clark: It is nice to see the Upper House ignored for once.

Mr. Dunstan: The effect is reduced if you have a smaller Lower House. Can't you see the difference between a House of 78 and one of 39?

Mr. COURCELLE: I am speaking about the Bill before this House as at present constituted. We are not talking about a smaller or larger House, and the honourable member for Norwood knows that as well as I do.

Mr. Dunstan: You were an advocate of a larger House.

The SPEAKER: I suggest you carry on this conversation after supper.

Mr. COURCELLE: The member for Norwood is anxious, so perhaps he may be able to do something. I suggest that a new Minister should have some connection with the fostering of industry. The member for Barossa said something along these lines earlier. Primary production in this country is important and it accounts for a large proportion of our export income. Primary industry in this State has a whole department (the Department of Agriculture with a Minister of Agriculture) to assist and foster it. That is right, and I have no argument with it, but I suggest that more extension services could be given. There is only a small Department of Industry, but it does not assist secondary industry because, as set up, it deals primarily with safety, inspections, conditions, awards and determinations. These are its main functions. It is a necessary department, but the only assistance given by it to industry comes from a small section called the Industries Assistance Branch, comprising about six technical officers. Compare that with the assistance given to primary industry! Surely we need to expand such a department so that it can assist industry, because secondary industry has the largest single group of employers in this State and provides employment to a much larger degree than does the whole of primary industry. My plea is that the Department of Industry be expanded. It warrants a Minister in charge. He may have other duties, but at least there should be a Minister in charge of the department. The future of South Australia depends to a marked degree on whether we continue to attract to this State new and worthwhile industries. All members will agree with that statement.

Mr. Loveday: Hasn't a Minister in the Upper House something to do with what you are talking about?

Mr. COURCELLE: The Attorney-General administers the Department of Industry.

Mr. Loveday: You seem to have excluded that from your other calculations.

Mr. COURCELLE: The department is confined and restricted, and at present cannot assist industry as it should. It is essential to this State's well-being that we continue to attract

industry and to improve and make more efficient our existing industries. This will ensure the employment of more South Australians. It is imperative that every possible assistance be given to new industries. If a new department is established its aims should include attempting to secure new industries and advising and assisting established industries to make them more efficient. Can any member conscientiously oppose such a suggestion? The department should be able to gather information concerning existing, new or proposed industries and undertakings, and it should also perform research in order to promote and encourage the establishment, development and expansion of industry generally.

It has been pointed out that one of the objects of appointing a new Minister is to foster and attract new industries and to build up our industrial force. We either favour that proposal or we oppose it. The Government favours encouraging industries, so we support the Bill. As a corollary can it be said that those who oppose the Bill oppose the expansion of industry? I have always supported proposals to assist and expand secondary industry, not to the disadvantage of other sections of the community but so that it can progress. By appointing a new Minister we will be encouraging and fostering the extension of industry, but by voting against this proposal one will be doing a grave dis-service to industry and to the State.

Mr. HUTCHENS (Hindmarsh): I oppose the second reading.

Mr. Dunstan: You are not an aspirant?

Mr. HUTCHENS: Unfortunately, no, but I think it is time a member from this side of the House was an aspirant. I listened with much interest to the play on words indulged in by members opposite. The member for Torrens suggested that my Party was not interested in developing industry. How foolish and unreasonable can one get? We know that this State cannot progress without industry and that if it doesn't progress misery will ensue. It is foolish to suggest that we want misery arising from unemployment. Members opposite have referred to this State's development. I do not disagree with their comments in this regard. The member for Barossa quoted figures and then said, "We have a magnificent Public Service". That is not disputed. I was amazed, however, when the member for Torrens said, in effect, that no good comes from the Legislative Council and that its Ministers should be disregarded. We

are discussing the appointment of an additional Minister for South Australia, irrespective of where he is situated, and to suggest, as did the member for Torrens, that the new Minister must be in this House—

Mr. Millhouse: He must be.

Mr. Heaslip: The Bill says he must come from this House.

Mr. HUTCHENS: I am not arguing about what the Bill says; I claim that it will be an additional Minister for South Australia.

Mr. Heaslip: You are talking about the Bill, aren't you?

Mr. HUTCHENS: I wish I could talk to people who could understand. If members will bear with me and try to understand me—

Mr. Shannon: Let me have your dictionary and I will have a try.

Mr. HUTCHENS: There are none so dumb as those who cannot or will not read.

Mr. Heaslip: You read the Bill to see what it says.

Mr. HUTCHENS: When the birds in their little cages have quietened down I will continue. I have read the Bill.

Mr. Heaslip: Well, read it again!

Mr. HUTCHENS: Perhaps I will allow the honourable member to read it aloud to me. No-one has denied that it provides for an additional Minister for South Australia.

Mr. Heaslip: In this House.

Mr. Dunstan: It does not say "in this House". It is about time you read the Bill. You have not the faintest idea of what you are talking about.

Mr. HUTCHENS: It does not matter whether I keep a fowl in my house or in my garage, if it is on my property it is my fowl.

Mr. Jennings: If you are talking about poultry why not mention galahs?

Mr. HUTCHENS: I submit that the contentions of the member for Enfield were correct. This Bill has been before the House for a long time. It was introduced on August 22, the Premier gave his second reading explanation on August 28 and then nothing happened until the Leader spoke on October 29. The Premier made one or two interesting comments during his speech. He said, as reported on page 730 of *Hansard*:

If Opposition members delved into the pages of *Hansard* they would find that there is much history in this matter, and I hope it will not be followed in this instance.

What he was saying, of course, was, "We believe that my Party has been pretty lousy in the past, but we hope you won't be." Apart from having read the Bill I have read many

of the speeches made in connection with previous attempts to increase the number of Ministers in South Australia. I thought I might find something worth while, but did not, so I will not quote from those debates.

Mr. Millhouse: It would be better for your case if you did not.

Mr. HUTCHENS: From the viewpoint of a lawyer that may be so, but I do not acknowledge that it is.

Mr. Dunstan: Oh!

Mr. HUTCHENS: A second-class lawyer. The Opposition is opposing this Bill not merely for the sake of opposing it, but in the interests of the people of South Australia. We have been told that a new Minister is needed but the duties he will perform have not been outlined, although many suggestions have been made about what he will do. The Premier has gone to much trouble to show that the affairs of the Electricity Trust are under the jurisdiction of two Ministers. He has said that financial problems are dealt with by the Treasurer and physical problems by the Minister of Works. He also said that Parliament had no Minister of Housing. That is not something new! The Labor Party has been talking about this need for years. Before the last election the Leader said, in his policy speech, that Labor would appoint a Minister of Housing without increasing the number of Ministers.

Mr. Jennings: And the people endorsed that policy.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes, by an overwhelming majority. The Premier said that the South Australian Tourist Bureau was under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Lands in some respects, but under the Treasurer in other respects. From all that the Premier said, the only inference to draw is that he is completely incompetent to adjust effectively the responsibilities of his Ministers.

Mr. Heaslip: You are the only one who thinks so.

Mr. HUTCHENS: If the member studies the results of the last election he will see that the people of South Australia endorsed my opinion. If the appointment of an additional Minister is approved, will the Premier's selection be more satisfactory than past selections? The Premier has been in office for many years, yet with all his experience his selection of Ministers has not been satisfactory, and he admits it.

Mr. Clark: He pulls them out of a hat!

Mr. HUTCHENS: It must be a poor hat. Only Queensland has a greater ratio of Ministers to members.

Mr. Jennings: That is because they have no Upper House.

Mr. HUTCHENS: Yes. When Parliament is asked to do something it should know what it is doing. In this instance it should know what the new Minister's duties will be and how the portfolios of other Ministers are to be reallocated; then members would be able to vote with confidence. Although the arguments put forward by members opposite have justified a substantial increase in the number of members, no argument has been adduced to show what work a new Minister would perform. The Premier has admitted that the present Ministerial arrangements are unsatisfactory and he should not be given the opportunity to extend this state of affairs.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I warmly support the second reading. That will not surprise anybody because I advocated an increase in the size of Cabinet during my speech in the debate on the Address in Reply. Had I not been used to the absolute irresponsibility of the Opposition, I would have been staggered by their opposition to this Bill. As it is, even though one learns to take anything from the Opposition because it is so unpredictable, I am at my wits' end to find reasons for the opposition that has been forthcoming from speakers opposite. I have read with great care the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Frank Walsh). I can find no reason at all in that speech to justify his opposition to the Bill. I listened with some enjoyment to the speech of the honourable member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), but I am afraid I could not find even one point that would justify his opposition. I listened to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hutchens), and again I must say, with great respect to him, that I could find nothing to justify his opposition.

Mr. Clark: You certainly are at your wits' end!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I have consulted the *Rules, Platforms and Standing Orders of the Australian Labor Party* to see whether any clue to the opposition could be found in that very precious document! However, it shows that the Labor Party advocates two additional portfolios, a Minister of Transport and a Minister of Housing, but does not say anything about dropping any of the other portfolios. How on earth can one say, as the Labor

Party says (and only the Labor Party could say) under the heading of "Transport", "The co-ordinating of all transport services under a Minister of Transport responsible to Parliament"? Under the heading "Housing", the document states: "A Minister for Housing to be appointed to carry out all the functions of such office." That is the Labor Party's view (we have heard it advocated on the other side of the House year in and year out): that two extra Ministers be appointed. It is set down in the platform of the Party, yet the Opposition now has the gall to oppose this Bill.

Mr. Jennings: Why can't Lands and Agriculture be co-ordinated for a start?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why didn't the member for Enfield, in his delightful and amusing speech (I usually enjoy his speeches, although the member for Torrens was not amused on this occasion), make constructive suggestions? There is no clue to that in the platform of his Party!

Mr. Lawn: You want us to give you the clues all the time.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I think the Opposition owes it to the public of South Australia to give some clues sometimes, but at present we do not get any clues from members on the other side. If the Opposition became the Government (it thinks it will but it won't) it would be able to take advantage of a Bill of this nature. The Opposition will not become the Government, although it is difficult to convince members opposite of this in spite of what happened on November 30. This Bill simply provides for an increase in the number of Ministers to nine. Perhaps I went a little too far when the honourable member for Hindmarsh was speaking and I said that the Minister would have to come from this House, it contemplates six coming from this House, and it is perfectly obvious that the new Minister will come from this House. The Bill does not specify his duties: they are laid down by the Governor. If we go back only 11 years we can see what was said when this matter was last before the House by the very Opposition members who have spoken today. I had some amusement looking through the 1953 volume of *Hansard* and comparing speeches made then with those made today. At that time the present member for Edwardstown (the Leader of the Opposition) was the member for Goodwood, although he did not have the same job as he has now, being only the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in those days. The

speech the honourable member made then is not of great assistance; he supported the increase from six Ministers to eight.

Mr. Clark: We all did.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Gawler is ahead of me on that and I am glad he is.

Mr. Clark: No-one has made any secret of the fact that we supported that increase.

Mr. Jennings: Except the present Minister of Lands.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The present Leader of the Opposition was not very helpful in his support of the Bill, because he had some sort of a grouch about Ministerial salaries at that time and spent all his time discussing that point. However, the then Leader of the Opposition (the late Mr. O'Halloran) was, as always, much more fluent and explicit in what he had to say. He first upbraided the Premier for giving what he said was an unduly long explanation of a Bill that would not be controversial. He then went on to say:

The Premier is not entitled to expect serious opposition from this side of the House, because he said that on previous occasions when Labor under a different electoral system occupied the Treasury benches, it put forward proposals to increase the number of Ministers, and we have indicated our continued belief in the desirability of that action, by suggestions we have made from time to time. It will be recalled that during the worst period of the housing problem—

and this is something that the present Leader of the Opposition called in aid of his opposition to this Bill, as his predecessor did not—we continually advocated that a better form of organization should be established to solve it, and that it should be under the control of a Minister with no other responsibilities.

Having directed the House's attention to the very thing the present Leader of the Opposition did when he spoke in this debate, what did Mr. O'Halloran do? He certainly did not—as members opposite now do—oppose the Bill: he supported it, but expressed the hope that there would be a Minister of Housing.

Mr. Clark: Do you realize that there is a great deal of difference between six Ministers and nine Ministers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The last increase was from six to eight in a Lower House of 39 members and an Upper House of 20 members. Of course, there is another Bill to come, and if we consider the ratio between the former increase and the increase from eight to nine, as is now suggested, with a Lower House of 42 members and an Upper House of 24 members, I think the bottom is completely knocked out of the Opposition's argument.

Mr. Clark: You might be counting your chickens a bit.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am only showing the fallacy in the line of argument the Opposition is putting up. When we compare the proportions roughly, the increase which we are now advocating is justified. All I say about Mr. O'Halloran is that he directed attention to the size of the House and expressed the wish that it be increased. However, neither in his speech nor in the speech of any member of the Opposition who spoke on that occasion—people who are members now and were members then—was there any suggestion that we were getting near the upper limit of Ministers for the size of the House. There is not one word anywhere about that.

What did the member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) say on that occasion? I have made a note of something he said then because it is not quite the same as what he said tonight. The honourable member (at page 680 of *Hansard*) said:

On perusing *Hansard* I was amazed to find that a similar measure was introduced by a Labor Government in 1930 and opposed by a Liberal Opposition, but on this occasion South Australians will find in the Labor Opposition a greater appreciation of the needs of this State. That was 10 years ago. Unfortunately, that greater appreciation of the needs of the State has evaporated in the meantime, because the arguments which were adduced then certainly have been disregarded or contradicted now. The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan), who interjected a few minutes ago, supported the Bill warmly and discussed education. The member for Enfield, to whom I have just referred, did not even bother to speak at all in the debate, let alone say any of the things which he and his colleagues have been saying in the present debate. However, of course, he gave a silent vote for the Bill when it came to the vote, because there were only two dissentients and they were both Independent members. All the Opposition members and all the Government members voted in favour of it.

Mr. Jennings: There was a much more important Constitutional Bill before the House at the same time, on which I spoke at length.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Perhaps exactly the same thing could be said now, and the member for Enfield knows that that, too, is true. In the last 10 years, for some sort of misguided or misplaced Party political purpose, there has been a complete somersault—

Mr. Lawn: You are put out because you are missing the bus.

Mr. MILLHOUSE:—in the attitude of the Opposition. I defy any member to refer to the debate in 1953 and draw one of the arguments out of it which are now being adduced in opposition to this Bill. That is really all I wanted to say—to point to the absolute irresponsibility of the Opposition and its *volte face*. No doubt the member for Enfield will understand what that means and will know that what I say is true. I do not propose to canvass any further the merits of this matter; they speak for themselves, without my saying anything more. I do not think it matters two hoots whether or not we give the Treasurer the title of Premier, for he has done pretty well without that title during the past few years. I read in the press only a few weeks ago that his grandfather, when Premier, preferred to be called the “Prime Minister of South Australia”, which, of course, is as good and just as effective as the title of Premier.

Mr. Jennings: You have no hope of getting the job!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is all right; I am not even trying. If we look at the increase of population from just under 800,000 in 1953 to over 1,000,000 today, if we look at the development of the State, and if we look at the increase in work which the Ministers have to undertake, there is no doubt at all of the justification for this measure. As I have said previously, the position justifies at least one more Minister, if not two. With those few halting remarks, I support the second reading.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): As do other members on this side of the House who have already spoken, I oppose this Bill. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) has referred to what members on this side of the House said in 1953. Unfortunately, through certain happenings, I was not a member at that time; I should have been, but I was not. However, that is past history. Of course, I was not able to comment on the Bill that was before the House at that time. I think the member for Mitcham is a little bit astray when he compares the Labor Party attitude at that time to the increase from six Ministers to eight with its present attitude to the proposed increase from eight Ministers to nine on this occasion. I think that not only the members then and now but all taxpayers in this State would have agreed at that time that six Ministers was a ridiculously low number. Only two members of the House, I am told, opposed that increase for particular reasons; but all people who gave this matter some thought felt, I am sure, that that was a

reasonable thing. We had 39 members then and we increased the Cabinet from six to eight Ministers. But now we still have 39 members and, although the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) has referred to another Bill to come before this House, it is purely a hypothetical question and there is no certainty that this House will increase in size soon.

Mr. Clark: What sort of an increase would it be, anyway?

Mr. BYWATERS: I shall come to that in a moment. In any case, the whole position is that at this stage members on this side of the House do not consider there is reason for increasing the size of Cabinet while the House remains with its present members. Earlier this session a Bill was introduced by the Opposition to increase its membership to 56. Then, of course, would have been the time to reconsider the position of Cabinet. I agree that possibly the present Ministers are burdened with too much work in their respective portfolios. I appreciate the amount of work they do but nevertheless while the House is constituted as it is, with only 39 members, my Party and I feel there is no justification for increasing the executive control.

The member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) in his illuminating speech was bold enough to forecast who the new Minister would be. I certainly would not be so bold, but I say that what is required of a Minister in this present Government is a man with a good head, one who when the Premier says “Yes” will move it up and down and who when the Premier says “No” will move it sideways. That is the main qualification for being a Minister in this Cabinet.

My main reason for speaking on this Bill is the Premier’s suggestion of an Industries Department to be set up inside the Treasury. That is something that we did not expect in this particular Bill. Members will recall that prior to the last election this was part of the policy speech of the Premier. (I should not call him the Premier, according to this Bill; I should call him the Treasurer. Nevertheless, he is known as the Premier.)

Mr. Lawn: He is known as the master, too.

Mr. BYWATERS: That may be so, but he made a statement that legislation would be brought down in order to encourage industries, and a department would be set up to assist industries in coming to this State and particularly to deal with the decentralizing of industry. This was part of his policy speech.

A full year went by and nothing was done, although it was referred to not only in his speech but in the Governor's Speech opening Parliament after the election. Again, the following year it was suggested, in answer to questions, that this would be brought about by legislation. It did not interest me very much whether or not it would be brought about by legislation. I felt we already had the machinery to have people responsible for encouraging industry to come to this State (particularly in regard to country industry) set up in a department that already existed. We have advisers who are of great assistance to industry—members of technical ability who have been of great worth to certain industries and who have been able to give assistance. It appears to me, however, that when an industry is interested in coming to South Australia it approaches one person, and that is the Premier. This is not the way it should be. There should be a group of people who could be referred to if anyone was interested in coming to establish an industry in this State—or in any other State, for that matter. I believe that throughout the country this request has been made by various committees interested in decentralization. Certainly by the Murray Bridge Industries Development Committee a request was made that some people should be able to be approached to put a case for a particular district. This was the main purpose in the Premier's mind when he made his policy speech the year before last.

Again I felt that this was the main thought in his mind when he answered questions, but it appears that this is not the case now in the introduction of this legislation: it is purely to appoint another Minister. Figures have been quoted today on both sides of the House of percentages of Cabinet Ministers to back benchers. It has been pointed out by members opposite that this Bill applies only to this House. The member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Hutchens) rightly pointed out that this was not so, and he was told to read the Bill, which distinctly states in clause 3 that section 65 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the word "eight" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "nine". Then, of course, as the new Minister would be appointed from this House, it would be necessary also to delete the word "five" and insert in its stead the word "six", applying to the House of Assembly. But still we do not split the Cabinet. It is united, or it should be, and we have our eight members of the Cabinet regardless of the House they represent, whether it be the House

of Assembly or the Legislative Council. They form the Cabinet of this State and dictate its policy by their Cabinet decisions. This is the reason why the member for Hindmarsh said the Bill applied not only to this House but to the whole Parliament.

The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) made an excellent case for an increase in the membership of this House. I do not claim that an increase from 39 to 42 would line up with the statistics he produced in his speech. We have been told that our population has doubled since 1939; in fact, that it has increased almost by 25 per cent in the last 10 years. The member for Barossa put up an excellent case for a much larger House of Assembly than we have at the moment. Had this been the policy of the Government, as mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition in his remarks on the Bill, and had it brought down something a little nearer the mark, the Labor Party would have considered it; but to increase the membership, as has been suggested, from 39 to only 42 is ludicrous in view of the figures produced today by the member for Barossa. An increase has occurred not only in population but also in the wealth of this State, because in both primary and secondary production its wealth has gone ahead by leaps and bounds over recent years. So it is obvious there is a case for a much bigger Parliament, but I may be going outside the range of this Bill if I pursue that now rather than refer to it when another Bill comes before this House. Although the member for Mitcham has stated that members on this side have not made out a case, I believe the only case we could make out is the one we have stated. Every member who has spoken has said the same thing—that it is out of proportion. That is our case.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I support this Bill. I know my saying that will amaze members opposite! The only thing that amazes me is the inconsistency of the Opposition on this matter. Their insincerity is, I think, obvious to everyone who has listened to their speeches on this problem ever since I have been in Parliament, which is many years. They have advocated more Ministerial responsibility and more opportunities for private members of Parliament to deal with Ministers who are responsible for Government departments. Their criticism of the Premier always gives me cause for a certain amount of private mirth. They charge him with being the only man in the Ministry. They say he is the king pin and that if one asks Tom for something and he says "Yes" one can do anything one likes. The

member for Murray (Mr. Bywaters) a few moments ago said that the only qualifications a new Minister would require would be to shake his head when the Premier said "No" and nod his head when the Premier said "Yes". Perhaps I am wrong in my assumption, but I would have thought that an extra member of the Ministry would give the Premier at least one more person he had to convince that he was the only man in the Cabinet. I may be wrong in that; I do not know. Generally speaking, however, the larger the party one has to convince the greater are the difficulties of the man who has to do the convincing.

Mr. Clark: Not if the same man appoints them all.

Mr. SHANNON: Of course, the honourable member rushes right in with his mouth wide open. Obviously, we do not appoint them; the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) does the appointing! The member for Gawler apparently omitted to take note of that. Obviously in this matter he should do his homework again. Let me point out to the member for Enfield a slight error in his remarks. He said that the Government of the day could allocate Ministerial portfolios in any ratio between the Upper House and the Lower House that it decided—that it could make any division it liked between the two Houses.

Mr. Clark: I do not think he said that.

Mr. SHANNON: Yes, he did. He probably thought I did not hear him, but I did.

Mr. Clark: I think he meant the portfolios.

Mr. SHANNON: He mentioned the number. He said it could be five. If I am wrong, *Hansard* will show it, but unless the honourable member corrects this before it gets into print I am sure *Hansard* will show that he said five Ministers could be appointed to the Upper House. When the member for Enfield was speaking, he said what I expected him to say, and I was delighted.

Mr. Ryan: Do you want a mention?

Mr. SHANNON: I do not want to be mentioned; I just want to have my say now. If the member for Port Adelaide wishes to correct the member for Enfield, I think he will be entitled to do so. This Bill amends the Constitution Act.

Mr. Dunstan: Don't we need to read the amendment with the original?

Mr. SHANNON: Yes. The member for Enfield made such an egregious error that it needs to be corrected.

Mr. Dunstan: Just show where he made an error.

Mr. SHANNON: Read clause 3 (b) of the Bill.

Mr. Lawn: You are only asking the honourable member to give you some clues.

Mr. Dunstan: You can have five over there if you want them there.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suggest that you have a conference tomorrow. The honourable member for Onkaparinga.

Mr. SHANNON: Apparently the honourable member has not made up his mind about the interpretation of this measure. Members opposite should do their homework and see what it means. When they have read it carefully and have studied it in conjunction with the existing law they will discover that all we are endeavouring to do is provide for one more member of the Ministerial panel in the House of Assembly. The Minister of Lands knows that the Bill is self-explanatory, and I want to deal with some of the things that have been said about him. I think it is wise that I should have a voice in this matter. It has been said that the appointment of the Minister of Lands caused much heartburn amongst the back benchers of the Party supporting the Premier. That has been said *ad nauseam*. I should like to tell members opposite that the Party I have the honour to support, which supports the present Government, is more than pleased with the choice of the Minister of Lands. He has shown courage, judgment and ability which have delighted the people who support him on this side of the Chamber. I do not want to embarrass the Minister, but I want to say what he is justly entitled to have said about him. He has had some knotty and sticky problems left to him to deal with and, if I may be permitted to use the word, he has dealt with them courageously. Are any members opposite—and some of them have soldier settlers in their districts—prepared to get up and deny that?

Mr. Hughes: We would not.

Mr. SHANNON: Very well. We have an oligarch—Tom Playford we call him—and he is not a bad judge of men, if he alone decides who the panel that serves under him shall be, which has to be proved. I know this is said *ad lib* by members opposite, but I do not agree with it. However, if the charge were true that the Premier was the be-all and end-all of the Ministry, thank God we have a Premier who has his head screwed on the right way and can pick the right man for the job!

Mr. Ryan: You must have changed your mind in the last 12 months, then.

Mr. SHANNON: The honourable member would know about changing his mind. After all, it is a dreadful *cul-de-sac* to get into if you haven't a mind to change! Some people can change their mind and others cannot. I like to change my mind when I am wrong. It is awful not to have a mind to change; please save me from that. This Bill is not in any way a Party measure.

Mr. Jennings: That is true. Do not bring politics into it!

Mr. SHANNON: Is the honourable member just chipping me again? If he is, he should be careful, as I may bite. If we look at this matter objectively, could there be any political implication in deciding the size of the Cabinet that should effect the proper control of the various departments of the State? Should there be any political implication in it? Our friends of the Opposition go to no end of trouble to assess the ratio between the Ministerial panel and the total number of members of Parliament in the various States, but I do not think that approach has any virtue. If, for instance, we are either above or below the mean, does that introduce an argument to decide what we in South Australia should do? I submit that it does not. Our own conduct of the affairs in this State is a matter for this Parliament to decide. I was pleased to hear the member for Murray lauding the Government's efforts to increase the size of Cabinet. It cheered me up no end to know that South

Australia had been growing so fast over the last decade under the guidance of the Liberal and Country Party. If that is true—

Mr. Ryan: You are getting a bit political, aren't you?

Mr. SHANNON: No, I am accepting the alternative offered by the honourable member for Murray.

Mr. Bywaters: It happened in every State of the Commonwealth, of course.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not think the honourable member for Murray mentioned that. I thought he mentioned only South Australia. If the Labor Party were in office it would do exactly what this Government is doing now. Members opposite are suggesting that, if this Parliament were a little larger, "we would grant you a larger Cabinet." I should like to take that back into debates when Parliament was the same size as it is today. Members opposite not only advocated but voted for an increase in Cabinet from six to eight Ministers. There will be an opportunity to enlarge the size of Parliament in South Australia at no distant date. I am hoping that my dear friends on the Opposition benches will remember the things they said tonight when they come to debate that measure.

Mr. LAWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 8.57 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 19, at 2 p.m.