

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, February 19, 1964.

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2.2 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS.**COMPREHENSIVE INSURANCE.**

Mr. FRANK WALSH: Recently premiums for comprehensive insurance on motor vehicles were increased. Press information discloses that because of the high risk of motorists aged between 18 and 25 years comprehensive insurance premiums have increased by 33½ per cent. From memory I believe it costs £39 or £40 for a £1,000 cover. Has the Premier considered this matter? Should the motoring public outside the accident-prone age group be expected to compensate insurance companies for those motorists within that group?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As honourable members know, the position regarding motor vehicle insurance is that the law compels a motorist to take out an insurance cover in respect of third parties. That is a compulsory insurance; it is controlled by the Government, and is subject to decisions of the insurance premiums committee, which investigates the subject of what premiums may be charged. These, of course, are based on the number of accidents that occur. I point out that no differentiation is made in the legislation between motor vehicle drivers of various ages, and under those circumstances I know of no ground upon which I could direct a company to vary its premiums for the various age groups. I realize that the cost of comprehensive insurance today is very high: indeed far too high. Nevertheless, I have had the greatest difficulty in getting many insurance companies to undertake certain insurance. Only yesterday, one honourable member pointed out that many companies are not anxious to take this class of insurance at all because it is not profitable and it is easy to lose large sums on it. In fact, that is borne out by the experience with insurance operations carried out by the Government of one of our neighbouring States which incurs heavy losses on motor vehicle insurance.

I believe that probably a fairer way of dealing with the problem than the way suggested by the Leader is the granting of discounts to accident-free drivers. I know some young people who are extremely responsible with motor vehicles, and I consider that it would be unfair to penalize those people

because of irresponsibility on the part of others. The no-claim rebate now granted takes care of the responsible motorist who is not accident-prone or careless. I am willing to discuss the matter with the insurance companies to see whether the no-claim discounts are large enough or whether they should be further increased, for I believe that is fairer than dealing with the matter purely on the basis of the ages of owners of vehicles.

GOMERSAL WATER SUPPLY.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: In about September of last year I handed to the Minister of Works a petition signed by constituents of mine living in the district of Gomersal, west of Tanunda, requesting a reticulated water supply to the properties named in the petition. Can the Minister say whether favourable consideration has been given to the request made in the petition?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: On receipt of the honourable member's request I had it investigated by the Engineer-in-Chief. Naturally, that took a little time, because additional mains were involved, and also it became apparent that some approval by the proposed rate-payers would be necessary regarding the rating to be applied. These matters have been resolved, and the Engineer-in-Chief has told me that he would be prepared to recommend the scheme. It is a small scheme that will not involve a great capital expenditure, and I have approved it to meet the request of the rate-payers concerned. Although the scheme cannot be proceeded with this year, consideration will be given to it in next year's Loan Estimates and, as it involves a slight increase on normal rating, it will be subject to approval by landholders.

SCHOOL BOOK ALLOWANCES.

Mr. HUGHES: Will the Minister of Education say whether it is departmental policy to halve the book subsidy to students repeating a year of study in a secondary school? If it is, will he outline the reasons for this decision?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: This is the policy, and it has been the accepted policy for some years. The reason is, of course, that the expense of the books to such a student, or to his parents, is half or even less than half.

KING GEORGE MEMORIAL.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Following the lamented death of President Kennedy, an appeal has been launched in South Australia for a memorial fund, I think to endow certain scholarships in

his memory. With that appeal I heartily concur, but it has reminded me of what I believe to be the position in this State—that we have not yet any permanent memorial to the late King, His Majesty King George VI, as we have to nearly every other monarch who has been on the throne since the foundation of the colony. As the King has been dead for over 12 years, I respectfully suggest that it is about time something was done about this. Although I do not know precisely whose responsibility this may be, will the Premier say whether the Government would take a lead in the matter?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The erection of previous memorials has been spontaneously undertaken in the first place by patriotic citizens who have had meetings and launched appeals, and I think on every occasion (I know on some occasions) the Government has supported the appeals. There was considerable difficulty regarding the last memorial erected. In the first place, the appeal was not very successful and donations did not nearly cover the cost, but finally the Government made the necessary payments to enable the memorial to be erected. As I cannot answer the question offhand and as this matter has not been considered by Cabinet, I should like to examine some implications.

RAILWAY FARES.

Mr. CLARK: My question deals with railway fares, particularly between stations between North Gawler and Smithfield. At the moment the return fare from North Gawler to Smithfield is 3s. and the single fare 2s. 2d. People boarding the train at intermediate sidings such as Para, Tambelin and Kudla and going either way pay the same fares as if they boarded the train at North Gawler. Similarly, the fare between Gawler and Smithfield is 2s. 10d. return and 1s. 10d. single, and people who board this train at Para, Tambelin and Kudla are forced to pay the same fare for only a few miles. I understand that if the fares were equalized between these sidings and Gawler or Smithfield the fare from North Gawler to Para, for example, would be about 1s. 6d. return and 10d. single. Will the Minister of Works ask his colleague, the Minister of Railways, to consider equalizing the fares between the sidings mentioned on a mileage basis?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes; I will refer the matter to the Minister of Railways for a report.

YORKE PENINSULA WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. FERGUSON: Last year, the Public Works Committee recommended that certain water reticulation extensions be made on the southern part of Yorke Peninsula. Recently I have received correspondence from the district councils concerned saying that, although they appreciate the assistance already given, they would be grateful if the Minister of Works could indicate that these extensions were to be carried out. Assured water supplies are vitally important to this area and the councils concerned are anxious to reassure landholders that everything possible is being done to provide such facilities at the earliest opportunity. Can the Minister say when work on these extensions is likely to commence?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Last week the Engineer-in-Chief sent me a docket containing the details of these proposed extensions, and after I examined it I submitted it to Cabinet on Monday. Cabinet has approved the extension scheme in general, and the Engineer-in-Chief will take preliminary steps to go ahead with the extensions. It will not be possible this financial year to do much physical work on the site but, in anticipation of funds being provided, to some extent at any rate, in next year's Loan Estimates, the Engineer-in-Chief will assemble pipes and other material for work to commence next financial year. The amount of work he is able to do next financial year will depend on the Loan allocation we are able to make, but Cabinet has approved the scheme as recommended by the Public Works Committee and initial steps are being taken, or will be taken in the next few weeks, to make preparations for the mains to be laid.

WHYALLA SEWERAGE.

Mr. LOVEDAY: For some time I have pursued the question of sewerage for the earlier Housing Trust houses in Whyalla and on January 22 I wrote to the Minister of Works on this matter. A few days ago the *Whyalla News* published a departmental report relating to sewerage and the *Advertiser* published two statements on Whyalla sewerage which were attributed to the Minister of Works. In view of this, can the Minister now reply to my letter of January 22, in which I asked whether the Public Works Committee would consider this scheme soon and whether funds could be re-allocated so that work could start as soon as possible this year, as no funds were allocated for Whyalla last year under the heading "Country Sewerage"?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The scheme has been completed by the Engineer-in-Chief and submitted to me for Cabinet consideration and subsequent reference to the Public Works Committee. Cabinet has approved of its reference to the Public Works Committee and I expect that tomorrow His Excellency the Governor in Executive Council will approve the reference to the committee, after which the committee will have to make its examination and report. Some time must necessarily be taken, however assiduous the committee may be in the discharge of its duties, to examine the scheme, which is to cost well over £2,000,000. The proposal as submitted by the Engineer-in-Chief is in two parts. The first covers the new Housing Trust area and, generally speaking, the area west of the town; the second part will serve the older residential and commercial area of the town. From memory I cannot indicate precisely where the line of demarcation comes.

The reason for having the scheme in two parts is that the first part is extremely urgent with houses awaiting sewerage before normal occupancy and with building extending rapidly in that area. It is uneconomic to require septic tanks when sewerage is shortly to be available. In order to serve first that area of the town that needed it most the scheme has been divided into two parts. The provision for the disposal of the effluent is a simple one by aerobic and anaerobic lagoons in series which can be added to without great difficulty. The scheme at present envisages serving a population of between 25,000 and 30,000. I cannot take the matter further at present because it will go to the Public Works Committee for consideration, but that in broad outline is where the matter stands and what the proposals represent.

EGG MARKETING.

Mr. LAUCKE: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether there has been any developments in recent months towards the establishment of an all-States stabilization scheme for the egg industry?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On the face of it there has been no change since I answered the last question in this House last year. At that time I said the Commonwealth was considering introducing a Bill relating to an Australia-wide scheme for organizing the egg industry. That is correct. I spoke to the Commonwealth Minister for Primary Industry last week and ascertained that this is being done. The Minister assured me that in due course we would receive copies of the Bill and,

when I receive a copy, I shall be pleased to let the honourable member know.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: My question relates to the election of egg producer members of the South Australian Egg Board. Legislation passed by this Parliament last year altered the system of election of these members to give egg producers a franchise. Can the Minister of Agriculture indicate when the first election will be held?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Lists have been prepared of those eligible to vote, and I understand they are in the hands of the electoral officer. It should not be long before the vote is taken. However, perhaps I had better check on the progress that has been made, and I shall inform the honourable member.

METROPOLITAN ABATTOIRS.

Mr. CASEY: I understand that changes in market days at the Metropolitan Abattoirs are being discussed by the Government. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether this is so, and if it is, what changes are contemplated and when they are likely to operate?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Actually, this matter is not under discussion by the Government. As honourable members are aware, the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board planned some time ago to alter market days and certain market conditions. Later, as a result of complaints from various organizations, I appointed a committee to inquire into the proposals, and that committee has inquired. Its opinions vary in some respects from those of the board, and I asked the committee and the board to discuss their differences in order to arrive at a solution satisfactory to both sides. The board is in some difficulty with the present arrangements and considers that some changes must be made. No specific change is required as several changes must be made, but there could be a combination of various courses of action. In other words, it is not necessary that market days be altered merely to a certain day, but the board and the committee are considering the various combinations of circumstances and I hope that an agreement satisfactory to everyone will be reached soon. When that happens I shall inform the honourable member, but up to the present there has been no new development.

SOUTH-EAST SCHOOLS.

Mr. HARDING: The Naracoorte South Primary School, the Penola High School and the Kangaroo Inn school were recently completed and occupied last year. However, these

schools have not yet been officially opened. Although the Kangaroo Inn school is outside the electoral district of Victoria, many students from that district attend the school. I understand that it was expected that the schools were to be officially opened in April, but there has been some delay. Can the Minister of Education say whether the official opening has been delayed and, if so, will the schools be opened later this year?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I had intended to make an extensive tour of schools in the South-East commencing the first week in April, and in doing so to visit and officially open schools at Kangaroo Inn, Naracoorte South, Penola and Mount Gambier. These schools were notified accordingly. However, I have received verbal and written advice from the committees of some of these schools that in their opinion the surrounds of the new schools are not sufficiently developed for the opening ceremonies to be conducted successfully and urging me to postpone them. I had notified the honourable member and the honourable member for Mount Gambier of my intention, but because of the requests I have decided to cancel my visit and to postpone the ceremonies until later in the year.

ATTACHMENT OF EARNINGS ORDERS.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Last year Parliament amended the Maintenance Act to provide for the making of attachment of earnings orders in the maintenance court in those circumstances where the court thought that an attachment of earnings order was the appropriate way to enforce a maintenance payment. The Act provided for the making of regulations to prescribe the manner in which the court was to proceed upon the making of attachment of earnings orders. Already in the rules under the Commonwealth Matrimonial Causes Act are regulations that could easily form the basis of a draft under our Maintenance Act to prescribe the manner in which these proceedings should go on. So far as I am aware, no regulations under the amendment to the Maintenance Act have been gazetted. I have received many requests from women who are unable to enforce maintenance payments adequately that this matter should be proceeded with urgently. Can the Premier say when regulations under the Maintenance Act will be gazetted and when the Children's Welfare Department will proceed under them?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member will put his question on notice I shall get the necessary information.

PORT PIRIE DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. McKEE: In the *News* of January 18 appeared a joint statement by the Broken Hill Associated Smelters Pty. Ltd. and the New South Wales coal-mining group that negotiations were proceeding for the establishment of a multi-million plant at Port Pirie to treat the 5,000,000-ton slag dump there. Can the Premier say whether there is any foundation for this statement?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is not the Government's policy to comment on every statement made by everyone because we would not know whether or not many of the statements were true. This matter has been discussed with the company and, as I informed the honourable member yesterday, with the Prime Minister, but whether a project can be worked out is unknown. Problems associated with the proposal have not yet been overcome. I do not believe that anyone can say whether the project will proceed. Much work has taken place and several conferences have been held, but no decision has been reached. Until I hear from the Prime Minister I doubt whether a decision can be reached.

FAULTY HOUSE BUILDING.

Mr. HUTCHENS: In the *Mail* of February 8 appeared an article headed "Concern at Poor Building Work" in which the Chairman of the Master Builders Association (Mr. Weeks) said that most builders took care and did good work but that unfortunately some performed work cheaply and shoddily. All members are aware that this is so and that some people have suffered as a result. Mr. Weeks said that many purchasers were unable to tell good work from bad and that it was only after deterioration had set in that they discovered that they had been "taken down". I am not suggesting that the Government is less concerned than any member about the disabilities the general public has suffered, but can the Premier say whether the Government has examined this problem, whether it considers sufficient protection is afforded prospective house purchasers, and whether it has considered introducing legislation to require a certain standard in the building of houses?

Mr. Jennings: The Government had best look at the Housing Trust while it is about it!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have personally considered this matter. I have received deputations from various organizations asking for legislation to be introduced requiring builders to be registered. The problem with that suggestion is that "builder" is

not defined and many successful builders are not tradesmen and have served no apprenticeship. However, they do employ tradesmen and do a good job. Proposals placed before me envisage that everyone at present carrying on business as a builder will be automatically registered. If that were done I do not know that mere registration would achieve much. It is claimed that some persons within the industry are not doing proper work. If they were registered we would be only taking steps to limit access to the industry; this ultimately may be undesirable. Unfortunately, some of the building land in Adelaide is not satisfactory for some structures, and even reputable builders experience difficulty in these areas. We know from experience that the Housing Trust, which seeks to supply only best-quality work, has had to return to its completed houses and make repairs because the land on which the houses have been built has moved and wall cracking has resulted. I do not know of any solution to the problem. I can only advise a person who is contemplating erecting a house to obtain the services of a reputable builder and a reputable architect, and, more particularly, not to erect a solid house on Bay of Biscay soil, which has proved unsuitable even under the best conditions. Unless one puts in extremely costly foundations, I think it is almost inevitable that some movement will take place. Although the matter has been considered by the Government, no firm conclusions have been reached and the Government will not introduce any legislation in respect of it during this short session.

MOUNT GAMBIER OCCUPATION CENTRE.

Mr. BURDON: I received several inquiries recently as to how planning is progressing regarding the building of an occupation centre in Mount Gambier. Can the Minister of Education say when the building of this centre is likely to commence?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: Approval has been given for the construction of this building, and the work will be undertaken by the Building Division of the Public Buildings Department. It is intended to commence the work early in April, but I cannot give the honourable member an assurance as to when it will be completed because several classes of tradesmen will be involved and I am informed that there is a shortage of some skilled tradesmen, particularly plumbers, in the district. I am just as anxious as is the honourable member that it be completed as early as possible, because it is urgently necessary to give proper and adequate education to these handicapped or retarded children.

BOOL LAGOON.

Mr. FRED WALSH: During the Parliamentary recess I received correspondence from a constituent of mine who is a bird lover and who, with others, is interested in, and perturbed at, the plans for the drainage of Bool Lagoon in the South-East. I do not wish to repeat the question that was raised by the member for Victoria (Mr. Harding) on November 11. The honourable member fully explained the matter and, in reply, the Minister of Lands said that Cabinet was referring to the Land Settlement Committee a proposal concerning the further drainage of Bool Lagoon and would ask the committee for a report. Can the Minister inform the House of any alteration in the original plans or give any other information that would be of value?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: There is no alteration to the original plan. The investigation by the Land Settlement Committee will be concerned mainly with the water which at present does not enter Bool Lagoon but which, under the proposals, is to be diverted into the lagoon. There has been much ill-informed conjecture regarding this drainage project, even amongst people who are genuinely interested but who did not have the necessary information. I appreciate the interest and concern of those people. Recently I made a full public statement through the press as to the intentions regarding this scheme, which are not to drain the lagoon—and, of course, that was never intended—but to divert water into it and to place at the outlet of the lagoon a reticulating weir to maintain, as far as possible, water in the lagoon for the benefit of the birds that now can be there in vast colonies, particularly the ibis, which is such a valuable bird. This will work in the interests of agriculturists, and will be particularly helpful to pastoral development in the South-East. When drainage was mentioned the idea that became current was that the lagoon was to be drained, but the contrary is the case: water is to be drained into the lagoon, and as far as it can be done the level of water in the lagoon is to be maintained by means of the regulating weir at a level which will at all times be in the best interests of the bird life naturally associated with inland water. We hope that these results will be achieved.

Mr. LOVEDAY: Recently the *Advertiser* published a statement by the Minister of Lands concerning details of the South-Eastern drainage, with particular reference to Bool Lagoon. As the Land Settlement Committee has been authorized to investigate this matter and as the final conclusions and report of the

committee may not be exactly on all fours with the Minister's statement, does he consider it advisable for him to have made statements on this matter while it was under consideration by the committee?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes. In view of the public interest, I considered it completely advisable. No alteration to the design for Bool Lagoon, apart from some matters concerning water that overflows from Mosquito Creek and now floods the country, will be made. The investigation of the committee relates to the water that does not reach Bool Lagoon and now floods the country, but the idea of the new drain is to divert into Bool Lagoon that water now flooding the country. Bool Lagoon itself is incorporated in the Eastern Division of the drainage scheme for the South-East. The outlet to Bool Lagoon and the regulating weir have already been approved. The only thing that could possibly happen would be that, if the committee did not agree to the diversion into Bool Lagoon of the water flooding the land (and, although I shall not anticipate the committee's decision, I cannot imagine that it will do that), Bool Lagoon would still retain water better than it ever did, irrespective of any report the committee might make.

UNLEY LIBRARY.

Mr. LANGLEY: In the Unley district there is a circulating library which does not fully occupy the building in which it is housed, and a free lending library could easily be catered for. Such a free lending library would be of great benefit to the community. The Minister of Education stated during the debate on the lines of the Estimates that this matter was being investigated by the Public Libraries Board and by the Council of the Institutes Association. Has the Minister yet received the joint report and recommendation of those bodies?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTONSON: Unfortunately, I have not. There has been much correspondence between the members of the Public Libraries Board and the Council of the Institutes Association, but they have not yet solved their differences, which, although they are difficult, I do not think are insoluble. Those bodies have not yet come to any final conclusion or submitted a final report or recommendation to me. I do not know whether the Unley library as an individual library has taken the matter up with the Public Libraries Board, but that is what I would advise the library and the honourable member to do.

RAL RAL IRRIGATION CHANNELS.

Mr. CURREN: Several times this session I have raised with the Minister of Irrigation the question of the need for the concrete lining of channels in the Ral Ral Division of the Chaffey irrigation area. Has the Minister a report on the investigations into this matter?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes; I know of the honourable member's interest in this matter, and I have a report here. A proposal two or three years ago for certain limited portions of the main earth channels to be concrete lined was agreed to and funds were provided accordingly. However, this work did not proceed because it became apparent that in order to retain a balanced output in the overall main distribution system and at the same time provide for areas at present unplanted but which might in the future be approved for planting—and, I might add, they undoubtedly will be—it would be necessary to make a complete investigation and an overall plan of reconstruction. It became apparent to the engineers that it was not good policy to re-line the existing channels as they would not provide for any extension of the system and it would be quite unwise to bring about later a duplication of expenditure. The engineers have now completed such an investigation. Estimates of costs are now being prepared, and it is expected that in the near future the engineers will be submitting a recommendation for consideration. At this stage I am unable to suggest a date by which any work in this regard may commence, because apart from a need to make a decision regarding any recommendation submitted by the engineers it may also be necessary to seek additional Loan funds to meet the cost involved. I think the cost will be greater than was at first anticipated.

ROSEWATER DISTRICT SEWERAGE.

Mr. RYAN: For a long time I have been seeking information on, and pressing for, the installation of a sewerage system in parts of Rosewater, Ottoway and Wingfield. Eventually the Engineering and Water Supply Department approved of the sewerage system operating in Woodville North, Athol Park and Mansfield Park, which are on the southern side of Grand Junction Road. This matter is causing grave concern in the district and is creating much worry for the local council. Yesterday, after this matter had been considered by the Port Adelaide council as a result of a report made by the local health inspector, I received a letter from the local board of health in which appeared the following:

In some cases there were septic tanks installed, in others sullage pits, and in each case the effluent tended to run all over the backyard and has been unable to soak away during the recent wet weather. The householders have therefore dug trenches along the sides of their houses in order to carry this water into the street, where it lies in pools in the gutters.

As the Minister of Works knows, I have pressed this matter on many occasions and I have been told that the answer lies in the completion of the Bolivar sewage treatment plant. So that I can tell local residents and the council, will the Minister say whether this project will be referred to the Public Works Committee soon?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I know the problem but at the moment I cannot give the honourable member the assurance he desires. Several areas in the western suburbs have difficulty concerning sewage disposal. Although Adelaide is better sewered than, I think, any other city in the Commonwealth, we still have trouble in the lower areas.

Mr. Millhouse: And the higher areas.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Generally speaking, I think those in the higher areas are more fortunate than those in the lower areas, if comparisons are of any value in this matter. We are trying to overcome this and are making some impact. The district the honourable member represents has not been neglected; we have done much work there, as I think he will agree. One of our setbacks in that area occurred only last year when one of the main trunk sewers proved to be completely deteriorated and we had a very costly job of replacement to do at once. The Bolivar trunk sewer does govern the area about which the honourable member asked, and I regret that we are somewhat behind schedule with that trunk sewer because of problems the contractor has met in spinning the large diameter pipes required and inserting the P.V.C. lining in them, which is part of the specification. He has now solved the problem but there has been some delay in working out ways and means to overcome it. Work is going ahead, but the rate of delivery of the pipes is slower than expected and the commencement of delivery is delayed. These two factors combined will unfortunately delay the completion of the trunk sewer by some months—perhaps eight or nine months. I am not sure how long it will be delayed, but it will be a substantial period. Consideration of the scheme mentioned by the honourable member would not advance the cause if it could not be implemented until the trunk sewer was ready to receive it.

Having said that, however, I will inquire further to see how far the department's investigation of the scheme has gone, and I will inform the honourable member. However, I think it only honest and proper to tell him the position as I understand it at the moment.

RURAL ADVANCES.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Lands indicate how many applications under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act have been received by his department, how many of these applications are at present being processed, and when the first applications are expected to be ready for final approval?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Up to the present 14 applications have been received. Preliminary inspections to determine the nature and condition of improvements have been made in four cases, and these are now in the hands of the Land Board. Arrangements have been made in two other cases for preliminary inspections to be made shortly. The remaining eight applications have been received only recently, and these are still in the preliminary stages of consideration.

FOSTER CLARK (S.A.) LIMITED.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Premier further information regarding the cannery formerly operated by Foster Clark (S.A.) Limited, and are there prospects of it being used for the current season?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The receiver has not yet disposed of the cannery previously occupied by Foster Clark as the Government desires that it should not be broken up and sold in small pieces but be available for use as a cannery, the purpose for which it was established and was financed by the Government. I understand that an offer for the cannery as a going concern is likely to be received by the receiver because some inquiries have been made. In the meantime, some plant is being used this year under an agreement between the receiver and another cannery, Jon Products Limited, to process fruit, mainly pears. This company has not the capacity to handle its fruit and has entered into an agreement with the receiver whereby it is using a portion of Foster Clark's plant.

FLUORIDATION.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the session I have several times asked a question about the wisdom or otherwise of adding fluoride to the water supply in South Australia as an aid

against tooth decay. In his reply on October 1, 1963, the Premier referred to a report that had been made to the Chief Secretary by two Government officers who had attended a conference in Tasmania. Will the Premier table this report for the information of members?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I shall have to consider this problem. It is not usually the Government's policy to table reports of officers made to it, because in some instances if the officers know that their report is going to be made public they are much more guarded in expressing opinions fully. A report might be different if officers knew that it was going to be considered as an honest report and would not involve them in public controversy. The report of the two officers favoured fluoridation. There may be no reason why I should not give the report to the honourable member or to any other honourable member. However, before making a statement to that effect, I shall consider the report to see whether it can be regarded, in any circumstances, as privileged.

SMALL BOATS.

Mr. BYWATERS: Considerable concern has been expressed in my electorate and in other districts on the River Murray about the irresponsible actions of some owners of small boats towing water skiers. The trouble seems to concern people who are not associated with clubs and who often perform to the annoyance of other river users. The Premier will recall that I previously requested that some action be taken to control small boats. I understood that a committee was formed at that time to consider the matter and to suggest to the Government legislation to control small boats. Has the Premier had a report from this committee and, if he has, what action is to be taken by the Government to control small boats, particularly those used on the River Murray?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I must confess that the honourable member's statement that the Government had set up a committee surprises me. As I have no knowledge of that committee, I will inquire whether one has been established. Cabinet has frequently considered whether it would be desirable to have State-wide registration of small boats, but its opinion is that it would be a cumbersome and ineffective control. Honourable members know that local government authorities have certain regulation-making powers should they wish to control annoyances in their area. Cabinet has taken the view that

rather than subject everyone to an overall control because of some foolish by-play by irresponsible persons in one area, it would be advisable for a local regulation to be made to control undesirable actions. However, in view of the honourable member's definite statement about a committee, I shall inquire and inform him of the results when he asks another question, perhaps next week.

PORT PIRIE TECHNICAL SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Education say when construction of the new Port Pirie Technical High School is to commence?

The Hon. Sir BADEN PATTINSON: I will try to obtain the information for the honourable member and let him know soon.

WOODVILLE LAND.

Mr. RYAN: Early last November I introduced to the Minister of Works a deputation comprising members of the Woodville council who were concerned because the extended lease or sale of land on which the Engineering and Water Supply Department operated was likely to go to a private firm. Upon presentation of the case, the Minister told the deputation that the matter would be considered by Cabinet. The council informed me a few days ago that it was alarmed that it had received no information, although the lease of this land expired in January this year. Can the Minister of Works explain what transpired as a result of the deputation, and what was the answer to the proposition put forward?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I recall very well the circumstances of the deputation, the matter it presented, and the proposals made at that time. Upon further inquiry Cabinet devised what it thought to be a fair solution of the problem. I understand that the Premier for some time had reports from the parties concerned, more particularly from the engineering firm involved. A possible compromise having been suggested, I believe the engineering firm has been informed. The suggestion was that the firm should be permitted to occupy part of the land; that the council should be permitted to obtain by purchase a piece of land to widen the street; and that the council should be invited, if it so desired, to acquire the balance of the land for parking purposes.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: The council was so notified.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I was going to check on that.

Mr. Ryan: It had not been notified up to an hour ago.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will check on that. As I recall it, that is the basis of the proposals that we thought might meet the desires of both parties.

RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: On November 7 last I asked about the sales of some television sets and other equipment and in December I received information to the effect that the Prices Commissioner had forwarded a report to the Premier indicating that considerable research would be necessary before a practicable and worthwhile suggestion to effectively deal with this problem could be recommended. It was hoped that a report would be ready for this session. Has the Premier any information from the Prices Commissioner about this matter or will he obtain a report?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have had no further report to the one I forwarded to the Leader, but I will ascertain how far the inquiry has proceeded. I know that the question of the sale of secondhand television sets and the identification of such sets has been considered at a conference in another State. It is easy for a disreputable firm to pass off a secondhand set as a demonstration set or even a new set. I will get a report for the Leader.

TRADES HALL BILL.

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Hon. A. J. Shard, member of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Assembly on the Trades Hall Bill.

The committee has made this request. The Honourable Mr. Shard is a trustee under the deed poll mentioned in the Bill and is able to give valuable evidence to the Select Committee. A resolution embodying the request is necessary to conform with Standing Order No. 447.

Motion carried.

Later, the Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution.

ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL (TYRES).

Mr. HALL (Gouger) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1963. Read a first time.

Mr. HALL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I thank members for their courtesy in permitting me to give this second reading explanation forthwith. I apologize for not having sufficient copies of the Bill to distribute to all members. I have distributed about 16 copies and I trust that will be sufficient. The Bill seeks to include another provision in that part of the principal Act containing safety provisions. It is aimed at suppressing what I regard as an unsafe practice and a fraudulent practice, namely, the regrooving of smooth tyres and fitting them to passenger vehicles. Most members know what regrooving is: it is a process carried out on almost completely worn tyres. A groove is cut around the surface of a tyre so that in appearance it simulates a tread. It creates a design, which, I suppose, is a type of tread, on the surface of a smooth tyre, but in the cutting process the groove gets close to the canvas of the tyre and, in some cases, actually cuts the canvas. In such instances any safety inherent in the smooth tyre is removed. These regrooved tyres are sometimes fitted by secondhand car dealers to vehicles that they have bought for resale. I know of two young people who purchased secondhand vehicles that were fitted, unknown to them, with regrooved tyres. In each case when the vehicle was taken home and examined the regrooved tyres were detected. The vehicles were used but travelled a few miles only—

Mr. Millhouse: About how far?

Mr. HALL: No more than 250 to 500 miles. That would have seen out the life of the regrooved tyres. In one case two tyres blew out on the road. This clearly demonstrates that the safety effect of the tyres was greatly reduced by regrooving. One of these vehicles was sold by an authorized dealer of a well-known car manufacturing company who had accepted this car as a trade-in and had regrooved the four tyres. He sold the car at a handsome profit. Had he fitted four new tyres his profit would still have been extremely high. Therefore it is obvious that this practice of regrooving not only reduces the safety of the tyres but, in effect, perpetrates a fraud on unsuspecting buyers. My intention in bringing this Bill forward at this time is not to have it pushed through this House and through another place but to bring forward in this place the intention of doing something about the practice of regrooving smooth motor car tyres. I trust that as a result of its being raised here the trade which indulges in this practice will take note of it and if they have representations to make they will make them between now and next session.

I shall be quite happy to listen to any case the trade is willing to put forward. However, at present I am of a mind that this is a bad practice indeed and should be suppressed.

I know that the Royal Automobile Association disapproves of the regrooving of passenger car tyres. I emphasize the words "passenger car tyres" because I believe that the large tyres used on some commercial vehicles can be regrooved with safety and with some financial saving to the people operating them. This can be done because of the rather thick layer of rubber that lies beneath the actual tread on a commercial tyre. Therefore, I do not wish to become involved in any way in suppressing the regrooving of tyres used on any commercial or industrial vehicle.

Mr. Shannon: Doesn't it also apply to some of the heavy-duty tyres on passenger cars?

Mr. HALL: I do not know of any passenger cars that would fit more than a 4-ply tyre at present. There may be some, but I would think that a car fitted with a 6-ply tyre would be a larger car than is the popular size at present. That car would be so fitted with a heavier tyre because it needed that size tyre, and I believe that the regrooving of that tyre would reduce the safety factor somewhat, the same as it would with a lighter car.

Mr. Shannon: Often the tyre is worn bald.

Mr. HALL: Exactly. One factor with commercial or industrial vehicles is that their speed is not usually as great as that of a private car, and in fact a heavy bus or motor lorry can blow a tyre and usually does not run the risk of overturning. I cannot imagine the Municipal Tramways Trust buses running that risk in the City of Adelaide. This morning I rang a prominent member of the tyre trade and he told me that in his opinion this practice of regrooving was widespread. He pointed out that it was supported mainly by second-hand car dealers who, of course, as I outlined earlier, can benefit by having a smooth tyre regrooved unknown to an intending purchaser. Undoubtedly, an astute intending purchaser can ascertain whether tyres are regrooved, but unfortunately we are not all astute in these matters.

Mr. Shannon: Isn't it a simple thing to ascertain?

Mr. HALL: No, I do not know that it is a simple matter. I doubt whether a dealer, if he were asked, would deny that a tyre had been regrooved, but, of course, that question is so often not put to him. I know of two people amongst my rather limited circle of acquaintances who have been—I would say—

defrauded in this manner, and one of them had two blow-outs on the road because of this regrooving. Therefore, I believe that this practice should be suppressed, even if it is taking place on only a small scale. I believe that the trade should have every opportunity to put any case it may have for the regrooving of tyres, and that is why I am bringing this matter forward now. I understand that if the Bill is to remain a remanet for next session it is necessary that the second reading be carried in this House. Whether or not that can be achieved next Wednesday, I do not know, but I should be happy to see that occur. If it cannot be arranged, I shall be sure to introduce the measure in the next session later this year, so that the matter can be fully tested in this House. Those concerned with the regrooving of tyres now have the time and the occasion to examine this legislation.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I appreciate the honourable member's desire in this matter, and under the circumstances I do not intend to delay consideration of the measure. I believe that there are some sound grounds for legislation of this nature. However, there are one or two matters that I should like to mention. It has been the practice of the Municipal Tramways Trust for some time now to have tyres specially constructed with the object of having them regrooved when the tread has become worn down. This practice has proved to be quite satisfactory, and no danger has arisen from it. In fact, the practice has saved the trust many thousands of pounds a year in working expenses, because it has not had to replace the casings immediately the tread goes off the tyre.

Mr. Casey: Those are specially constructed tyres, aren't they?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. I believe that in the initial stages the trust had considerable difficulty in getting the tyre manufacturers to construct these tyres. I have also heard that since that time other firms using passenger-carrying vehicles have obtained the same tyres. Indeed, I believe that the people operating one public transport body asked the trust whether it would regroove tyres for them. I know that the honourable member does not desire to interfere in that respect, because his Bill does not apply to the trust. I intend to support the second reading, but I should like the honourable member to closely examine the words "private passenger purposes". I have not yet had an opportunity

to check the principal Act to see what definitions are provided. Do those words apply only to a car which is privately owned and which is used normally by the owner, or do they apply to public transport that is privately owned? I think the definition should be looked at because I believe that those words could be extremely important. I know that reputable organizations such as the Municipal Tramways Trust use this type of tyre; it is specially manufactured and grooved under the trust's own control, and I understand that there has been no objection by anyone in that matter. I do not know, for instance, whether or not a taxi service would be included in the words used by the honourable member. Probably it should be included, but it may not be. I venture no opinion on that because I am not sure what the definition in the principal Act is. The other matter I submit to the honourable member is in relation to the last words in new section 162b:

A person shall not drive a motor vehicle to which this section applies that has been fitted with any tyre which has been regrooved after becoming worn and devoid of tread.

I think the last few words would make it extremely difficult to prove an offence. If the sentence finished at the word "regrooved", I think this possibly could be determined by observation of the tyre at the time of examination by the inspector, but I think that the words that follow the word "regrooved" are superfluous and that they would make it difficult for a conviction to be recorded. It would be difficult to prove that the tyre was worn and devoid of tread before it was regrooved. I say this offhand because I have not had the opportunity to study this Bill.

I believe the honourable member was well advised to have the Bill printed and to carry it to the second reading stage to enable anyone involved in it—reputable people not doing anything wrong—to study it and raise objections. In those circumstances, I support the second reading on the understanding that, if it becomes necessary later to amend it or add some proviso to it, the honourable member will understand that my second reading support does not necessarily involve a complete acceptance of the provisions of the Bill.

Mr. BYWATERS (Murray): I support the remarks made by the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) and the Premier. I, like the Premier, would appreciate time to consider the Bill and particularly the definition of "motor vehicle". I draw the attention of the member for Gouger to the situation relating to taxis. This position may not be covered by the words "private

passenger purposes", but I believe it is essential that people who ride in taxis be covered by important legislation such as this. I know most taxi proprietors provide good tyres, but it is possible that some drivers may not. If they use regrooved tyres that may be a danger to the public using their taxis, I think they should be covered by the legislation. I support the second reading.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): Unfortunately, I did not hear the explanation of the Bill, and I am not prepared at present to give a definite opinion. I believe that many tyres that have been regrooved are safer than some tyres that have no grooves at all. At least regrooving enables a driver to have better control over a car than is possible on a car that has tyres with no grip. Although I support the second reading, I reserve the right to reverse my opinion later.

Mr. FREEBAIRN secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ELECTORAL).

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 to amend the Constitution Act, 1934-1963.

Motion carried.

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

PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF WATERS BY OIL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prevention of Pollution of Waters by Oil Act, 1961. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I preface my report on this Bill with one or two remarks. As the House is aware, the preservation of the metropolitan beaches, indeed of all the beaches throughout our State, is a matter of great public interest and concern. Therefore, any steps that can be taken by this House to eliminate or at least to minimize pollution will be welcomed by the public, and I believe that we are anxious to take such steps. The occurrence of oily substances on beaches

around South Australia has a long history. There are some misapprehensions about this matter and a tendency, perhaps not surprising, to blame entirely certain recent developments in St. Vincent's Gulf for the present problem. It is a well established fact that there have been occurrences of oily substances on our beaches for many years.

I personally have been aware of them on the coast of Eyre Peninsula for as long as I have lived there, which is now nearly 30 years, and they have occurred at various points in the South-East, at Kangaroo Island and certainly on parts of Lower Yorke Peninsula and Eyre Peninsula for as long as the white man can remember. They are of origins which we are not able to determine precisely, but the substance is chemically and physically different from any man-made oil that is produced for the normal purposes for which oils are used. It is distinguishable by a chemical analysis, and by either fluoroscopic or chromatographic analyses the types are distinguishable. Therefore, with an occurrence, we are able to decide either that they are of submarine origin (which has occurred for many years) or from a man-made source such as an oil tanker or a ship proceeding up the gulf.

We have taken all steps that could be taken to eliminate and minimize occurrences of man-made origin, but accidents occur because of the human factor that cannot be entirely eliminated. This Bill introduces an amendment to the Act, which this House approved in 1961 and by which we ratified our agreement and approval with the International Convention. However, due to certain operative weaknesses it was decided to introduce this amendment.

The principal object of this short Bill is to insert in three of the sections of the principal Act the word "agent". The first of the sections concerned and the main one is section 5 which provides for the offence of discharging oil into waters. Paragraph (a) of that section makes both the owner and the master of the ship liable for the penalty. This section is to be amended by including the agent, thereby making not only the owner and master, but also the agent of the ship, responsible. The necessary amendment in this connection is made by clause 4. "Agent" will be defined in section 3 of the Act, the necessary definition being set out in clause 3.

The need to insert "agent" arose because the Convention and our Act named the master and owner only as being responsible for

breaches of the law. We could not effectively take legal proceedings during the times when the vessel was on hand to be served with the necessary processes. Before evidence could be accumulated, the substances analysed and a case prepared the vessel had left South Australian waters and it was impossible to serve the necessary papers of proceedings on the master and, in any case, the owner was usually an absentee. In order to overcome this problem, "agent" has been inserted in this clause. Clauses 5, 6 and 7 make consequential amendments. Clause 5 inserts the word "agent" also in section 6 of the principal Act which confers special defences upon persons charged, and it is clearly necessary to enable the agent to take advantage of any special defences which are open to an owner or master. Likewise, clause 6 which relates to the making of regulations regarding the keeping of records will, by subclause (a), be extended to cover regulations covering agents. Subclause (b) will amend section 6 (a) of the principal Act, which penalizes owners and masters for breach of the regulations, by including agents. Clause 7 amends section 12 of the Act which places restrictions upon the transfer of oil at night. Section 12 attaches the penalty to the master of the ship and the amendment will include also the agent and the owner.

Honourable members will appreciate the reason for the amendments to which I have referred. In most cases it is not possible for practical reasons to proceed against an owner or master of the ship: the owner is in most cases outside the State and it is not possible to serve a process upon a master after he has left the jurisdiction. With the amendments it will be possible to proceed against the agent of the vessel. The provisions to include agents were inserted in the Victorian Act, although they do not appear in the legislation in other States. I believe that the amendments are necessary if we are to be in a position to police the Statute. Clause 8 corrects four typographical errors in the original Act which was based upon the uniform Bill. They relate to the evidentiary provisions in section 18 where the references to relevant sections are incorrect. The opportunity has been taken to correct the errors in this Bill rather than by way of a Statute Law Revision Bill. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

Mr. HUTCHENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(MINISTERS).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 18. Page 1982.)

Mr. LAWN (Adelaide): Everyone but the Premier was heartily enjoying this debate last night.

Mr. Jennings: That is why the House was adjourned.

Mr. LAWN: Yes, that is why the House adjourned at 9 o'clock when I was due to speak. The House normally sits until 9.30 or 10 before it rises, but the inglorious exhibition of Government members convinced the Premier that the sooner the House rose last night the better it would be for the Government. Last night convinced me that television is out of date. Occasionally when I have had the opportunity of watching television I have seen a series of plays in which the main characters are persons called "The Three Stooges". I am satisfied that the South Australian Government has more than three stooges.

Yesterday's show here was started by the member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) who is the Government Whip and an aspirant for the Ministerial position mentioned in the Bill. Although he supports the attitude of the Opposition he stated that he supported the Bill. I will return to this later. The trapeze artist, the member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe), also supported the attitude of members of my Party. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) contributed nothing to the debate. He kept twitting members of the Opposition which prompted the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) to remark that the member for Onkaparinga seemed to be a superannuated "beetle". The member for Onkaparinga criticized the member for Enfield for saying that if the Bill were passed it could result in there being five Ministers in the Legislative Council. The member of Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) supported the member for Enfield so, all in all, last night the Government supporters did not know where they were. It was obvious, however, that many of them were candidates for the Ministerial position. The member for Mitcham—

Mr. Clark: I thought he looked a bit sour.

Mr. Jennings: He looked sour because he knew he was not in the running.

Mr. LAWN: There is no doubt that he was sour, but it is obvious that anyone with a pickled-puss like his would curdle himself. He said:

Perhaps I went a little too far when the honourable member for Hindmarsh was speaking and I said that the Minister would have to be from this House, but six usually come from this House, and it is perfectly obvious that the new Minister will come from this House.

He put the position exactly as it was stated by the Opposition: this Bill does not state that six Ministers will come from this House.

Mr. Jennings: It does not matter what appears in the Premier's second reading explanation; what matters is what is in the legislation.

Mr. LAWN: Exactly. I intend to show exactly what the position will be if this Bill is carried. Clause 3 (a) amends section 65 of the principal Act by striking out the word "eight" in subsection (1) and inserting the word "nine". The provision will then read:

The number of Ministers of the Crown shall not exceed nine.

Paragraph (b) amends section 65 (2) by striking out the word "five" and inserting "six" so that it will read:

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 six of the Ministers shall at one time be members of the House of Assembly.

Mr. Jennings: It does not mean that there has to be more than one Minister here.

Mr. LAWN: There may be any number fewer than six. There could be four Ministers in the House of Assembly and five in the Legislative Council. Paragraph (c) inserts a provision "that one of the Ministers of the Crown shall bear the title and fill the Ministerial office of Premier". That is rather an innocuous provision and does not cause the Opposition much concern. It does not matter whether the Premier is called the Premier, the master or Don Athaldo.

Mr. Jennings: What we call him could not be included in the Bill.

Mr. LAWN: That is so. It does not matter what he is called. A Government member said that the present Premier's grandfather preferred to be called the Prime Minister of South Australia. Someone might like to call himself the Czar of South Australia or the dictator, but that is immaterial. I wanted to answer the criticism levelled by the member for Onkaparinga at the member for Enfield who said that there could be five Ministers in the Legislative Council. It is obvious that there shall be no more than six in this House: there may be four here and, consequently, five in the Legislative Council.

Mr. Clark: Have you dealt with all the aspirants for the new Ministerial position?

Mr. LAWN: No. Yesterday mention was made of the Government Whip and of the member for Torrens as aspirants for the position. If my memory serves me right, last year we were told that the Chairman of Committees (the member for Angas, the Hon. B. H. Teusner) and the member for Gouger (Mr. Hall) were also candidates. I do not know whether the member for Burnside (Mrs. Steele) was mentioned. I am surprised that the member for Gouger has not spoken in this debate. So far he has not indicated his intentions, which surprises me because I should have thought that he would strongly object to being left out of calculations. We know that he is most conceited, and the most conceited member of this House, so I expected him to indicate by now that he was going to stake his claim for the position. The Government Whip lost no time: he was the first one to follow the Premier.

Mr. Bywaters: Would not the member for Burnside uphold the rights of women?

Mr. LAWN: I think that women forget that once they become members. They forget about equal pay for the sexes and adult franchise. I have not heard the member for Burnside speak about granting equal pay in the Public Service to women who are performing men's work, nor have I heard her advocate adult franchise which would result in women getting a vote for all Parliamentary elections. It is all right to profess such beliefs prior to an election, but such beliefs are conveniently forgotten once a woman becomes a member. Of course, the member for Burnside is following me in this debate and she will be able to contradict me and say that she still believes in adult franchise, if she still does.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. LAWN: I had forgotten another member. I think that he won a directorship in Farmers' Union—the member for Albert (Mr. Nankivell). Was there not betting as to who would be the new Minister and was not the member for Albert a likely candidate? Because of the competition between the members for Angas, Albert and Barossa, I think I would have to say that the position is very chilly for Willy.

Members opposite during this debate have cursorily referred to the number of members in this House in the past. They have referred mainly to the number of Ministers in years gone by. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) and the Government Whip supported our attitude, for they referred to the increase

in population and the increase in the business of the State. The member for Torrens also referred to the greater sums included in the Budget and voted for public works. Let us have a look at the overall position. I make no apology for having supported past Ministerial increases, but I think we have reached the maximum increase until such time as we increase the size of the House.

Mr. Clark: And not by just two or three.

Mr. LAWN: No.

Mr. Jennings: We want an equitable system.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. Let us have a look at the number of members in this House when the population was only one-quarter of what it is today. From 1857 to 1875 there were 36 members; from 1875 to 1884 there were 46 members. In 1881 a census showed that the population of South Australia was 276,414. At that stage there were six Ministers in this Parliament. Parliament then decided to increase the number of members of this Chamber because of the growing population, and, as a result, from 1884 until 1890 there were 52 members. That was very close to 100 years ago. During the years 1890 to 1902 there were two extra members, making a total of 54, because we took over the Northern Territory. From 1902 to 1912 there were 42 members. From the years 1912 to 1915 the two Northern Territory members were taken away, leaving 40 members in this House. From 1915 to 1938 there were 46 members, and that latter year was when the great gerrymander, first passed in this House in 1936, was put into effect. The number of members in this House was reduced.

Let us have a look at how the Budget figures have grown over the years. Figures from the Pocket Year Book of South Australia, which can be checked, show that the Budget figure in 1955-56 was £60,832,379; in 1956-57 it was £65,809,746; in 1957-58 the figure increased to £74,041,707; in 1958-59 it was £73,707,000; in 1959-60 it was £80,589,000; in 1960-61 it was £85,091,000; in 1961-62 it was £92,834,000; and in 1962-63 it was £96,835,000. All members will know that during those years our Loan expenditure also increased substantially. The Government members claimed that an increase in Ministers was justified because our population, our Budget figures, and our Loan expenditure were increasing substantially. I agree. Now, by that argument, if these increases in our State activities justify an increase in the number of Ministers from eight to nine—a one-eighth increase—the Government members must admit that the same set of figures

justify a substantial increase in the number of members in this House.

Let us look at the population figures. I have already referred to the population in 1881, when there were 46 members in this House. This was later increased to 52 members because of the population, which at that time was 276,414. The authority I now quote is the *Quarterly Summary of Australian Statistics*, December, 1962, No. 247, Page 1. The population at June 30, 1961, was 969,340, and it was estimated by the same authority that at June 30, 1962, the population was 989,389—nearly 1,000,000 people as against 276,000 people, yet we have only 39 members as against the previous 52. This has happened despite the substantially increased Budgets, Loan expenditure, and governmental activities generally. Members opposite want only an increase in the number of Ministers and a further gerrymander of the north of the State, because they propose to have two industrial seats so that they can take away from this side of the House one Opposition district member.

Let me quote some figures for the lower Houses of Parliament in Australia. The Commonwealth Parliament has 124 members; New South Wales, 94; Victoria, 66; Queensland, 78; South Australia, 39; Western Australia, 50, and Tasmania, 35. I now want to relate those figures to the number of square miles a member is called upon to represent. I have been criticized in the past by members opposite, who used to sing out from their side of the House that the member for Adelaide could stand out in King William Street and talk to all his electors, that he did not have the distances to traverse or the area to represent that they had.

Mr. Bywaters: You have a good voice, but it is not that good.

Mr. LAWN: They were trying to make the point that I was representing only a small portion of the State, while they represented acres and acres. They certainly represent acres, as well as galahs and sheep and so forth. I represent people. The following information may be of interest to members opposite: in Victoria, each member of the House of Assembly represents an average of 1,331 square miles; in Western Australia the average is 19,518 square miles; in New South Wales the figure is 3,291 square miles; in Tasmania it is 749 square miles; in Queensland, 8,551 square miles; and—listen to this—in South Australia the average area represented by a member is 9,745 square miles. Only one State exceeds

the South Australian figure—Western Australia. I think there is only one State with fewer members than we have—Tasmania. That State has 36 members, each representing 749 square miles. Let us look at some of the statements made by Government members which I claim support the attitude of members on this side of the House. The member for Barossa (Mr. Laucke) said:

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.

He is thinking in terms of a dictatorship.

Mr. Ryan: Haven't we got one?

Mr. LAWN: Yes, and they admit it. The member for Barossa was thinking of a dictatorship, which he supports, and he could not get it out of his mind when he spoke.

Mr. Jennings: He was advocating Executive control.

Mr. LAWN: Exactly. He was overlooking that there is a Parliament in the State. He was thinking of Executive control, and he wants the Executive increased. He says that the activities of the Executive are growing and growing; however, we are supposed to be a democracy—I say that we are supposed to be—but there is supposed to be a Parliament here. We are supposed to represent electors, and we should have the opportunity to come here and voice matters on behalf of those electors. We should be able to bring forward Bills and have them fairly treated, and we should be able to speak to other matters raised here from time to time and to make representations to Ministers.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Have you ever brought a Bill before this House that you can say was unfairly treated?

Mr. LAWN: Not personally, but I think I said "we". I was speaking of members of this Party.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: I do not think any member has brought a Bill before the House that has been unfairly treated.

Mr. LAWN: I will mention that later. The member for Barossa was talking about the growing activities of the State, but he was concerned only with the activities that concern Government members. He continued:

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.

All this increase spoken of by Government members is supporting the attitude adopted by members on this side of the House; in addition to increasing the number of Ministers, we should increase the number of members. I have shown that we have had 52 members in this House, excluding two from the Northern Territory when it was joined to South Australia. Our policy has been to ask the Government to legislate for 56 members, as the population is nearly four times what it was when there were 52.

Mr. Jennings: We have 20 useless people up top, anyway.

Mr. LAWN: That is so. The honourable member continued:

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.

He went on to make many more representations in regard to the Executive, but that was the only place I could find where he thought of an increase in the number of the people who actually do the work when the business increases. That is why he was not worried about increasing the number of members in this House but was only concerned about increasing the number of the Executive, as he likened this Parliament to private enterprise. The member for Torrens (Mr. Coumbe) said:

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.

Hasn't a greater responsibility been placed on members? The Budget increases year by year, and it is now double what it was in 1952 when I became a member. Doesn't the honourable member admit that the duties of a member have increased? While the Budget has doubled Loan expenditure has increased; the honourable member knows this from his activities on the Public Works Committee. Although he has been a member of that committee only a few years, he must have seen the ever-increasing amount of work going before it. The work has increased despite the fact that, whereas once projects costing over £30,000 went before the committee, that figure was lifted by this Parliament so that only works costing over £100,000

go before it now. We have relieved the Public Works Committee of many investigations, yet its work has increased so that it gives its members practically a full-time job. The honourable member continued:

The eight Ministers in 1953 were expected to handle £50,000,000, but now they are handling £100,000,000.

Does he forget that we have some say or does he think we are only a rubber stamp? Members opposite seem to take it for granted that anything placed before this House from that side must go through because if the master speaks that is the end of it. The honourable member was talking in the same terms as were used by the member for Barossa when he said that in 1953 eight Ministers were expected to handle £50,000,000 but that they are now handling £100,000,000. He said "they"; he forgot that this Parliament had a hand in it.

The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said that he always enjoyed speeches from this side of the House, particularly those of the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings).

Mr. Jennings: Hear, hear!

Mr. LAWN: I agree. Then he showed the position members opposite were in last night. He was standing up pleading with us to give the Government some clues. Fancy the people who claim they are the most fitted to represent the people in this Chamber getting up and complaining that the Opposition is not giving them clues! Without their master they would be absolutely hopeless. The member for Mitcham then said:

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.

I can remember that he almost cried these words complaining that we had not given him any clues, and that we were not giving any last night.

Mr. Jennings: He was lachrymose.

Mr. LAWN: Yes. The member for Enfield reminded him that he had no hope of getting the job, and he said:

That is all right. I am not even trying.

He could probably have said that he had another job as good as or better than that of a Minister. The member for Mitcham continued:

If we look at the increase of population from 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 these few halting remarks I support the second reading.

Can the member for Mitcham truthfully say that the facts quoted by him do not justify an increase in the number of members in this Chamber? I would not oppose this Bill if the number of members of the House were substantially increased. I do not deny that we could increase the number of Ministers, but the same facts and the same justification for an increase in Cabinet members applies to an increased number of members of this House. We should not make another job available for executive control. This House is usually out of session for six or seven months of the year but when we are here if we ask a question about certain undertakings such as the Housing Trust and the Electricity Trust we are told by a Minister that he will submit the question to the chairman of the undertaking and see if he cares to reply. These State activities have been placed outside Parliamentary control.

Whilst the justification exists for an increase in the number of Ministers, there is a greater case for an increase in the number of members of this House. That is why I oppose the Bill and shall continue to do so until such time as Parliament passes a Bill to increase the number of members of this House.

Mr. Loveday: On a reasonable electoral basis.

Mr. LAWN: Of course. I do not support the intrigues practised by members on the other side of the House.

Mr. Jennings: You have a conscience, of course.

Mr. LAWN: I am glad I am reminded of that. We want a fair electoral system if there is to be an increased number of members of this House. When that is achieved I will support an increase in the number of Ministers. However, that is not the only thing I want. I want adult franchise; I want to see that the women of this State have a vote, although I would not make that a pre-requisite for the other things. My Party has stated its attitude, and surely Government members can understand why we oppose this legislation. The Government apparently thought that it could use us like a rubber stamp, just as it uses members of its Party. We have a valid reason for rejecting this Bill. If the Government wants our support to increase the Executive, all that it need do is to introduce a Bill to increase the number of members of this House in a reasonable way. I oppose the Bill.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I support the Bill, and I am grateful to the member for Adelaide because I must admit that never in my

wildest dreams did I think that my name would figure among those who were aspiring to the post of extra Cabinet Minister. However facetiously he said it this afternoon, at least he has given me that little bit of pleasure. I remind the member for Adelaide that when he was speaking of women members and what women members should do for other women, he should have remembered that his Party does not have a woman in Parliament, and it does not give women the opportunity of becoming members of Parliament because women are never endorsed for seats where they have a possible chance of getting in.

Mr. Bywaters: That will be altered next time.

Mrs. STEELE: Many of the benefits which women have gained under superannuation in the last few years have been gained, I consider, in some way because of representations that I and my fellow lady member have made to the Government. Never have I listened to such ineffectual, inconsequential or frivolous talk as I have heard from members opposite since I have been listening to the debate, which began in earnest yesterday. I heard nothing from any one of them to justify their objection to this Bill. I have not heard one Opposition member say anything amounting to a real objection. I am certain that, if they were in power tomorrow (which would not happen), or next year (which heaven forbid should happen in the interests of South Australia and its people), they would increase the number of Ministers far in excess of that which the Government contemplates in this Bill, because the Labor Party has the principle of one-man-one-job. There are actually 21 different departments administered by the eight Ministers at present, and if this principle were taken to ridiculous lengths it would mean that someone would have to have more than one job, because in that case every member would be a Minister.

From my reading of the Premier's second reading explanation, it does not actually mean that the new Minister to be appointed will automatically hold a position of Minister in charge of the new department envisaged. There could be, of course, a general reshuffle, but this is the only State that does not have a Minister holding the specific title of Minister of Development or Minister of Industrial Development, or whatever term might be given to it. We have the Attorney-General holding the dual office of Minister of Labour and Industry, but he does not deal with actual development, only

with matters affecting industrial welfare and such things as factory inspections, inspections of scaffolding, comparison of awards and that type of thing. This is the only State where there is no Minister who deals exclusively with State development. Although we all know the wonderful job the Premier has done in attracting industry to this State, the appointment of someone to take charge of this envisaged department would relieve him of duties and responsibilities in this direction.

I shall quote figures showing that all departments controlled by members of the present Ministry have experienced tremendous growth since the size of Cabinet was increased in 1953, and this growth alone, as other members have pointed out, justifies the projected increase. So that I might make a comparison, I took the figures that were nearest in the *Year Book* to the years under review, which were 1951-52 and 1961-62. Some figures have already been given in a general way by other speakers, but they are interesting in view of the contention for the necessity for another Minister because of the growth of this State. In 1951-52 the Budget provided for about £51,250,000 whereas in 1961-62 it provided for almost £97,000,000. In that period our population increased from just over 750,000 to over 1,000,000. Industrially, in 1951-52 a total of 3,245 factories employed 84,189 and 10 years later 5,519 factories employed 99,094. We are familiar with the rapid and dramatic growth of education facilities. Enrolments have increased startlingly during the last few years. Whereas in 1951-52 a total of 107,926 were enrolled in Education Department schools and institutions (and there were 4,381 teachers), in 1961-62 the enrolments had increased to 202,661. Another spectacular increase occurred in the housing field. In 1951-52 a total of 8,473 houses were constructed with a value of £17,782,000 whereas in 1961-62 the number was 9,891 with a value of £51,629,000. These figures clearly indicate the great expansion and development in this State and reveal how much more work has devolved on the Ministers who form the Cabinet here. During the same period the expenditure on hospitals increased three-fold, and four times as much was spent on roads. The net productivity of this State in primary and secondary industries almost doubled in that 10-year period. I use these figures to indicate our great growth and to show that the appointment of an additional Minister is long overdue.

We are all keenly aware of how much of our own time as members of Parliament is involved in attending to the many duties that devolve

upon us, so we must appreciate how much more so does this apply to Ministers. If this situation is to be resolved we must increase the size of the Ministry, and to some extent, reduce the work undertaken by the present team of hard working Ministers. With those few remarks I support the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I do not wish to weary the House at this stage but I believe I must make a few pertinent comments. Much of this debate has been "off the rails", as many members have concentrated their remarks on the proportional representation of Ministers as compared with the size of the House. They have overlooked the needs of the State. It is wrong to say that we no longer have a voice in this Parliament. We have to approve the appropriations—the moneys that are spent by the Ministers in their respective departments. Secondly, we have an open forum at question time when we are able to ask the various Ministers about the manner in which they handle the appropriations. The way in which members expect Ministers to answer complex and varied questions emphatically indicates the need for an additional Minister. Members demand detailed replies from Ministers, and this requires a Minister to have a personal knowledge of all matters handled by his department.

Mr. Loveday: That is why the Premier answers questions directed to other Ministers!

Mr. NANKIVELL: The question is whether the present Ministry is big enough to handle and personally supervise the business of the departments they administer. Even should there be a reshuffle of portfolios, as suggested by the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), I doubt whether that would ease the burden of work that now falls upon the Ministers responsible for the administration of their departments and answerable to this Parliament. The purpose of the Bill is set out in the Premier's second reading explanation. It seeks to create a new department. It may be considered that its special purpose is to appoint a Premier, because up to the present we actually have a Treasurer, there being no Premier's Department. The second reading explanation indicates that a department responsible for giving increasing attention to the needs of industrial expansion, for establishing new industries and for developing old industries will be set up. In explaining the Bill the Premier said:

I need not stress the fact that an additional Minister is needed to give impetus to following up the possibilities of attracting new industries.

Later he said:

It is reasonable . . . for us to take special means to attract any new industry to this State.

As members opposite know, expanding industry, so increasing avenues for employment, is fundamental to the increasing development of this State. It will create employment for the increasing number of people who seek it and it will be the means of providing this State with a balanced economy. Industry is necessary for this State's welfare. I know that the member for Stuart (Mr. Riches) is a member of the Industries Development Special Committee which tabled a report in this House yesterday. I have read most of that report and there are one or two statements in it on which the honourable member did not bring in an independent report.

Mr. Riches: You must have been working overtime.

Mr. NANKIVELL: I quote from this report to substantiate my argument that there is a need in this State for the creation of a department and the appointment of a Minister—an additional Minister—responsible for stimulating and encouraging industry. I will quote the report verbatim so that the honourable member cannot quibble. At page 25 the following appears:

The committee has noted that in both New South Wales and Victoria there are branches of the Premier's Department—

and we have no such department—

charged with responsibilities such as those mentioned above. Similar departments or sub-departments exist in Queensland (Department of Labour and Industries), Western Australia (Department of Industrial Development) and Tasmania (Premier's and Chief Secretary's Department). The committee is not able to judge whether the existence of these sections has achieved any marked and permanent decentralization, and it is noted that they have other functions relating to development of industry generally. They do serve the purpose, which appears to be lacking in South Australia, of co-ordinating the efforts of local authorities and committees, of providing information to them and to industries, of providing rationalized publicity and of actively seeking industries generally or for specific locations. The committee believes that a similar organization should be set up in South Australia. It believes that such actions would be welcomed by industrialists and by local authorities and committees, that it would receive cordial support from similar organizations in other States and that it would provide an extremely useful information and advisory bureau for the Government.

On page 75 appears the following:

As set out in the body of this report the committee believes it to be desirable that industrialists have some definite point of contact with the Government which can give

information on the various aspects of the State's industrial and economic forces and give advice and assistance on the various technical aspects of choosing and operating from a particular location. This can best be achieved by setting up a special department or branch of a department to promote country industrial expansion and, in association with local committees, publicize the natural advantages which certain locations may possess. The committee does not propose to set out in this report its views on the scope of the functions of such a department, but it believes that the head of department should have direct access to the Premier and that it should be staffed by personnel—administrative, technical, public relations and accounting—to give a service to industry and to publicize the advantages of South Australian location in general and, where applicable, of country locations in particular.

The pertinent point is that the express purpose is the establishment of a Premier's Department. As all members are interested in the promotion of industry in South Australia they should not object to the Bill. The personal supervision demanded of Ministers at present prompts me to ask, "Can such a department be set up without placing an undue strain on the Cabinet?" I support the intention of the Bill. Some members have been quibbling about certain matters and talking about the ratio of Ministers to members, but the point is whether we have sufficient Ministers to administer this important matter of industry in the interests of all. I ask all members on both sides to agree to the Bill, which I commend to them.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Premier and Treasurer): I did not intend to speak at length in replying to the matters raised in the debate, but one or two points need clarification. One honourable member criticized the Government because the Government asked for the adjournment of the debate last night, but the adjournment last night was sought at the request of the Opposition. The Government did not intend to adjourn it, but the Opposition asked for it. I have always tried to work in with the Opposition and I accepted its request last night and arranged for the debate to be adjourned.

Mr. Lawn: After I had finished speaking it was to be adjourned by the member for Albert, but you asked me not to speak.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The member for Albert was not ready to speak last night and the Leader of the Opposition asked that the debate be adjourned, and the Government acceded to the request. The Leader of the Opposition will agree with this statement. He did not have his full number of members present, which he desired to have. I agreed that the debate be adjourned because with a

Constitution Bill a pair has no value. I think the member for Adelaide would have been better advised if he had said that the Government had adjourned the debate at the request of the Opposition.

Mr. Lawn: It had been arranged that after I concluded my remarks the debate would be adjourned, but you asked me not to speak.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Government was prepared to take a vote last night, and it had made arrangements accordingly. Not one member opposite who has spoken in this debate is convinced that the Bill is not a right one. Each member opposite knows that in the development of the State it is necessary to have the proper Administration for the purpose. The member for Albert referred to the report submitted to Parliament yesterday by the Industries Development Committee. Actually, I have not seen that report, which was the result of work done by the committee over a lengthy period. I believe there were one or two matters on which some members of the committee expressed reservations, but on the matters raised by the member for Albert the committee was unanimous.

Mr. Riches: There was no reference to an additional Minister.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It referred to the Premier.

Mr. Riches: A Premier's Department.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Everybody knows that at present the title of Premier in South Australia is only a courtesy title. We have no Premier's Department, and under the Constitution there is no provision for a Premier. The committee referred to a Premier's Department, and the honourable member knows that. The committee drew attention to the fact that in this matter of a Premier's Department we would be following the lead given by other States. It was a matter considered by the committee, which was appointed with the approval of both Parties in this House. I am certain the member for Stuart would not have signed the report without having read it carefully. I am sure he would not have signed it after it had been drafted by someone else, and without having looked at it. I am criticizing the honourable member not for signing it but for the statements that he made.

Mr. Riches: I signed it and I subscribed to it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I cannot understand a Party whose two representatives upon the committee are advocating one

course of action while the Party itself is stating that it opposes that course of action. Throughout the whole course of this debate there has been an air of unreality in the opposition of Labor members. Let me deal with some of the remarks of the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings). The honourable member made some startling statistical analyses that were rather enlightening to me, for they indicated the amount of consideration given to this matter by the Opposition before it stated its attitude here. He said that there were 39 members in this House, and that the ratio of Ministers to members here was greater than in certain other Houses. He stated that Queensland had so many members and so many Ministers, and that New South Wales had so many members and so many Ministers. So far as I could follow his figures, he pointed out that the ratio of Ministers to members in South Australia at present was at least as generous as it was in any of the other States. I think that was the argument the honourable member used.

Mr. Jennings: More or less.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think he will accept that as a fair summary of his argument. However, let me draw his attention to one or two matters. First, the functions of government in all of these States of Australia vary considerably. In some States, the central authority does not take any responsibility at all for the provision of water. I can see that the honourable member has suddenly woken up to that fact.

Mr. Jennings: I have not just suddenly woken up to that fact.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Most of the functions undertaken in the metropolitan area by the Government of South Australia are not undertaken by the Queensland Government in respect of the Brisbane area. Transport, electricity, water and sewers are not Government functions in Queensland. The honourable member has overlooked the significant difficulties in these matters. Let me show him where his arithmetic takes him. Supposing by some flight of imagination—and I assure the honourable member that it would be a very far-fetched flight of imagination—we decided in the next few days that instead of having 39 members in this House we would have 100 members. According to the honourable member's calculations, we would immediately be in order in doubling the size of the present Cabinet.

Mr. Nankivell: For the same amount of work.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes. To put the matter on the ratio of members to Ministers is so silly that I did not think even the member for Enfield would have advanced it. Obviously, if the honourable member will look at the proposition he will see that the functions of government do not necessarily have any direct relationship to the number of members in the House. In fact, I think this House probably deals with just as many matters as does the New South Wales Lower House, which has 80 members.

Mr. Lawn: You are taking a long time to answer an invalid remark by the honourable member, aren't you? You said it was not justified.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If we are going to make a comparison between the States at all (which, I again point out, has very doubtful validity on account of the different way that functions are undertaken in the various States), I suggest it should relate to the total number of Ministers in each of the States. That would be a much better argument than the one put forward by the honourable member. However, I do not advance it as an argument. I think what we have to consider is the question of the development of this State; that is the real question, and all of these secondary arguments and arithmetical calculations have no real bearing on the argument. Honourable members in this House surely know that if there is one State that has a more difficult line of development than others it is South Australia. If time permitted I could give some of the reasons why there are peculiar difficulties in the way of development of this State, and in fact I will mention one or two matters very briefly. South Australia has the least known natural resources of any State in Australia; every honourable member knows that that is the case. No-one knows what we may turn up in the future, and I should not like to have my remarks taken to mean that we will not find significant mineral deposits here; but, so far as is known, South Australia does not have the mineral wealth, the fuel, the natural timber resources or the naturally fertile land resources of the other States, nor has it the rainfall resources of the other States. Honourable members know that for many years South Australia was regarded as the Cinderella State of Australia. Indeed, a Labor Prime Minister (Mr. Curtin), a man of very great ability and one of the truly great Australians, told me once at a conference that South Australia would always be the poor

State of the Commonwealth, the Cinderella State, the mendicant State. South Australia has made substantial progress since those days. I emphasize that some of that progress has been due to good luck.

Mr. Ryan: I am glad you admit it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do admit it. We have had some bad luck, too, for that matter. Let me mention one aspect of the good luck. I remember that for many years Queensland, at the Loan Council meetings and the Premiers' conferences, took the attitude that Queensland did not want secondary industries. This attitude was most pronounced in the days of Mr. Forgan Smith and, although not so pronounced in the days of Mr. Hanlon, it was still a firm attitude. Queensland was a great primary-producing State and was not interested in the development of secondary industries.

Similarly, the States of New South Wales and Victoria until recently both assumed as a matter of course that they did not have to make any approach to industry but that industry had to come to them because of their central position. Indeed, to a large extent, I believe that it is the present position in New South Wales. Victoria has changed its policy considerably. Today it is a strong contender for any new project that may be coming to Australia, but for many years the policy in New South Wales was: "We are in a centralized position. We have the market here. We don't have to worry about making any overtures to industry to come here." Philips Electrical Industries is in South Australia today for that very reason. That industry, which is established in South Australia today, was once established in Sydney. Honourable members who were in the House at the time will remember that the Government introduced a Bill to assist in financing the move of that industry from Sydney to South Australia. If I remember rightly, of the cost of £250,000 to shift it over here the South Australian Government paid £45,000. That is well-known to members who were in the House at that time. That happened because Philips Electrical Industries in Sydney desired to expand in the Sydney area; it was told by the New South Wales Government that it could expand but would have to go outside the Sydney area. I now speak from hearsay but I think the suggested location was St. Marys. For a number of years there was no great pressure from other Governments to encourage the establishment of industry in their States.

But those things do not apply to the present Governments of other States. There is not one that is not spending huge sums on developing large departments for the advancement of industry. I had provided for me only today a book produced for another State by one of the most competent firms of consultants, all designed for publicity overseas to attract industries to that State. I say this advisedly: in South Australia we have had a relatively good employment position; we have had satisfactory industrial advancement; we have had many industries introduced. There has been considerable advancement not only in new industries but in industries already established here. But I give fair warning to honourable members opposite that, if we do not step up the work we are doing in this field, inevitably we shall slip behind. Today there is a spirit of competition between the States that, to my certain knowledge, has not existed at any time during the last 25 years.

Let me make this point quite clear. It was stated in the press the other day that one of my forefathers had some ideas about what his title should be. Let me assure honourable members that I have no delusions about what a title means. If you don't want to call me Premier you can call me the Treasurer; and if you don't want to call me the Treasurer you can call me anything else you like; it will not cause me any concern. But it does make some difference when we are dealing with Governments overseas. Whatever value we put on a title here (and, as I say, I have no personal delusions about it) when we are discussing matters with Governments overseas the question immediately arises: "What is your status? What is your authority to undertake these discussions? What is your ability to fulfil these obligations or contracts that you are undertaking?" While I have no worry about the position in South Australia, I am convinced that the Industries Assistance Branch of this State will function much more successfully if it has attached to it the nominal head of the Government. I make no apology for saying that. I shall be announcing next week, if the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings) will do me the honour that he usually does me of watching my telecast, a new important industry for South Australia. I give the honourable member fair warning so that he will be able to view it. I do not want to boost my audience of 2,000,000 by the insignificant number of members opposite, but let me give some history of this matter, because it is interesting. This industry made overtures to

all the Australian Governments. It stated that it was examining the prospect of coming to Australia to establish an industry.

Mr. Casey: An American firm?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I think the honourable member is anticipating. I believe the fact that we made personal contact immediately we got the overtures was largely the deciding point in getting a start in the actual negotiations. I say advisedly that, when honourable members debated this Bill, they debated something with an air of complete unreality about the requirements of the position. In the course of the debate there has been some discussion of what the Bill means by the distribution of Ministers between the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council. I noticed with some concern that one or two of my own members had looked at the paragraph deleting "five" and inserting "six", and had assumed that the "five" referred to the number of members of the Ministry in the House of Assembly, whereas it was not quite expressed in that way.

Mr. Shannon: I was one of those!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The position is that this is, I believe, a carry-over from the time when it was not necessary for certain Ministers to be in Parliament at all. There was a time (I think the member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) will probably be aware of this) when in Great Britain it was not sometimes even customary for the Attorney-General to be a member of Parliament, and until quite recently the same position applied in South Australia. The Act was altered some years ago to make it obligatory for the Attorney-General to be a member of Parliament. However, until recently—and I am now speaking in broad terms—it was not necessary for the Attorney-General to be a member of Parliament under those circumstances. The original legislation did not stipulate that there should be six Ministers, two of whom should be in the Legislative Council and four in the House of Assembly; indeed, one of them might not be in either. It was expressed that there should be six Ministers, not more than four of whom should be in the House of Assembly. That has been the method of expressing the matter and when the Parliamentary Draftsman drafted this Bill he followed the same procedure that has always been followed.

No-one, of course, had ever concluded that, because the previous legislation provided that not more than five should be in the House of Assembly, that House would not have the five Ministers. Honourable members had from me

a statement—and at the time I did not realize that the point would even arise—that the Bill would provide for a sixth Minister and that he would be in this place. As far as I know, the Premier has always been the Minister in the House of Assembly. I do not recall an instance when the Premier has not been in the House of Assembly and, as the purpose of the Bill was to create a Premier's Department, I would have thought it would be obvious to honourable members, from the outset, that this was a Bill to provide for an additional Minister in the House of Assembly. I do not believe that any honourable member opposite had any illusions on that point.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You said that in your second reading explanation.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, but I did not think any honourable member opposite had any illusions on that matter. The reason for saying that is that if he did have any illusions it would have been a simple matter for him to ask whether he could insert an amendment to deal with the matter. Instead of that the Opposition said, "No, we will not have this Bill." I think one of its reasons was that the Bill did not provide for a Minister of Housing.

Mr. Frank Walsh: Wouldn't it be possible to alter the title of "Premier" without increasing the size of Cabinet?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Yes, but I believe that at the present time—and I have had a little experience of this—the State does not get the best value by having eight overworked Ministers. I believe it would get better value if it had nine Ministers who were doing a proper amount of work. I do not know whether honourable members realize the volume of work that a Minister must handle every day: not only must he handle a tremendous volume of work but he is personally responsible to see that there is not somewhere in a docket something that should not be there. Honourable members may realize that Ministers are always on call seven days a week, and I do not believe that the State would get the best value from its Ministers, whoever they might be, if, by the very mass of the work that they had to attend to, they could not give close attention to the detail necessary in important matters.

So I say again that I am not concerned whether the title be "Premier", although I believe it has a value in dealings with overseas companies.

Mr. Lawn: It took you 25 years to find that out.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This matter of course has a history. If the honourable member wants to go back—

Mr. Lawn: I do not want to go back; I want to go forward.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Well, the honourable member always looks back and at the present time he is trying to stand still. He will go back, but that is another matter. I have not looked this matter up, but I have a vague recollection of reading at one time that the Labor Party decided to have a Premier and that the Liberal Party opposed it. A little later, the Liberal Party, having taken office, decided to have a Premier and then the Labor Party opposed it. I think that is the history of the matter. It does not reflect too well on the sagacity of our forefathers. We should, however, deal with the matter as it is today and it is essential that we establish a well qualified department to deal with industrial matters. I am not referring to matters such as wages and conditions of employment, workmen's compensation, factory inspection and that sort of thing; I believe the present Department of Labour and Industry is doing a good job. I have no complaint with it and I do not believe that honourable members opposite would not but say that they have every respect for the inspectors in the work they are doing.

If an industry desires to come to Australia its representatives will inevitably desire to make contact with the States to assess the best location where it can be established most effectively. The committee that has been inquiring into country industries, I am sure, encountered this problem, for every industry establishing naturally desires to select a location where it will be able to function most effectively. When I say "effectively" I have in mind the words "at the lowest cost" because that is a problem always affecting industry. There is a competitive market and industries are always trying to keep costs down to a limit that will enable them to compete successfully.

Therefore, when an industry is coming to Australia, the first thing it does is to make a grand tour, looking from State to State to see what is available and to make a general assessment. Every other State has a department that is immediately able to provide statistical information and everything that could possibly be desired. In South Australia the Housing Trust has done good work; officers in my own department have also done good work. The Industries Development Committee

has overcome some of the financial problems confronting a new industry starting, but these activities are all unco-ordinated and unknown to outside people. I repeat that any opposition to the Bill is completely unreal. After all, what is involved from the State's point of view? An additional Minister, the salary of an additional Minister, and a motor car and driver for an additional Minister. It will probably require a department with two or three capable senior people and a number of people to carry out clerical operations. One good industry a year would more than compensate the State hands down for those expenditures.

Mr. Shannon: No private company would think of being without such assistance.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It is chicken feed compared with the opportunities that would exist. I have spoken longer than I expected, but I repeat that I believe that the Opposition, when it comes to consider this matter, will realize that its opposition in this instance is completely unjustified, unreal, and not in the best interests of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: As this Bill is an amendment to the Constitution Act, pursuant to Standing Order 294 I have counted the House, and there being present more than an absolute majority of the number of the members, I put the question:

That this Bill be now read a second time. There being a dissentient voice, it requires a division. Turn the glass.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

The SPEAKER: There are 19 Ayes and 19 Noes. There being an equality of votes, and as this is an important matter and the House might want to consider it further in Committee, I cast my vote in favour of the Ayes. There being an absolute majority of 20, the Bill therefore passes in the affirmative at this stage.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

The Committee divided on clause 3:

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Stott.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 19 Ayes and 19 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my vote to the Ayes.

Clause thus passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

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

That the third reading be made an order of the day for tomorrow.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has moved that the third reading be made an order of the day for tomorrow. Is that motion seconded?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: In view of the statement of the Premier when I asked for a certain agreement to provide for an adjournment last night, which I accepted, and now having reached the stage where there is a full muster of members in the House, will the Premier reconsider disposing of the third reading forthwith, and withdraw his motion that the third reading be made an order of the day for tomorrow?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The only reason why I set this matter down for tomorrow was that there had been, from certain members opposite, a suggestion that the Government was by trickery or by unconstitutional means going to try to force these Constitutional Bills through. The Government, under those circumstances, would be anxious to comply with every form of Parliamentary practice as it is understood in this State. To my knowledge, the Government has never, in the last 25 years, tried by any device whatsoever to override the proper decision of Parliament, and the only reason why I set the matter down for tomorrow was that I know that to take this third reading forthwith requires that I would have to move Contingent Notice of Motion No. 2, or suspend Standing Orders. In those circumstances, the normal thing would have been for it to have been

considered tomorrow. In view of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has signified that the Opposition is prepared to take the third reading vote at this stage, and on the assumption that I am not going to be accused of trying to override the Constitution by unconstitutional methods, I will, Mr. Speaker, ask leave to withdraw the motion.

Leave granted; motion withdrawn.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD moved: That this Bill be now read a third time.

The SPEAKER: In pursuance of Standing Order No. 294, as this Bill is an amendment to the Constitution, I have counted the house, and there being present more than an absolute majority of the whole number of the members of the House, I accept the motion. The question is:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

There being a dissentient voice there must be a division.

The House divided on the third reading:

Ayes (19).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Harding, Heaslip, Laucke, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Baden Pattinson, Mr. Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Quirke and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Burdon, Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hughes, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, Tapping, Frank Walsh (teller), and Fred Walsh.

The SPEAKER: There are 19 Ayes and 19 Noes. There being an equality of votes, and this being a Constitution Act Amendment Bill, I cast my vote in favour of the Noes, and so it passes in the negative.

Third reading thus negatived.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ADDICTS (TREATMENT) ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 18. Page 1969.)

Mr. FRANK WALSH (Leader of the Opposition): I intend to divide my remarks into two categories. First I shall speak of the better side of this legislation. I want it clearly understood that the Opposition's sympathy is entirely with those people who need care, attention and supervision. In 1961, the Alcohol and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Bill was placed before this House. It provided for the treatment, care and rehabilitation of persons who were addicted to alcohol or drugs. I believe that that Bill was an attempt to overcome a serious social problem in our community, but

now, almost three years later, the Government informs us that the Act has not been enforced. Even before the scheme has been tried, the Government is proposing alterations. In April, 1961, a committee comprising six members representing a wide cross-section of the community was appointed for the purpose of establishing a centre for the reception, care, control, treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics and for recommending the enabling legislation. Mr. J. H. Allen, Sheriff and Comptroller of Prisons, was the chairman of that committee. I understand that as a result of its recommendations, the principal Act was introduced and passed in 1961. Now we are informed that another advisory committee was appointed last year to consider and report on the principal Act—to recommend suitable amendments to that legislation before it was brought into operation. We were not told in the Premier's second reading explanation, but I understand that committee comprises three members, namely, Mr. G. J. Cook as Chairman, who is also Chairman of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board, Mr. J. H. Allen, Sheriff and Comptroller of Prisons, and a representative of the medical profession, Dr. R. T. Binns.

The first committee I referred to was larger. It would seem to offer more potential for the consideration of views from a wider cross-section of the community. However, in addition to these two special committees, the Public Works Standing Committee also entered the field and reported on the proposed construction of a centre for the reception, care, control, treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics. That committee has recommended against the establishment of a centre for the time being, and in reaching this decision the committee was influenced by the following points (and I quote from the report of that committee):

In reaching a decision on this question the committee has had regard to the following considerations:

1. That an institution to which patients are committed by court orders might not attract applications for admission from the other categories of alcoholics.
2. That the successful treatment of alcoholism has a relatively short history and has not yet produced any large number of experienced and trained workers in its specialized field.
3. That the interstate clinic inspected by the committee, and which impressed the committee, was hampered by lack of staff although the clinic was of modest proportions.
4. That it would be more than difficult to find suitable staff for the proposed alcoholics centre.

The Committee finds:

1. That it is inexpedient to proceed with the proposed public work of the construction of a centre for the reception, care, control, treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics; and

2. That as a first step it is desirable that special units for the treatment of alcoholics should be established at psychiatric or general hospitals and that the special units should maintain outpatient clinics in appropriate locations.

It would appear to me that the Government has yielded to pressure somewhere along the line, because by clauses 6, 7 and 8 it seeks to postpone the establishment of an alcoholics centre, but the machinery is being provided for the establishment of a board that seems to have similar functions to that of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board, which we have found to be so unsatisfactory in the past. For example, frequently members have discovered that they have been unable to obtain information from the Minister responsible for child welfare: in fact, the Minister has sheltered behind the operations of the board and avoided his responsibilities to this Parliament. I believe the Government is attempting something similar on this occasion. I do not think any member would deny that it is extremely difficult under the present set-up of the Children's Welfare Department to obtain information, even though questions are directed at the Minister. A member gets the information that the board is prepared to let him have, and nothing more.

It is my firm conviction that the operations of the institutions and voluntary centres should not be under the jurisdiction of the board but rather that the board should operate similarly to the Aborigines Protection Board. It was my intention, on behalf of the Opposition, to try to amend this Bill, but I have been informed that it would require a sheaf of documents to accomplish what we would seek.

Alcoholism is also related to other social problems, such as mental instability and unhappiness in the home. The first is a medical problem, which can best be remedied by members of that profession, but the problem of unhappiness in the home should be dealt with under this Bill. I do not think a person would enter a voluntary centre for treatment if he knew that his family would not be cared for financially. Clause 23 provides that "Unless otherwise provided by or under this Act, all patients shall be entitled to receive gratuities at such rates and subject to such conditions as may be prescribed." This appears to me to be in the form of a

gratuity to the patient for his minor private needs, but it does not recognize the needs of the family. It is not clear to me whether the Government intends to cater adequately for the needs of families in these instances. The Government should have investigated the possibility of a wife and family receiving at least a widow's pension whilst the husband was receiving hospital treatment, and it should have informed honourable members of the results of this investigation. As there is nothing in the second reading explanation on this aspect, I believe that the good intentions of the principal Act, as well as of this Bill, could be negated, because cases requiring treatment will not come forward voluntarily unless it is known that the family unit is not left destitute. Another phase that must be faced deals with the many persons who continually come before our courts as a result of alcoholism. I believe it is accepted by all persons who have interested themselves in this problem that, whilst the successful treatment of alcoholics requires a person to enter a treatment centre voluntarily, there is still the need for compulsory centres for alcoholics who continually come before the courts. This problem is not solved by the Bill because the principal Act empowered the Government to establish these centres and it has been on the Statute Book for two and a half years, but matters are still in the process of investigation. Although Parliament passed the Act it was not proclaimed to make it operative. I should like to know, if we pass this legislation, whether the Government intends to proceed with the establishment of such a centre at Yatala or elsewhere in the Northfield area.

I think it is fair to say that the instructions given to the Parliamentary Draftsman by the committee set up to supersede the previous committee were "We shall appoint a board under terms as near as possible to the terms in the Act, irrespective of the consequences". Under the Bill, if a board of three is appointed and a man is sent to Yatala, as the result of his being an alcoholic, will he be retained there without treatment, or will a treatment centre be established at the institution? If one is set up under the supervision of the board, how will the board's chairman be able to supervise the treatment of the man, who, because he is in the institution, would be under the control of Mr. Allen (Sheriff and Comptroller of Gaols and Prisons). The board set up under the Bill will be different from the board set up under the Aboriginal Affairs Act. Irrespective of what

has been said in other debates, Parliament should be the supreme body when the Government provides money for a purpose. I object to an outside body saying what must be done. Many times Opposition members have criticized such legislation. For the control of Aborigines we have a Minister, but for alcoholics the control will be with a board.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: You had "Minister" inserted in the legislation dealing with Aborigines.

Mr. FRANK WALSH: All glory to the Minister for accepting the suggestion. Because of that we have the right to ask the Minister for information about Aborigines. Previously some people regarded as mental defectives who were sent to the Parkside institution, instead of being detained at the Yatala Labour Prison, managed to get out of the security block, and then had to be sought by the police. They had no right to enter the Parkside institution. Surely it is possible to have a treatment centre at the Yatala Labour Prison so that persons sent there can remain under the control of Mr. Allen instead of someone else.

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

Mr. FRANK WALSH: I think I have said sufficient to indicate that the provisions regarding the appointment of the board do not meet with the Opposition's approval. Opposition members would agree to a board that operated on similar lines to the Aborigines Protection Board. They sympathize with the desire to have the best possible treatment for these people, but consider that the terms of the Bill do not provide for that. The Government should redraft the Bill along the lines I have indicated, for it is impracticable to alter it by amendment at this stage. I believe that the Parliamentary Draftsman was requested to draw up a Bill to give complete power to this proposed board. Such a provision is not acceptable to the Opposition. Members should have the fullest possible access to and be able to ask questions at any time of the Minister in charge of the department. There is an element of doubt in my mind concerning the terms of reference given to the Public Works Standing Committee in this matter. I believe that the committee made all the necessary inquiries but that it went beyond what it was asked to do. It appears that the Government has acted on the committee's report and has endeavoured to put this matter under the control of a board. I do not agree with the proposal, and I recommend to the Government that it redraft the Bill.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I support the Bill. What I shall have to say applies to both the earlier Bill and the one now before the House. As we all know, much debate took place on the earlier measure, but time has passed and many people who are interested in this legislation have had the opportunity to study it afresh in the light of the new developments that have taken place and the new advances that have been made in the treatment of alcoholics and drug addicts. I consider that this lapse of time has led to more mature consideration of this problem. It is a problem, because I understand that one-tenth of the people in Australia who are addicted to the taking of drugs and alcohol are to be found in this State. Since the initial Bill of a couple of sessions ago there has been a chance for many of the people who earlier spoke for or against the legislation to take a second look at it.

In addition to that, the Public Works Committee has had an opportunity to consider the plan placed before it for the establishment of an alcoholics centre; it has also had the opportunity to take evidence from medical practitioners and from specialists in this branch of medicine. Alcoholism is a disease, and therefore we have to look at it as a medical problem. The committee has also taken evidence from social workers and people in charge of centres in other States, from police officers, and, in fact, from all sorts of people with practical experience and those who have a particular interest in this problem and thus are qualified to speak. As we know, it is a problem not peculiar to South Australia; it is a social problem to Governments and to communities all over the world. We are at the beginning of this road of, as it were, treating the unfortunate people who find themselves suffering from these two social ills. We are, therefore, in an advantageous position in that we can take advantage of the experiences of those who have dealt with this problem in other States and in other countries.

I like this Bill a great deal more than I liked the first one, and for several reasons. First, I like the idea of a board. Three heads, for instance, are better than one, and to have a Director is to place all the responsibility for a decision on one person. This proposed treatment is a form of rehabilitation, and in any kind of rehabilitation these days the practice is for the people concerned with the patient's welfare, his well-being and his treatment to study his case history, and, on the result of getting together on this particular

problem, to decide on the next step to take to aid the patient's recovery. It is the same everywhere. Secondly, I like the legislation because it provides for two different types of clinic. One type is for the voluntary patient who knows the hold the disease has upon him and who is prepared to go into a clinic and take advantage of the advanced methods of treatment in the hope that he will be restored to health and be able to keep a check on himself in the future. The second type of centre is where people who are addicted to drugs or to alcohol are referred by the courts. I think this is a step in the right direction. I consider that the previous idea of setting up an alcoholics centre defeated its own ends. I consider that only in rare instances would we have succeeded in getting a voluntary patient to go into a general alcoholics centre. Those of us who are associated with any kind of rehabilitation know that if a person undertakes rehabilitation voluntarily he is half-way along the road to recovery and to success.

I consider, therefore, that this provision is definitely a step in the right direction. There should be some control over those people suffering from this form of disease which has led them to the state where they are brought before the courts. The courts are dealing with people who may be in a position to create a nuisance or to commit a crime through their addictions to these social ills, and I think it is quite right that there should be places where the courts can commit them for a period of treatment. I certainly do not think we can mix the two groups: we should have a place where voluntary patients are, of their own accord, treated and brought back to health, because we cannot expect them to go to places where people who probably have reached the lowest level in the community are sent simply because the court orders that they must have treatment. For those two reasons alone this Bill is a great improvement, and I think it will commend itself to the community. We have to remember that this problem is as old as civilization itself and that successive civilizations have been trying to find the answer down through the centuries, so here in South Australia we cannot expect to solve it within a few years. This is a step in the right direction. We are doing the right thing by meeting this in perhaps a restricted way at this time and making provision for dealing with these two kinds of patient. With these few remarks I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. DUNSTAN (Norwood): I do not think there is any member of this House who during the course of his Parliamentary career has more

regularly besought the Government that urgent measures should be taken upon the problem of alcoholics than I. Since coming to this House I feel that I have perhaps at times wearied the Government with requests for action under the old Inebriates Act or, subsequently, under the Alcoholic and Drug Addicts (Treatment) Act. If anybody sees, as practitioners at the police courts see, the most sorry and pitiful examples and the degradation and misery that beset alcoholics, he must be infused with the feeling that something has to be done urgently in this matter.

It is a matter of great regret to me that institutions could not have been set up very much earlier than this. I can remember questions being asked from both sides of the House as long ago as when I first entered it—and I am becoming something of a veteran these days for I have been here more than 11 years now. I regret that this measure has been introduced in its present form. I think that anybody who has studied the objections that were raised to the original proposal before the Public Works Standing Committee and the valuable evidence that was given (to the effect that it was necessary to have voluntary treatment centres and, in fact, that in many cases it was the patient who was brought to a realization of a need to help himself) must go along with the view that the committee forcefully expressed that there were deficiencies in the original Act and that provision for different kinds of institutions should be made in a further Bill.

Nobody on this side of the House has anything to cavil at in that. The trouble that I see about this Bill is that it proposes an entirely new form of administration, one against which members on this side have resolutely set their faces at all times. We do not agree with the establishment of substantially independent boards for administration purposes. We believe that the administration of Government departments should be directly under Ministers who are, in effect, seeing to the administration of their departments through departmental officers and who are directly responsible to Parliament for the details of administration. While it is true that under this Bill the board will be responsible to the Minister, in fact it will be the board's policy that he is explaining to the House when he is questioned, not his own. The board, not the department or the Minister, will be responsible for day-to-day administration. It will not be to the Minister that the various policies of administration are referred. And, if the Minister is questioned in this place it will be not his replies that he gives but the replies

of the chairman of the board, as we have so often seen in other departments similarly constituted. Particularly is this so with the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board, about which members on this side of the House have continually complained.

We wish to amend the Bill, in consequence, to allow those things that we thought were good, the things recommended by the Public Works Standing Committee, but to cut out this proposal for a new form of administration. But that is simply not practical in the terms of the present Bill. We would have to amend practically every clause. Members may notice that not only is there a series of clauses in this Bill but at the end of it there is a schedule of consequential amendments which cover three pages in very small type. They are consequential amendments upon the change in administration.

In those circumstances, it is simply not a practical proposition to put forward amendments in detail to this particular Bill in order to do what we want and what members on this side of the House believe should take place—that is, that we should have the changes in the original Bill for the different kinds of institution that were recommended but not a change to a form of independent board administration. We cannot do that in this Bill. Consequently, as the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, we believe that this Bill should be withdrawn and redrafted to make it quite clear that the Minister shall be responsible for administration, the departmental officers shall be directly responsible to him for day-to-day administration and, if there is a board, it shall be an advisory board only. If the Minister then finds that on policy matters he needs the advice of persons who are experienced in various phases of the treatment of alcoholics and drug addicts, he can get that advice; but the responsibility shall be his for day-to-day administration.

In those circumstances, unless the Government is prepared to withdraw this Bill and redraft it, I feel I cannot support it as it stands. I say that with regret because members on this side of the House are apprised of the urgency of this matter and of the need to do something about this treatment as soon as possible.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: Is that the only objection the honourable member has to the Bill?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: You want Ministerial control instead of a board?

Mr. DUNSTAN: Exactly.

The Hon. P. H. Quirke: That applies to the Land Board, the Pastoral Board and every other form of board that we have: Ministers are in charge of those.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. The Minister will remember that we had a lengthy debate on this score at the time the Aboriginal Affairs Bill was presented to this House.

Mr. Shannon: To which the Government agreed.

Mr. DUNSTAN: It agreed to the alteration in the form of administration that we demanded on that occasion, that the whole system of administration should change from independent administration to that of a Minister, and the board was made an advisory authority only. The Minister accepted it in Committee and that form of administration, as the Leader has pointed out, which has been written into the Aboriginal Affairs Act is one that we would go along with in this case; but we do not want another buck-passing authority, of which we have so many in this State. The Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board has caused every metropolitan member in this House—I believe it is true of members opposite; it is certainly true of every metropolitan member on this side and a number of country members as well—much concern because we simply cannot get the kind of administration that we should have. I believe that the views expressed in this House last year and approved by this House are being ignored by the department now and that, when we ask questions about the policy that the board adopts in administration, it is not the Minister's administration that is accounted for; we are given a reply from the chairman of the board.

Mr. Clark: If he sees fit.

Mr. DUNSTAN: Yes. The replies for the last part are wildly unsatisfactory. We believe, for instance, concerning housing that there should be a Minister of Housing in this House and that we should have to rely upon replies not from the Chairman of the Housing Trust, but from a Housing Minister here who knows the day-to-day administration of his department. I do not believe there are as many complaints—I have heard some from time to time in this House—about the Land Board, but I know from personal experience here that the Minister of Lands is of great assistance in the administration of that board. However, this is not so with many of the boards and trusts that exist, and the Opposition has consistently taken the view that the board of administration proposed in the Bill is the

wrong form. There may be objections to be raised to the placing of the whole of the administration of this Act under the Sheriff's and Gaols and Prisons Department instead of under the Department of Health. That could well be debated, but we are not arguing whether it should be the one or the other.

We believe that it should be a normal departmental administration and not an administration by a board that will apparently represent several departments. I believe that, if the Government were to withdraw this Bill and to introduce a measure along the lines that have been advocated by the Leader and me, the Opposition would give every assistance to the Government to get this through as a matter of urgency. However, as the Bill stands we are in a difficult position as we cannot support the form of administration proposed.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): The more I listen to the Opposition on the matter of administration and responsibility of the Ministry to members of this House the more amazed I become at their consistent inconsistency. "We want a Minister of Housing; we want a special Minister to look after children's welfare; we want a Minister to look after this particular problem—

Mr. Ryan: We want Ministers, not rubber stamps.

Mr. SHANNON: If the honourable member wants to go outside and flap his ears he will not interfere with my speech. It is obvious—

Mr. McKee: Don't be so nasty.

Mr. SHANNON: I shall not be nasty. I do not want frivolous interjections that have no bearing whatever on the problem we are now discussing. This is a serious problem. I know that Opposition members are not very serious; I discovered that this afternoon. They have a different state of mind from ours. The Public Works Committee has had the most difficult task of all its investigations I remember in arriving at a decision as to what would be the proper thing to do in this field. Members of the committee discovered that it was impossible to find authorities who would speak authoritatively on this matter. In nearly every case where we found anybody who had had any experience of this problem he repeatedly used "perhaps" and "if" in his evidence. If honourable members read the evidence tendered to the committee they will discover that to be a fact.

Mr. Jennings: Before your committee?

Mr. SHANNON: That is all right by me; if the honourable member thinks he is being facetious, that is very pleasant from his point of view and does not hurt me one bit. The committee is a responsible body and I want to point out that I am glad that I do not have to put up with the honourable member's presence on it. The committee, in its investigation of this problem, arrived at one definite conclusion, for the benefit of the honourable member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan). This was supported in practically every instance by the most knowledgeable witnesses we could get, dissociated entirely from Police Department participation. These people admitted at once that any taint of police administration would prevent many sufferers from ever putting forward their claims for help. I refer to the volunteer. We would not have had any volunteers; there would not have been one if the Police Department had been involved. Who would volunteer to go into an institution that was housing the recidivists who had been before the court not once, not twice, not 10 but probably a hundred times, something of which the member for Norwood would be well aware.

Mr. Dunstan: It was three hundred times in one case.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not doubt that, either. If we expect to get any result at all, please do not mix up the improbable recoverer (I will not say it is worse than that) with the probable recoverer.

Mr. Clark: None of us would want to do that.

Mr. SHANNON: I do not know that any member has yet had time to read the committee's report. Obviously no-one has had time to read the evidence.

Mr. Clark: The members of the committee have.

Mr. SHANNON: They listened to it and came to a decision on it. This problem is urgent and I would make bold to say that our first attempt to deal with it will not be the final answer.

Mr. McKee: That applies to many things; that is not uncommon.

Mr. SHANNON: Hence I should hope that sweet reason would be applied to this problem by my friends on the Opposition benches and I should not expect a perfect measure to come before us. I intend to deal with the major complaint made by the Leader and by the member for Norwood in more detail but I want first of all to point out to the House that in this remedial field much exploratory work is still to be done.

We have some excellent work being done by volunteer organizations today in a very restricted field. We applaud that work and we trust that any legislation that is passed will not deny these volunteer organizations the right to play their part in this difficult task of helping afflicted people to recover. This Bill is met by many odd suggestions that are mentioned in the Public Works Committee's report on the problem. However, it does one vital thing: it takes the matter right out of the hands of the Sheriff's and Gaols and Prisons Department and divides the classifications of people who suffer from this affliction into two categories. My opinion is that we could have profitably created a third category for I think there is a third category, but the Bill provides for only two: the volunteer and the person committed by the court. There is a third category, and it is a very important category. Those who have had experience of this problem will know full well that under the legislation we passed in this Chamber it was appropriate for medical action to be taken to advise a certain member of the family group to seek help in this field. My own view is that that is the second most profitable group we have to work upon. I think we shall get a bigger percentage of recoveries there than from the third and final group, which comes under court orders.

I am not going to wipe off people who have offended many times and whom courts have found it necessary to commit. Most members know just what we now do with a person who offends by taking too much liquor—the Adelaide Gaol is his destination. He goes there for what is known as the drying out process, comes out, goes through the same thing again, and then goes back to gaol and dries out once more. There is no such thing as remedial treatment in that process. If I may say so, it is the cruellest possible approach we could have to this unfortunate type of individual. I cannot think of anything worse that we can do to him than put him in gaol for 10 days or a fortnight and then turn him out on the road again. The first thing he does is go back to his old associates, who get him into trouble again. He is picked up, probably within a day or two, and then goes back to gaol again. The member for Norwood (Mr. Dunstan) has said that some people who come before the court have 300 convictions, and I do not doubt that for one moment. I know that some people have hundreds of convictions.

The Public Works Committee's final assessment of this problem was that there were two categories in which there were really worthwhile chances of getting people back into

society as respectable citizens. The first category consists of the volunteers and the second of people who have been encouraged to seek help by members of the family or by medical practitioners. The people in these two categories do not reach the courts. This is the right way to attack the problem, because it is getting to the core of the problem before the person offends to the stage where the courts get him into their hands.

We consider that those two categories should be handled very wisely and carefully so that there is no possible taint in the minds of the people who are near and dear to them, their family or their social friends. There is less possible taint, because they have sought some assistance. I remind members that it is not many years ago in the field of mental health since asylums, as we called them, were the last thing in the world one mentioned in polite society if one was in the unfortunate position of having a relative incarcerated in one. We now have the experience in this field of mental health of people volunteering to go in for treatment for mental disease in what we now describe correctly as mental hospitals.

We all know that a section of the community is beyond remedial treatment in this field. Unfortunately, ailments are born without hope of recovery, and we have them in our community. I do not at this stage refer to them as mental sufferers, as they were born deficient and, unfortunately for us, medical science at this stage can do nothing for them, but it is doing a tremendous thing for the ordinary mentally sick. The same thing applies in this field. In fact, I believe that if this Bill becomes law the psychiatric approach to this problem will not be denied to have some very great force and effect in bringing some of these people back to what I call reasonably social individuals. I believe there is some psychiatric disturbance in some sufferers from this complaint.

I shall not speak at any great length, because I think the Public Works Committee's evidence which has been tabled will give anyone really concerned about this problem a very good lead. We took evidence from people who have been doing their best in this difficult field in our sister States, admittedly not with 100 per cent success. They admit themselves that they do not know the full answer. They are not too sure whether even now they are doing all that they should be doing in their restricted fields. The committee has recommended that this matter should be very carefully examined and very quietly approached, not rushed, by the

authorities concerned so that they will feel their way towards establishing the type of clinic that will encourage people to go to it.

Members of the committee saw one of these clinics in Alexander Parade in Victoria. Dr. Bartholomew, who is a police doctor, is in charge of that clinic. I do not condemn him for being a police doctor, as he is a most excellent gentleman and has a sense of a ministerial calling; he is like a pastor of the church, as he feels so strongly about his duties. We saw when we were at the clinic an old habitué stumbling up the stairs as we were being shown out. I am not sure whether we were being shown out by Dr. Bartholomew or by Dr. Cunningham Dax, the Director of Mental Hygiene; I think it was Dr. Dax. This chap stumbled up the stairs and fell at the first landing. One of the members of the committee asked, "Is he one of your clients?" Dr. Dax said, "Yes, he is one of our clients. He knows that he can come here and be dealt with. He has been out and has got into bad company, but he has come back where he knows he can get help. He is one of our problem children. We have not cured him. We may never get him back into society as a respectable citizen, but at least he is off the street, isn't he?" We could not deny that. This man had enough sense left in him, despite the fact that he was inebriated, to clamber up the steps to people who could help him. These people have the drugs to help him dry out.

Mr. Clark: He was a nice polite fellow.

Mr. SHANNON: Even in his cups he was a gentleman. He was neither crude nor rude. It was one of those distressing things which happen and which pinpointed to me and members of the committee this problem as being unusual. There are no set rules. Do not try to set down rules; you are simply up against a brick wall if you do. I want to give to some people the scope to try out some new ideas. I want them to learn what they can from overseas in such places as Sweden. I should like to have visited Sweden if I could have had a free trip at the Government's expense.

Mr. Clark: Would you have taken the committee with you?

Mr. SHANNON: I have been informed that the Swedish Government deals with this problem in a more humane manner than the general approach, which is, unfortunately, "If he is that big a fool let him look after himself." We cannot take that attitude with these people. That they are foolish we admit, but the foolishness arises from some aberration that

should be treated. This House is justified in seeking proper control and members should be properly informed about the success or failure of the venture resulting from this legislation. I do not see any bar to making a private approach to the Minister controlling this department; if not a private approach then a public one in this Chamber by way of question on any particular aspect of the administration or the department's activities. This department should not be in any different category from other Government departments, on which, through curiosity or our knowledge of their activities, we quiz the Ministers. Some members do it privately, some write a letter, some earwig the Minister, and some ask a question in the House. I have discovered by long experience that my pen is my best ambassador. If I write a letter the Minister knows what I want and frequently I get results by that approach.

I am pleased that a board of three has been appointed rather than a Director as at present; not because I think three heads are better than one, but because three men will not agree to do the wrong thing. Three men will not decide to do something that is futile and foolish. We ourselves are the policemen who can take the appropriate action.

The Hon. Sir Baden Pattinson: The Minister in charge is still responsible.

Mr. SHANNON: He will have a load on his shoulders and he will know it. The Minister of Education knows full well that he carries a heavy burden, and frequently is unjustly criticized because of a decision that he is forced to make. The same thing may happen to the Minister in charge of this project. Do not put a Minister in sole charge of this particular problem. No Minister could possibly know all the answers or ramifications of what will arise and have to be dealt with by the board. It would be humanly impossible for any Minister to know all about the various departments that he administers, but he is still responsible to this House. If one of his officers does something wrong we quickly take action through the Minister to ensure that what we think is wrongly done is righted. That same channel is open under this legislation.

I hope Opposition members will reconsider this problem and not arbitrarily dismiss it and say that too much power is being put in the hands of a board. In whose hands would they put the power? Who are the people that they would choose to tackle this problem? The Public Works Committee, after a thorough investigation, did not know that.

Mr. Clark: We thought we would leave it to Parliament.

Mr. SHANNON: We left it to Parliament because no help in this matter came out of our evidence. This legislation is not perfect, but I do not ask for perfection. I ask for a step in a direction that may finally lead to some amelioration of one of our social ills.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE (Minister of Lands): I speak on this question primarily because I was on the Public Works Committee when the matter first came before it. I accompanied the Chairman and other members of the committee interstate and saw what was being done there. I saw what was being done in this State, and knew from evidence what was not being done. The committee obtained first-hand evidence of the problem. By interjection tonight I asked whether the only objection that the Opposition had to this Bill was the fact that it was to be administered by a board of three instead of by a Minister, and the reply was, "Yes, it was." I take it that this is the only objection. I ask the Opposition to think again, not raise that objection, and let the Bill pass. There is no deliberate intention on the Government's part to evade this problem. This Bill has been designed to apply the best brains possible to the question. Probably none of the present Ministers, or any Ministers who could be appointed, would have a first-hand knowledge of this problem. No-one on earth has the answer to it. We are attempting to place people, who have become addicted to alcohol, in an environment where the best opportunities are given to overcome their affliction.

Mr. Riches: We all agree on that.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: That is the intention of the legislation.

Mr. Riches: Can you assure me that the board will be answerable to Parliament?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: It will be answerable to a Minister who is answerable to Parliament. So far as I can give that assurance as a Minister, I give it. The board will comprise three members. It will not be easy to get three dedicated men to undertake the work. I cannot visualize any three men undertaking a more frustrating job. This is the first approach to the problem. It could prove to be a sturdy approach, or the effluxion of time may prove it to be a halting approach, but I appeal to the Opposition to give it a chance. I would rather have three dedicated men, one of whom was a medical man, to advise a Minister who would have no personal knowledge—

Mr. Riches: Does the Bill say that one member must be a medical man?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: Yes. The board will comprise three men who have some knowledge of psychiatry. No Minister knows how to apply psychiatry. No man knows everything about this problem and a trinity of men is more likely to achieve results than a Minister who would have to make decisions without direction.

Mr. Dunstan: He could have an advisory board.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: This board can act in an advisory capacity.

Mr. Dunstan: It will administer in detail.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: The Bill states that the board shall be responsible to the Minister for the discharge of its duties and the exercise of its powers. Is that not normal legislation? Is not every board and every department responsible to a Minister?

Mr. Riches: You are weakening your argument if you suggest that this will result in a repetition of some other boards we know.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: If other boards have weaknesses, it is possible to correct those weaknesses. I have control of two or three boards and there are no administrative weaknesses in their administration. Their members have been appointed to do a job and they do it admirably and well.

Mr. Loveday: What about the Transport Control Board?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: That board is appointed under Act of Parliament and it obeys directions. I ask that this legislation be given a chance. Whoever is appointed to administer the legislation—whether it be a Minister or a board—will have to explore unknown territory. It is better to go into unknown territory in a body than as an individual floundering and seeking directions.

Mr. Riches: No-one is saying that it isn't.

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: It has been suggested that there is a sinister intent in suggesting a board, but that is not so. The board will achieve as much good as could possibly accrue to any legal instrument appointed to cope with a problem to which no-one has the answer. When we reduce the problem to fundamentals, the only man who can cure an alcoholic is the alcoholic himself. We can give him psychiatric and other treatment, but he is the only person who can determine that he will never drink again, and that would be the most difficult decision that any man addicted to alcohol would have to make. I have been a cigarette smoker all my life and periodically I stop smoking. I will decide not to smoke one week and to smoke again the next week.

Mr. Clark: Can you manage without a cigarette for a week?

The Hon. P. H. QUIRKE: I can manage for a month, but not a day passes that I do not sorely want a cigarette. If I compare my feelings with how an alcoholic must feel about giving away drink, then I can understand the difficulty of such a decision. Drink must be an irresistible attraction. I could cheerfully smoke a cigarette now, but I have not had a smoke for a fortnight. I can imagine the feelings of an alcoholic who has to make such a decision.

It is far better to have a board of three men, one of whom must be a medical man, to investigate what has to be done—because we do not know what has to be done—and to submit recommendations to the Minister for adjudication. What is wrong with that procedure? If members reject this measure, even assuming that the Government recasts the legislation to comply with the Opposition's wishes, it will be the end of the year before legislation can be passed. Meanwhile, we would be condemning these people to a further 12

months of suffering. Most of the 88 Bills that have been passed this session are amending legislation. If legislation is unsatisfactory it can be amended. This Bill deals with a subject about which nothing is known. It is a gesture of sympathy that will cost the Government money which it is willing and eager to spend in the interests of humanity. I ask the Opposition not to insist on its decision to resist this legislation because it is to be administered by a board and not by a Minister. The board will be entirely responsible to the Minister who can still exercise his Ministerial powers. From a humanitarian viewpoint I ask the Opposition to let this legislation become operative as soon as possible.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

LAND AGENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 8.39 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, February 20, at 2 p.m.