HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 1, 1965.

The SPEAKER (Hon. L. G. Riches) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DOCTOR'S DISMISSAL.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I desire to refer to the dismissal of Dr. Gillis. The history of the employment of Dr. Gillis in the Public Service of South Australia has been a sorry one. Matters concerned with his blatant disregard of the provisions of the Public Service Act, his refusal to accept proper direction from his superior officers or his Minister, and his completely unfounded allegations of fraud and corruption against senior and responsible public servants fill 16 large files. It is doubtful if any member of this House has been free of his roneoed letters which uniformly contain a spate of half truths and distortions, and on many occasions the most blatant untruths. It is not necessary to enlarge on this more than to say that a recent letter sent to members of this House and apparently some hundreds of other people contain allegations concerning utterances attributed to the honourable member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings), which are completely untruthful.

In 1961, following a fantastic campaign by Dr. Gillis over his position in the tuberculosis services of South Australia, the then Government appointed Dr. H. M. Birch to conduct an inquiry. The inquiry lasted 10 months, and cost £1,710 9s. It resulted in Dr. Gillis being specifically required to do what he had previously refused to do. Dr. Birch's findings and recommendations were accepted by the previous Government and this was specifically made clear to Dr. Gillis in a letter by the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin on October 1, 1962. Dr. Birch's findings include the following:

Dr. Gillis alleged Dr. Paxon as "guilty of rank neglect and deliberate intent to deceive".

Finding: Dr. Paxon was not guilty of the above.

Dr. Gillis alleged Dr. Paxon's actions were corrupt.

Finding: The allegation is not true.

Dr. Gillis stated that Dr. Paxon failed to inform the authorities on bed requirements which could "cost the State hundreds of thousands of pounds in unnecessary buildings".

Finding: Dr. Paxon was not guilty in any way whatsoever. The allegation illustrates the lack of responsibility in many of the complaints of Dr. Gillis.

Dr. Gillis alleged Dr. Paxon was "directly or indirectly" responsible for the Assistant Secretary of the Hospitals Department being "rushed up to the Morris Hospital" on May 22, 1961, to deliver the instructions of the Public Service Commissioner.

Finding: Dr. Paxon had nothing whatever to do with this. The allegation shows how Dr. Gillis's hatred and suspicion warp his judgment.

Dr. Gillis alleged that Dr. Rollison signed the specific directive of May 19, 1961, and memorandum of duties and responsibilities of the Director of Tuberculosis and Medical Superintendent hurriedly and without proper examination of the document.

Finding: This most important directive, which had been compiled with meticulous care by the Crown Solicitor, the Public Service Commissioner, and other heads of departments, was issued to the two men concerned. Dr. Gillis takes it upon himself to maintain that Dr. Rollison failed to read properly this document and he gave specious reasons for forming this opinion. Herewith we have a further example of Dr. Gillis's propensity for forming his own interpretation of what other people do or think or feel and what he himself should do. Dr. Rollison did not sign the papers without proper care; indeed, the evidence is that he was most careful before signing.

Regarding the specific instruction of May 19, 1961, the Minister agreed to this inquiry conditionally upon Dr. Gillis complying with the instructions. Dr. Gillis did not comply. He saw Mr. King and he wrote letters and said the Minister understood he was not to comply, etc. I find nothing at all to indicate that the Minister or Mr. King had in any way agreed that Dr. Gillis was excused from his obligations, which had been issued through and by the several heads of departments. I was not aware of this until half-way through the inquiry, otherwise I would not have commenced. It is beyond my understanding how one man can flout the lawful instructions given to him.

These extracts from Dr. Birch's findings constitute but a few of the criticisms which he found himself bound to make of Dr. Gillis's attitudes, his lack of co-operation with other members of the Public Service, his refusal to accept proper direction from his superiors, and the campaigns he carried on in flagrant breach of the Public Service Act. In 1962 Dr. Gillis commenced a campaign concerning the appointment of Dr. J. H. Kneebone to a position of Assistant Medical Superintendent of the Northfield Wards of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, a post for which he was also an applicant. Dr. Gillis approached individual members of the board, wrote a vast number of letters, circularized members of Parliament, and threatened scandal and public harm if the refusal to appoint him were not rectified. In the course of this campaign he alleged that misrepresentations had been made concerning himself and improper procedures by the Public Service

Commissioner and the board, and made accusations concerning the actions and attitudes of members of the Executive Council. This culminated in a letter to Dr. Gillis from the Under Secretary, on the direction of the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin, on August 3, 1962, which stated:

The proceedings of Executive Council are confidential, and information of the nature which your letter demands cannot be supplied. I am further directed by the Chief Secretary to inform you:

(1) that as you are a public servant, any complaints which you may desire to make concerning any matter affecting your position in the Public Service should be transmitted in the normal manner through the head of the department to which you belong. No notice, except of a disciplinary nature, will be taken of communications not so forwarded;

(2) that the suggestion made in the last paragraph of your letter is insulting and unbecoming a professional man of your standing. You will in future refrain from offensive remarks of this nature in your correspondence.

However, this directive did not deter Dr. Gillis. A large file concerning the relations between Dr. Gillis and his superiors exists, in which it is clear that he once again circularized members of Parliament, including all members of the Liberal Party, with voluminous correspondence protesting at the proper directives given to him in the Public Service. This matter was finally referred by the previous Government to the Crown Solicitor for advice, and the Crown Solicitor advised on May 21, 1963, that Dr. Gillis had been clearly guilty of a breach of the Public Service Act on several scores. No action appears to have been taken by the previous Government on this report. When the present Government took office, members of the Government received further voluminous correspondence sent directly to Ministers, complaining about improper directives given within the Public Service as to Dr. Gillis's duties and protesting about the appointment of Dr. Kneebone. Again, these letters included the most scandalous remarks about senior public servants on allegations which had been the subject of inquiry years before and which had been found to be baseless. Dr. Gillis made it perfectly clear that he intended to continue campaigns, concerning which he had had ample warning previously.

Dr. Gillis was informed in both April and May that the Government did not propose to take any further action about the matter about which Dr. Gillis had circularized members of the Government, and concerning which he had continued to pepper members of the previous Government despite their directives to the contrary. This was the background in which the Government had to deal with Dr. Gillis's actions in a particular case of a woman under his care. In September, 1964, the Director of Tuberculosis recommended that an order be sought under section 146 (*f*) of the Health Act for the removal of a woman referred to in this report as "Mrs. X" to the Morris Hospital at Northfield for a period of six months. A resolution of the Central Board of Health authorizing the Director-General to apply to a special magistrate was made on November 3, and approval was given by Sir Lyell McEwin on November 19. An application was duly made to the magistrate, and an order was made by His Honour Judge Gillespie on December 14, 1964.

Mrs. X was taken to the hospital, but a warrant pursuant to the order was not issued at the time of the making of the order. Dr. Gillis wrote to the Crown Solicitor drawing his attention to the fact that it was unsatisfactory to have her in the hospital under the order without a warrant, as she had at times previously left the hospital when it was not proper for her from the public health point of view to do so. The letter was acknowledged on December 24 by the Crown Solicitor, and that letter contained the following two paragraphs:

The special magistrate has made an order against Mrs. X and this order is that she be detained at the Morris Hospital for a period of six months and offered treatment there. She is not entitled by her own action to terminate that treatment. If she does so then her actions would, I think, be sufficient justification for an application to be made for the issue of a warrant. I think this application would be successful.

The interval between Mrs. X's leaving hospital and the issue of a warrant could be only two or three days. I appreciate that even this break in her treatment is unfortunate. The period of six months commences from December 14 and the issue of a warrant during this period of six months will not prolong the effect of the order beyond June 14, 1965.

On January 4, Dr. Gillis informed the Crown Solicitor in a letter that the order had to extend for the duration of the order—in this case six months—and that that started from the date upon which a warrant was executed. On this score Dr. Gillis apparently considered himself more of an authority on the law than the Crown Solicitor. However, arrangements were made for the issuing of a warrant, and in January the judge signed a warrant which was forwarded to the Commissioner of Police

on January 25. It was in fact executed on Mrs. X on January 26. In March Mrs. X wrote both to Dr. Woodruff and to the Attorney-General concerning her detention in the hospital. Dr. Gillis was informed of the intention to reply to Mrs. X that the order for her detention would expire on June 15. He wrote to Dr. Woodruff disputing the date concerned, and the matter was referred to the Crown Solicitor. The Crown Solicitor, upon full investigation of the matter, again stated that unless a further order under section 146 (*f*) (2) were obtained concerning Mrs. X, Mrs. X's hospital term—pursuant to the special magistrate's order of December 14—would end on June 15, 1965, or such earlier date as she could be lawfully released.

Mrs. X was written to by the Director-General of Public Health and by the Attorney-General. Dr. Gillis saw the Attorney-General's letter in which, acting upon the advice of the Crown Solicitor, with which he completely agreed, and after full investigation of the matters in the file, he informed Mrs. X that the date upon which she was due for release was June 15. The Director of Tuberculosis wrote to Dr. Gillis on May 6 to inform him of the position, and the first paragraph of that letter reads as follows:

Dr. Woodruff has requested me to advise you of the Crown Solicitor's opinion regarding the date of termination of Mrs. X's compulsory period in hospital, which is that unless Mrs. X obtains an order under section 146 (*f*) (2) of the Health Act, her hospital term—pursuant to the special magistrate's order of December 14, 1964—will end on June 15, 1965, or on such earlier date as she may be lawfully released.

Dr. Gillis then directed a letter to the Attorney-General, dated May 21, not only disagreeing with the directives which he had received but stating that it would appear that what he considered to be the mistaken opinions of the Crown Solicitor and the Attorney-General had been based upon a failure by his superiors to supply sufficient information to the officer and the Minister. The Attorney-General then requested that the Minister of Health should draw Dr. Gillis's attention to the Crown Solicitor's opinion but was informed that this had already been done. On June 15, Mrs. X left the Morris Hospital, as she was legally entitled to do. Despite the clear directives to Dr. Gillis as to the legal position, at 8.30 a.m. on June 15 Dr. Gillis called the Police Missing Persons Bureau and informed Senior Constable Fletcher that Mrs. X had left the hospital without permission; that there was a warrant outstanding which had not expired; and that Mrs X could be returned to the hospital on the warrant already in existence. He specifically asked that Mrs. X be returned to the hospital by the police. He made no mention of the Crown Solicitor's or Attorney-General's opinions to the officer. The constable concerned depended upon the advice and direction of Dr. Gillis, and with Woman Police Constable Hansberry arrested Mrs. X and returned her to the Morris Hospital, purporting to act on the warrant.

The matter was later in the day brought to the attention of the Minister of Health and at 2.45 p.m. on June 15 Dr. Gillis was instructed by the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Public Health that Mrs. X must be released and that she must be provided with a taxi service order to enable her to travel to any destination she desired. In fact, it is understood that Mrs. X had missed a train connection to a country town as a result of her wrongful arrest and detention, and it was necessary for the Government to endeavour to do all that it could to rectify any damage or inconvenience caused to her. Dr. Gillis demanded written confirmation of the telephoned instruction, which was not given, but the Secretary of the Hospitals Department drew his attention to the advice of the Crown Solicitor which had been communicated to him on two occasions as to the time at which the effect of the magistrate's order expired. Dr. Gillis subsequently telephoned the Police Department and endeavoured to obtain action by the police to carry out what he alleged to be the effect of the warrant. The telephone call was carefully recorded by Sgt. Daws and the effect of it was, in fact, confirmed in a subsequent letter addressed to the Commissioner of Police by Dr. Gillis repeating statements in his telephone conversation. In his letter to the police Dr. Gillis alleged:

Neither has the Local Court changed, either by telephone or letter their statement to me over the telephone that of course the police and I must complete our legal obligation by detaining her up to July 26, 1965.

Investigation by the Local Court Judge reveals that no such statement or instruction was given to Dr. Gillis by any officer of the Local Court Department. Dr. Gillis then addressed letters to the Crown Solicitor and to the Minister of Health, dated June 16, stating:

I have carried out written instructions from the court under the law and notified the police of this fact that Mrs. X left the Hospital yesterday afternoon, so that the police can carry out their legal instructions and return

her to the hospital, and I will continue to do so up to July 26, 1965, when the warrant expires.

Dr. Gillis thus made it clear that he would not accept the opinion of the Attorney-General and the Crown Solicitor, that he would not accept directions of his Minister and his superiors in the Public Service, and that he would continue to follow a course endeavouring to get officers of the Police Commissioner's department to carry out what would be further wrongful arrest and false imprisonment of Mrs. X. In these circumstances, the Public Service Commissioner recommended to the Government that Dr. Gillis's appointment in the Public Service be terminated forthwith under the general power of the Crown as an employer. A recommendation was made to His Excellency the Governor in Executive Council, and that was done.

The Government was advised that publication of these matters would not only be contrary to the public interest on a number of obvious grounds, but also could draw attention to the fact that an action lay for wrongful arrest and false imprisonment for substantial damages by Mrs. X against innocent police officers. As the whole background of Dr. Gillis's actions and activities in the Public Service was well known to the Opposition, and as it was felt that publication of all these matters would certainly not be helpful to Dr. Gillis in obtaining employment elsewhere, the Government accepted advice tendered to it that no public statement such as has been made here today should be made.

As, however, the Government has been questioned by Opposition members concerning this matter and as Dr. Gillis has continued a campaign alleging that he has been unjustly treated, the Government feels it proper in all the circumstances that this statement should now be made available to Parliament. If there is any portion of the files on this matter which honourable members wish confidentially to examine, the files will be made available to them.

QUESTIONS

DOCTOR'S DISMISSAL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I take it that the public interest previously referred to as the reason for the Premier's not making a statement on the dismissal of Dr. Gillis concerned whether the woman referred to had taken action for damages for wrongful arrest. I also take it that this matter has been examined by the Premier and any necessary action taken. I believe that, if any citizen has had a substantial wrong done to him, the Government should not escape its obligation merely by refraining from making a statement in Parliament. Will the Premier comment on what I have said?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: One reason for my not making a statement concerned the wrongful arrest of a certain person. However, to any extent that is necessary in the interests of the people of this State, the Government will honour its obligations. I was reluctant to go beyond what I had previously said on this matter because I believed that the interests of public justice would be best served by nothing further being said. However, following the actions of Dr. Gillis and the persistent questions of the Leader and some of his colleagues, I decided that the matter should be ventilated. I am sure that now that the case has been brought into the open many members of the South Australian Public Service will feel that a load has been lifted from their shoulders. I believe that one could search far and wide before finding a more reliable group of people than our public servants. In that regard we were forced into the position in which there was a suspicion that we had something to hide. If members study the report carefully they will realize that the Leader of the Opposition, when he was Premier, should at least have seriously considered the position of Dr. Gillis. I have already said that the Government of the day has the right to select and the right to consult with the Public Service Commissioner, who has a job to do in the interests of this State. I believe the Commissioner has done the honourable thing in this matter, and when he is forced to act on another decision he will have no alternative, because there are sound reasons for that decision. I do not think Dr. Gillis has anything to gain as a result of what I have said today.

ELIZABETH COURTHOUSE.

Mr. CLARK: I understand that tenders and contracts will shortly be invited for extensions to buildings at the Elizabeth courthouse. Has the Attorney-General any information on this matter?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Tenders are being called by the Director of the Public Buildings Department for extensions consisting of single storey additions to match the existing building and to provide an enlarged public office and a new entrance at the Elizabeth courthouse. This is necessary because of the now

inadequate provision at the Elizabeth courthouse for the numbers of calls made on it. Tenders had been called previously, but proved to be unsatisfactory, so tenders are now being recalled for extensions to the existing courthouse which have already been shown to be necessary.

CHILDREN'S RELIEF.

Mr. CASEY: Several weeks ago a Mr. Weidner in Peterborough applied for an air passage to Germany so that he could receive further medical treatment that is unavailable here in Australia. I am pleased to say that Mr. Weidner has been notified that he will be able to make that trip, leaving Australia tomorrow. As he is almost a complete invalid suffering from multiple sclerosis, he will be accompanied on the trip by his wife. He intends to seek treatment in Kiel, in Germany. Mr. and Mrs. Weidner will have to leave behind in Peterborough their young family of five children. As far as I know, they have no relations in Australia, having migrated from Germany some years ago, and I understand that the children are to be looked after by friends in Peterborough. Will the Attorney-General ascertain whether relief could not be provided by the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Department for these children until their mother returns from Germany, which I believe will be as soon as Mr. Weidner is settled comfortably in hospital there?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member could let me have the details of this family's general position and income, I shall have the matter immediately examined by the Chairman of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board to see whether relief is payable in these circumstances.

TRANSPORT CONTROL.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yesterday I asked the Premier a question regarding transport control. Has he a reply?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister of Transport replied to an honourable gentleman in the Legislative Council on this matter yesterday. The Government has not changed its intention in this matter, and I assure the honourable member that legislation to deal with it will be introduced soon after the show adjournment.

BURIAL PLOTS.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently constituents of mine have come to see me regarding the differences in prices for land in cemeteries for burial plots. The quotations from the Evergreen Memorial Cemetery at Enfield are three times as high as those for the Centennial Park Cemetery. As this seems to be a big difference, will the Premier investigate the reason and ensure that exorbitant charges are not made?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take up the question for the honourable member and get him an answer soon after the show adjournment.

MURRAY AREA SCHOOLS.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked last week about when terms of reference would be submitted to the Public Works Committee in respect to the Agincourt Bore and Paruna schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: It is difficult at this stage to say when construction work will be started, but it will be as soon as possible. At Agincourt Bore the water taken from the chosen site has been reported as being quite acceptable for normal purposes. The air conditioning units for the Samcon buildings could be operated by local power units. The Public Buildings Department engineers are examining all the possibilities in relation to the question of the Samcon building being suitable, and construction will be started as soon as possible.

COMMONWEALTH SCHOLARSHIPS.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Minister of Education an answer to my recent question concerning the award of Commonwealth secondary scholarships?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member's question concerned the number of students in high, technical high, and area schools compared with the number of students at non-Government schools who were awarded Commonwealth general secondary scholarships. The total number of these awards to non-Government schools was 228 out of a total number of 3,170 students in these schools. This represents slightly less than 7.2 per cent. In Government schools, namely, high, technical high, and area schools, there were 716 awards for 10,360 students. This represents slightly over 6.9 per cent. It will be seen that the proportion of awards to non-Government schools and Government schools was about the same. It must be remembered, of course, that many non-Government schools are selective in their intake of students while Government schools are not.

WIRRABARA ROAD.

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Minister of Education a reply from the Minister of Roads to my question of August 26 about the sealing of the Wirrabara forest road?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that the Wirrabara forest main road 153 is scheduled in the 5-year works construction programme for reconstruction and sealing to commence in 1968-69, and to be completed during 1969-70.

MEDICAL ENTITLEMENT.

Mr. BURDON: Has the Premier a reply to my question of August 10 about medical entitlement cards?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I received a letter from the Commonwealth Treasurer, which states:

As I announced in my recent Budget Speech, the Government proposes to remove the existing means test governing eligibility for enrolment in the Pensioner Medical Service. This will mean that eligibility to enrol in the scheme will be extended to all persons in receipt of an age, invalid, widow's or repatriation service pension or a tuberculosis allowance, and the dependants of such persons. It is intended that these extensions of the Pensioner Medical Service will commence from January 1, 1966.

MOORLANDS-PINNAROO ROAD.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education ascertain from the Minister of Roads whether it is intended to reconstruct or re-sheet section of highway 12 from Moorlands to Pinnaroo during the current financial year, and, if it is, which sections it is intended to, first, reconstruct, and secondly, to re-sheet?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to get that information from my colleague.

WAR PRISONERS.

Mr. McKEE: I notice a statement in today's newspaper that claims that a Formosan soldier captured in New Guinea in the Second World War has spent 18 years in a mental hospital in Sydney. The report also states that there are several such prisoners in hospitals throughout Australia. Can the Attorney-General obtain a report from the Minister of Health about this position in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall ask my colleague for that report.

KYBYBOLITE RESEARCH CENTRE.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my question of August 24 about staffing the Kybybolite research centre?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Department of Agriculture has advertised this position three times in the past 16 months, and due to the shortage of experienced graduate research workers, it has not been able to fill the position so far. The position has just been advertised again, and if no highly qualified worker is available for this vacancy, the department will consider placing the management of the centre on a more permanent basis than that operating at present.

TRAMWAYS TRUST FARES.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford, for the Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Has the Premier an answer to the recent question of the honourable member for Flinders about the increased cost to the Tramways Trust of service payments to staff members and of the recently announced award increase, and what additional revenue is expected to be derived from the increased fares?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Increased costs to the trust as a result of service pay and increased margins awarded by the Arbitration Commission are estimated to represent in this financial year £187,000. Estimated recovery from the fare increase for the same period is £172,000. In addition, customs duty on fuel and consequential rises in prices of materials will cost an estimated £17,500, making total increased costs to the trust for this financial year of £204,500. For a full financial year the total cost and fare increase recovery are estimated to be £220,000 and £204,000 respectively.

WEEDS.

Mr. FERGUSON: Has the Minister of Education a reply from the Minister of Roads to my question of August 24 about weeds on roadsides?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague the Minister of Roads reports that the department has no responsibility in regard to the control of noxious weeds on roadsides, this being the province of the local government authority. Departmental activity in regard to spraying of weeds is normally only to ensure visibility of road signs, guide posts, bridge rails, etc., and in some cases in hilly country, as an aid to drainage. In the special case mentioned, namely, the South Hummocks to Ardrossan section of the South Hummocks to Edithburgh main road 267, the reconstruction of the road had resulted in a grader "rill" being left approximately on the line of guide posts. This rill became infested with noxious weeds and, because of its nature and proximity

to the road formation, could not easily be cleared of noxious weeds by the adjoining landowners.

Accordingly, the grader rill was levelled, and a strip 8ft. wide, each side of the road, was sprayed with Vorox AA (with 2,4-D added) over a length of 27 miles. The 8ft. strips comprised 2ft. on the bitumen side of the guide posts and 6ft. behind guide posts. The work was done in May, 1964, at a cost of £916. The spraying was completely successful, but the effects of the Vorox AA as a soil sterilizer will not persist beyond a season or two, and further treatment will be necessary. As pointed out, however, control of noxious weeds is not the department's responsibility, and any further departmental spraying will be in order to maintain visibility of road furniture. There are now no encumbrances, in this case, to any weed control activity by landowners.

NURIOOTPA TRAFFIC.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Education a reply from the Minister of Roads to the question I asked on August 26 about the proposal for the re-opening of the old road from Tolley's corner, Nuriootpa, to the Greenock Road?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that some time ago a report was prepared by the Planning Section of this department, which recommended a new road to bypass Greenock and Nuriootpa. Having regard to a letter from the District Council of Angaston in which reference was made to the problem outlined by the honourable member, and from other considerations, it was decided to re-examine the whole proposal to include the consideration of traffic from Tanunda and Angaston. Further information regarding traffic movement in the Nuriootpa-Greenock-Tanunda-Angaston area is currently being obtained and the points mentioned by the honourable member will be taken into account in the re-appraisal of the proposal.

SENIOR POULTRY ADVISER.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether the position of Senior Poultry Adviser vacated by Mr. McArdle is still vacant, and, if it is, what effort is being made to fill it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: This position is still unfilled, and has been since 1962, despite several attempts to fill it by advertisement. Recently I decided to divide the duties of this position. In the past the position involved the duties not only of poultry adviser but also of research officer. This position has been advertised in two parts, one in respect of Senior Poultry Adviser and one in respect of Research Officer. I understand that several applications have been received for the position of Senior Poultry Adviser, and it is hoped that the successful applicant will shortly be announced.

HOUSING TRUST.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Premier the information concerning water and sewerage services in respect of Housing Trust houses for which I previously asked?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Additional information requested by the Leader of the Opposition, following a question on notice on August 24, 1965, concerning completed Housing Trust houses in the metropolitan area awaiting water or sewer connections, is as follows:

At present 213 houses are now awaiting services, the details of which are as under:

Awaiting sewer connections:

Work will be commenced in mid-September—

Osborne	21
Taperoo	19

Work will be commenced this week—

Dernancourt area (1)	28
Dernancourt area (2)	27
Holden Hill area	36

Work started three weeks ago—

Parafield Gardens	56

A total of 187 houses is awaiting sewer services. The balance of 26 houses is awaiting either water connection or supply of electricity or both. It is understood that all of this work will be completed within two or three months.

CITY OF ENFIELD BY-LAW: ZONING.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

That by-law No. 20 of the Corporation of the City of Enfield, in respect of zoning, made on November 23, 1964, and laid on the table of this House on July 27, 1965, be disallowed.

Although the by-law is in two parts, I understand that it will be necessary for me to move for the disallowance of the whole by-law, as it is not possible to amend it by seeking to disallow only part of it. I have no objection whatever to one portion of the by-law, namely, the part relating to area R.17 at Valley View. Indeed, as far as I know, no other person objects to that portion. However, the area R.18 at Croydon Park is the one to which I draw the attention of honourable members. This area had previously been zoned for residential purposes, minor industries and business premises, and it substantially comprises residential houses. Although some

vacant allotments remain in this area, about 40 to 45 business premises and industries are established there which, I believe, in aggregate, employ about 250 people.

These industries have raised objections (which I believe to be valid), because the by-law seriously impairs their right to expand in the future. Indeed, I believe that the by-law itself has been brought about by the desire of a certain industry to expand and to purchase some vacant land that is available for that expansion. This by-law offers no compensation to those industries. Although I doubt whether the Enfield corporation, as it is at present constituted, would seek to stop such industries from expanding, I believe that, if it remained as it is, these industries would be denied the right to expand in the future. Even if they desired to expand on their own land, that would be subject to the approval of the corporation. The motion seeks to protect a group of people desiring to establish enterprises perfectly legally under the by-law.

Mr. McKEE secured the adjournment of the debate.

CHURCH PROPERTIES.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Coumbe:

(For wording of motion, see page 633.)

(Continued from August 25. Page 1273.)

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I support the motion, not because it concerns one of a number of things covered in a blanket undertaking given by the Premier in his policy speech to honour certain concessions offered by the former Premier in a speech he made the previous evening, but because the principle of the motion appeals to me. It seeks to exempt church properties from State rates and taxes. I think most of us (if not all) belong to one faith or another, and in that regard we are associated with a particular church. I believe we are all glad that in these days the finances of churches are better controlled than they used to be. Gone are the days (and thank goodness they are) when the incumbents of churches had to exist on a salary which allowed them little dignity and which did not allow them to do most of the things and have most of the comforts enjoyed by other people in the community. I believe the present-day arrangements made to budget for church finances are a decided improvement, and that we are all pleased to see them.

Because church finances are better controlled these days, most of us associated with churches make a contribution, and the aggregate of these funds is apportioned for various purposes. They are used not only for the stipend of the clergyman or parson but also for the acquisition of church property to provide for future expansion of church activities, for home and foreign mission fields, and for activities of a like nature. Of course, these contributions are a matter of personal decision. However, most people, realizing the expense incurred in the work of churches today, are as generous as they can be. I know that in many churches those who are really deeply involved in their faith and the work of the church make a contribution of perhaps 10 per cent of their income. Of course, other people cannot afford to be as generous as this.

I believe all members are familiar with the new type of financing used in churches and for many types of public work of a charitable nature. This is the wellknown Wells plan, and similar financial arrangements are also used. These are initiated in a dignified manner: people are called upon by responsible officers of the church and by people who volunteer to do this type of parochial work. The work of the church is presented to people so that they realize the obligation the church has to honour. It is pointed out that they are adherents of the church, and that it is therefore their duty, as well as their privilege, to make a contribution commensurate with their incomes. That is the basis of the Wells scheme and of many other schemes that have been evolved in recent years. The result has been that instead of the incumbent of the church having to exist on almost a pittance he now has a decent income—one that the adherents of the church feel is fit for him. This has made a great difference. It has also enabled most churches (and many of these can be seen in the metropolitan area and the country as well) that have been struggling for many years, now that they are financed on a much better basis, to be able to go ahead and build churches, to concentrate on work concerning young people in the community and to provide facilities for them. They are also able to contribute more towards mission work both in Australia and overseas. I believe all this is very good indeed. Therefore, for the reasons that I have enumerated, I believe everybody is interested in the motion put forward by the honourable member for Torrens, because it appeals to every thinking person in the community.

People realize that, with more funds at their disposal, the work of churches can be done much more effectively. and carried out much better. The fact that we now have churches in a much better position has resulted in their being able to provide homes for the aged. They have now been able to take the initiative in this kind of community work. The outcome of this is seen in the greatly increased number of homes (sponsored by churches) that cater for old people. Churches are enabled to qualify for the £2-for-£1 subsidy made available by the Commonwealth Government for the purpose of setting up and maintaining homes for the aged. For this reason the work of churches in the community is recognized much more than it used to be. They are playing their part in dealing with the geriatric problem, which is very close to the hearts of most people because they know they will grow old, and for many of them old age is looming much closer. Therefore, most people have a close interest in these things and are sympathetic with the part churches play in this field of social welfare.

Churches also obtain much support in the community, not only for the work they do spiritually but because they are brought before the notice of the public by the functions that are organized to sustain them in the carrying out of their work. I believe that much greater support would be forthcoming not only from the adherents of churches but from the public as a whole if support were given to churches in the way of remission of water, sewerage and council rates, and land tax, because much money is paid out to meet these community services. I sincerely believe that church supporters would respond more generously, perhaps, if churches did not have to pay out large sums for these types of service.

Mr. Hughes: Would they want to respond if all these concessions were given?

Mrs. STEELE: Many people seem to think that Governments should not tax churches and, therefore, if the Government would remit the taxes that I have mentioned these people would make greater contributions. I have heard the view expressed many times that the Government should do certain things and the churches should not have to pay for them. This applies in respect of other matters as well. Certain people subscribe to the theory that the Government should provide for handicapped children, for instance, but I would be sorry to see this happen because, while people feel that they should be responsible for supporting such organizations, and in fact do, a better community spirit exists.

Mr. Hughes: I have been closely associated with churches and with church trusts for most of my life and I have never heard that view.

Mrs. STEELE: I think the member for Wallaroo would agree that if the Government offered to remit the payment of rates on church properties, the churches would be happy to accept the legislation. The member for Torrens, in moving this motion, most correctly and fairly said that, should the exemption of rates be granted to churches, a church should have to meet the deferred charges on land which it had held for some time and subsequently decided to sell. I suggest that more land is being held by churches today than in the past because of the rapid expansion, particularly in the metropolitan area. We find that in these parts, where growth is greatest at present, if churches do not purchase land for future expansion they will simply not be able to afford to buy it when land values have increased by virtue of the expansion of the districts in which they function. Therefore, most far-seeing church committees are looking ahead and trying to purchase the kind of property they think will serve a district which is bound to expand and to develop in the future.

The member for Torrens said that, if this should happen and in some circumstances it was necessary for the church to sell, or if it found that the expansion was not going on at the rate it had expected and there was no need to proceed with the church building, if the property was sold the taxes should be a deferred charge. I think that is only right. I understand that land tax as applied to those properties used for purposes which come within the meaning of charitable, educational, benevolent, religious or philanthropic organizations is ¾d. in the pound. I presume that this includes properties owned by churches such as church halls and residences, and I assume, too, that it would include the kind of properties which have been bought in recent years by the central organizations of churches where church conferences, leadership courses, and conferences for youth leadership are held, and where also recreation facilities for the youth of churches are made available. We have in South Australia at present a number of these establishments, and I suggest that they are doing a magnificent job in training youth and providing facilities for youth leadership. I understand, too, from my reading of this subject that in other States total exemption is granted, and this, in effect, is the kind of concession being sought here.

—During the debate on this motion what has come to be known as the Ligertwood report has often been referred to. That is the report of the committee of inquiry on assessments for land tax, council rates, water rates and probate. The chairman of the committee was Sir George Ligertwood. Page 7 of that report refers to this subject. At the outset submissions were made to the committee which in the committee's opinion were outside the terms of reference and, although some witnesses were heard upon them, the committee made no recommendations because it felt that it was outside its charter to do so. However, it is rather interesting to read what that committee had to say about the exemptions from rates and taxes of the kind of organizations that would come within the scope of this motion. The report went on to say that representations were made by most of the churches in the community, including the Roman Catholic Church, the Methodist Church, the Church of England, the Congregational Union, the Baptist Union, the Churches of Christ, the Presbyterian Church, and the Salvation Army. It is also interesting to note that the Boy Scouts Association made a submission along similar lines. The committee reported that these submissions were followed up by an interview and by discussions with the committee in which representatives from all these churches joined and supported the same case that was presented to the committee. It went on to say, concerning the properties owned and used by churches, that the general effect of the legislation was that buildings used exclusively for public worship were exempted from rates and taxes but that there were no exemptions for manses, minister's residences, or rectories, or for vacant land held for the erection of places of worship in the future. These representatives from the churches went on to point out that in all other States both these categories were exempted, that South Australia should step into line in this respect, and that there should be no disability as a result of State boundaries.

At the conclusion of these discussions and submissions to the committee, the committee made recommendations to the Government on this subject when it presented its report, and although it said it thought it was outside its jurisdiction to recommend this, it considered nevertheless that the Government should look at it. Its final comment after the submissions and discussions with the representatives of the churches was as follows:

The question is one of policy, and the committee makes no recommendation upon it but draws attention to the arguments addressed upon the subject. The example of other States shows that relief to churches from rates and taxes can be based upon a general principle.

So, Mr. Speaker, acting on that report at the time, prior to the last election the then Premier in his policy speech said that he would introduce legislation to make it possible for churches and church properties to be exempted from the type of tax that I have previously mentioned, and because of this promise that was made and (as I have said) the sort of blanket undertaking that was given by the present Premier, the member for Torrens has put this motion on the Notice Paper, and some members on this side of the House have spoken to it. I, too, am happy to support the motion, which is most commendable, and I ask the House to consider it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): The member for Torrens has done a useful service in this House in moving this motion. I commend him, first, for submitting it, and I should like to say a few words in support of it, because there are several things associated with it that I think members opposite might consider. I also think that, if the matter is explained in its fullest sense, Cabinet members themselves will see that there is undoubtedly justice to be done here and a necessity to undertake some alleviation of the present heavy taxation which is borne by churches, particularly, in the interests of the community as a whole, and which in other States undoubtedly would not have to be borne by the churches. As stated by the previous speaker, this matter came to my personal notice when I received the report of the Ligertwood committee, which dealt with this matter fully, and I believe that, because of the undoubted integrity and competence of this committee, it is something that all honourable members would be interested to know. I think everybody in this House, and many people outside this House, greatly admire the work Sir George Ligertwood has done in this State. No-one would deny his standing, his judgment and his wisdom. Mr. Reiners, who had been Commissioner of Land Tax, and Mr. Shanahan, representing the primary industries, were the other members of the committee. This was a fully competent committee that was unlikely to make an unconsidered recommendation. Indeed, the committee gave close study to this topic and, after considering it, decided that its terms of reference did not include consideration of it; but

it felt that the case was so strong that it went out of its way to comment on it. I draw attention to the statements made by the committee when it examined this matter. The committee took evidence for many months and submitted a most valuable report, section 73 of which stated:

The committee entertained doubts from the commencement whether the subject of exemption from rates and taxes came within the terms of reference and finally decided that it did not do so.

When providing for exemptions from rates and taxes, Parliament is dealing with the persons who are liable for rates and taxes and not with the assessment of land for the purpose of paying rates and taxes. Who should be exempted is a matter of policy for the legislature. South Australia differs greatly from the other States in the extent of exemption of charitable and benevolent and religious institutions and is the least liberal of all the States in granting exemptions. Moreover there is a lack of consistency as between the South Australian Statutes themselves, to appreciate which, reference may be made to sections 10 and 12a of the Land Tax Act, section 88 of the Waterworks Act, section 65 of the Sewerage Act and the definition of ratable property in section 5 of the Local Government Act. The committee received written submissions on behalf of almost the whole of the churches in South Australia and also from the Boy Scouts Association putting a case for more liberal exemption of their properties from rates and taxes. The plea of the Boy Scouts Association was based on the importance of its work for the youth of the State and on the burden which rates and taxes imposed upon its limited and hard won finances, and particularly local government rates. As has been said the question is one of policy for the legislature. The submissions from the churches came from the Roman Catholic Church, the Methodist Church, the Church of England, the Congregational Union, the Baptist Union, the Churches of Christ, the Presbyterian Church and the Salvation Army. The submissions were followed by an interview and discussion with the committee, in which representatives from these churches joined and supported the same case.

In relation to properties owned and used by churches, the general effect of the legislation is that buildings used exclusively for public worship are exempted from rates and taxes, but there is no exemption for ministers' residences or for vacant lands which are held for future erection of places of worship. In all other States both ministers' residences and vacant lands, held for the erection of future churches are exempted and it was strongly submitted that South Australia should step into line in this respect and that there should be no disability on account of State boundaries. A further argument was urged in relation to vacant lands namely that in recent years there have been a very great number of subdivisions into new townships and that the township plan provides for allotments upon which churches can be erected in the future. The churches it was urged, are morally bound to take the opportunity of acquiring such allotments and will have to hold them until the extended population justifies the starting of a religious cause in the township. The burden of rates and taxes on such vacant lands can become very heavy and the churches submitted that relief should be given to them. Again the question is one of policy and the committee makes no recommendation upon it, but draws attention to the arguments addressed upon the subject. The example of other States shows that relief to churches from rates and taxes can be based upon a general principle.

That sets out clearly that the churches united to go before the committee to submit a case. No doubt the committee considered the case so well that it went out of its way to mention it and to point out two things, first, that South Australia is the least liberal of all States in respect of concessions for rates and taxes. In fact, we are completely out of line with the pattern of other Australian States. Secondly, it went so far as to include in the report the basis on which the churches had made the application, and stated:

The example of other States shows that relief to churches from rates and taxes can be based upon a general principle.

When I made the announcement of the policy that was so readily accepted by the Premier the following day, I said that the Government had received this recommendation, had considered it, and that if the Government were returned, it would introduce legislation to relieve the churches of their obligation to pay rates and taxes. I made one important reservation, that church properties would continue to pay for excess water used. In other words, they would have to meet the charge for providing water to the particular premises. Honourable members opposite will therefore see that this relief was completely and utterly justified. It was not suggested that churches should not pay for the water supplied, and in those circumstances I cannot for the life of me understand why the Government has not introduced legislation to give effect to what was promised by both Parties at the election.

Mr. Hughes: Now, now!

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I can produce the exact words for the honourable member, if he wishes. I have a *bona fide* copy of the then Leader of the Opposition's speech. He supplied it to the press, and the press kindly supplied it to me, so this is one of the original copies. The third paragraph of that speech, in effect, stated that "all these things that the Premier promised last night, we will undertake as administrative acts."

There was no qualification of this statement, but, of course, that qualification has been forthcoming since the election. Everybody must know that for land tax purposes ownership is aggregated.

Mr. Shannon: The more land that is owned, the more to be paid in the pound.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Exactly! It is not a question of holding a block at, say, Elizabeth for the purpose of establishing a church, and being rated on that block's value. All of these properties are valued on aggregate, and that falls heavily on the churches concerned.

Mr. Shannon: The more popular the church the more heavily it is taxed.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The more a church wishes to fulfil its future obligations, the heavier its costs will be. I am concerned when I see the levity with which one honourable member opposite is treating this subject. Surely, every honourable member present is conversant with the work undertaken by the churches, whether they are adherents to a church or not. When we combine the work undertaken by the churches with the tremendous amount of social work undertaken by the Salvation Army, the case for exemption is even stronger. Most of the work undertaken by the Salvation Army could well be at the public's expense, anyhow. Everybody should know that the churches are undertaking not only their religious responsibilities but also responsibilities for schooling, recreation, and social amenities and rehabilitation.

Surely, if ever we are to consider a matter in this House, it would be a matter to ensure that the promises so freely made at the election should be honoured now. This will not cost the Government large sums of money, but it will indeed give long overdue relief to church organizations. When I saw the report of the committee considering this particular matter, and the references it made to South Australia's being out of line with other States, I did not hesitate to suggest to my colleagues in Cabinet and in my Party that this measure should be our first undertaking if we were successful at the election. When I heard the Premier (following the evening I made my speech) promptly say that if he were returned to power he would do these things, I thought to myself, "This is one of those occasions when we entirely agree, and when we shall get somewhere."

Mr. Millhouse: You were entitled to think that, too.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Honourable members opposite have suddenly found some merit in continuing to attach church properties for taxing purposes, but other States do not see the merit in that.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: The Government has a long list of second thoughts since the election.

Mr. Hudson: It has not been operating here for 27 years; you had plenty of opportunity to undertake it yourself.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My remarks are based on those of Sir George Ligertwood, and I have not gone into the position obtaining in the other States. However, I should be happy to talk this over with the Premier, if he were prepared to listen. The member for Torrens is seeking only to ensure that churches in South Australia receive the same type of treatment as is received in other States.

Mr. Shannon: And what the churches were promised in South Australia!

Mr. Hughes: Can you tell me how long it has been operating in other States?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I do not know, but the report I have is dated August 25, 1964, and it is now September, 1965, so it has been operating for at least a year. Therefore, we are at least a year behind the other States, and if the motion is carried, the churches may well ask that this exemption be retrospective for a year. This exemption was promised by both Parties at the election. No quibble existed on our part, and the Premier himself did not quibble about it. It was a straight-out assurance that, if the Labor Party were returned to office, the announcement that I had made the previous evening would be put into effect. As I have said, this promise was contained in paragraph 3 of the Premier's policy speech, before he got on to other things which we have since seen attempted to be put into effect, or completely discarded, whatever the case may be. Apparently, the Government's attitude is, "As soon as we get into power we shall conveniently forget." This measure is reasonable, and the other States have been prepared to give effect to it. It has been promised, and under those circumstances I strongly support the motion moved by the member for Torrens. I hope that honourable members opposite have got over their attitude that everything that is suggested on this side of the House is automatically wrong.

Mr. Ryan: That is the attitude that you took for 27 years.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the honourable member cares to take the trouble to examine the whole period in which my Government was honoured to lead this Parliament, he will see that the suggestions of honourable members opposite, particularly regarding amendments, were time and time again—

Mr. Ryan: What about workmen's compensation?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: When an honourable member suggested an amendment that was not entirely workable, the Government assisted in framing something that was, and allowed that honourable member to move the amendment. Honourable members know that any promises made by the Government prior to the election should be honoured, and that any suggestions made by the Opposition should be considered. What is the purpose of having an Opposition unless it is able to bring forward constructive ideas—and this is a constructive idea and not a criticism of the Government. I should like the honourable member for Port Adelaide to justify to the churches in his district the fact that South Australia is taxing churches while every other State in the Commonwealth exempts them.

Mr. Ryan: What about the Workmen's Compensation Act? The Leader was not interested in that last year, yet we had different provisions in South Australia from those in other States.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This motion deserves the support of members opposite and I hope it will be enthusiastically supported.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): When something is being sought of the elector, the heart is soft but, after a favourable reply from the elector, the hardening of the heart sets in almost immediately. On reflection it is found that things that people were told would be done for them cannot be done. Obviously the remission of rates on churches falls into this category. I do not intend to deal with the subject so adequately covered by my Leader—church properties as such. I wish to deal with an aspect of religious activity which, in my view, is equally as important as the work carried on on the Sabbath. I refer to religious youth camps that are established in various parts of the State and some of which are established in my district.

Recently I had the pleasure of being able to get from the department concerned some of the Nissen huts that were no longer being used at Gepps Cross. It could be said that they would not be attractive for use in a youth camp. However, they were all that the Lutheran Church could afford for its camp at Clarendon. This church was glad to get nine or 10 of these huts to serve as refreshment rooms, sleeping quarters and so on. If anyone in our society needs attention it is our teenagers. Their attitude towards society is haywire. I suppose honourable members have read about what has happened overseas in the last day or two. Almost daily we can read about teenagers kicking over the traces in many places, such as Norway, Sweden, Great Britain and so on.

I have two or three youth camps in my district. A good camp is run by the Church of England at Mylor, and there is the camp run by the Lutheran Church at Clarendon. These camps are not used for commercial purposes or for any form of production. Such activity would not fall within the realms of practical politics for the churches. The camps are designed for youth groups and are not confined to members of the particular denomination that has established the camp. Anybody who is prepared to join the youth club is accepted. These camps do an excellent work in forming the character of young people. Both boys and girls attend and are properly supervised by people who give up their time without remuneration for their work, and I do not know what more could be asked of anyone in the way of a service to society. I make a plea for these organizations, and I hope the Government will consider it when it gets around to deciding which of the promises it made earlier in the year it can keep. I hope it will take into account the provisions in other States, as this is some sort of measuring stick. However, I do not always like this State to be a follower. There are times when we can give the lead. In the case of youth camps, people are prepared (for the good of the cause) to help establish social stability amongst our young people, and are capable of doing it. It is up to us to encourage them. A little encouragement could be given by keeping the promises made by both Parties before the election with regard to rates and taxes on church properties.

I agree with what the Leader said about water rates. I think the rebates should be given only on the amount of water used and that excess water should be rated because there could be carelessness or casualness in the use of water. The youth camps to which I have referred do not require large quantities of

water; they do not have large ovals. The camps are used periodically throughout the year and there is not the continuity necessary for organized sporting activities. Therefore, elaborate ovals are not necessary. At the Clarendon youth camp, the church concerned paid £80 an acre for 18 or 19 acres. Every property bought by churches to carry out this good work means an addition to the property already owned when it comes to assessing the land tax to be paid.

Mr. Freebairn: Unless it is held by the trustees.

Mr. SHANNON: Some churches are jealous in this respect and like to keep all their properties under a tight rein. However, I will not argue because I am not sure whether some churches split up the ownership by creating a trust, and thus avoid the higher rate of tax. I do not mind if they do. I think it is quite in order for them to relieve themselves of the burden of rates and taxes because they are working for the good of society. I do not believe it is possible to give an accurate estimate of the value of the work done by the various organizations.

The Leader referred to the Salvation Army. The Salvation Army Boys Home at Eden Park, in my district, caters for youngsters who have lost both parents and have, in fact, been thrown on the mercies of the world. The people at that home have turned out men who have taken a leading part in many activities. Some of those people had nothing at all to start with: they were a long way behind scratch educationally and morally when the Salvation Army took them in and gave them a home; they have been built into very useful citizens, and I am proud to know many of them. Their antecedents mean nothing: it is what they are today that matters, and they have been made that way by the Salvation Army.

I join with my Leader in a tribute to that organization which is well known throughout the world for its work in a strata of society all too often overlooked by people who should know better. I believe the hearts of Government members will soften once more. The hardening that set in following their success will gradually melt, and the milk of human kindness will flow from them, I am sure. I know that their financial troubles are not small, and I am not denying that they have many financial commitments which they did not know about until they achieved office. I ask them not to let those financial commitments for things which are perhaps not quite so important take precedence of the subject we are now discussing. I think the moral fibre of the community is of paramount importance, and therefore I suggest to the Government that they leave some of the more mundane things and let them wait their turn, with the idea of giving this question a No. 1 priority.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I did not intend to speak until I heard the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. I congratulate the member for Torrens on the very good and fair case he presented to Parliament in this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: Obviously you are going to support him.

Mr. HUGHES: If the member for Mitcham will give me time, I may get around to saying what I will not support. I am sorry the honourable member tried to drag me off the track, and his action certainly conveys the impression to me that he does not agree with the honourable member for Torrens, whereas I do. I admire the manner in which the honourable member presented his case. I am afraid I could not say that about the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon. Apparently he was talking with his tongue in his cheeck, because when I looked at him a couple of times with a smile on my face he charged me with not taking this matter seriously. I want to point out to the House that I have also been associated with church life, although perhaps not for so long as the Leader of the Opposition because I do not profess to have lived so many years on this earth as he has. However, I have been actively associated with the church for most of my life, and I can assure the Leader that I was not taking this in a joking manner at all, because I realize the great work that is being performed. Perhaps I realize this even better than does the Leader, because for many years I have been actively (and I emphasize that word, for the benefit of the Leader) associated with church work. No doubt the Leader has also, but I want to let him know that other people have been actively associated with the church and that there are other people who understand the problems associated with the various aspects of church life and also the great work performed by various denominations.

The Leader singled out the Salvation Army this afternoon, as did the member for Onkaparinga. I do not hold anything against them for that, because I know those people have done magnificent work. I have congratulated them on more than one occasion for the magnificent work that they have performed in Australia and particularly during the world wars. Many of the returned boys

today have a high regard for the Salvation Army for the work it did in the world wars, particularly the Second World War. However, we are more concerned at present with the rates being paid by the various church organizations in this State. I think it was a fine gesture on the part of the member for Onkaparinga when he said that this State was lagging a bit in this respect. Also, the Leader this afternoon was charging this Government with not already having put into operation something that it did not promise. I emphasize that for the benefit of the Leader. The present Government did not promise to exempt church properties from rates and taxes, and the Leader cannot show me in so many words where the previous Leader of the Opposition said that he would do that. If he can show me that, I will withdraw the statement I have made.

I was for some years the secretary and treasurer of the Wallaroo Methodist Church Trust, and during that time it was my responsibility to see that the various accounts for the maintenance of the church, the various church buildings and the manse were paid. It was also one of my obligations during that time to see that the light and power accounts were paid. To my knowledge, the church in my district has never quibbled about having to pay any of its lighting bills, nor has it ever quibbled about having to pay any of these rates and taxes that the members of the Opposition are having such a lot to say about today. The Leader charges this Government for not putting into operation in the five or six months it has been in Government something that it did not promise, as I have already mentioned.

I think the Leader said that the Ligertwood report was brought down on August 24, 1964. Therefore, the previous Government had almost seven months before the election, if it was so sincere about this question, so why did it not in that time do something about the matter and wait to make it a vote catcher at the election? If we are going to be charged with not doing something after five or six months, we can reply by saying that if the Opposition is concerned about it and is prepared to cry crocodile tears this afternoon, why did it not put into operation these things when it was in office?

Mr. Ryan: Why not give a lead to the rest of Australia during the 27 years it was there?

Mr. HUGHES: I must be fair. That report was not introduced until August 24, last year. This afternoon, the Leader went out of his way to make it appear that this Government should have put into effect something that it had not promised.

Mr. Ryan: It was not an election promise.

Mr. HUGHES: That is the point on which I challenge the Leader. He cannot show me where this was said by the Opposition.

Mr. Ryan: He dreamed it.

Mr. HUGHES: Apparently he has left the Chamber now, perhaps to check it, and I hope he can prove me wrong, but I don't think he can. Do not underestimate the Leader. He has a good memory and one of the best of any man I know. I do not think he has gone out to check at all. He has gone out because he knows he cannot deny my statement. It is all right for the Opposition to say that the Government promised this and that because of some reference in the policy speech, but when it is charged to prove the allegation, this cannot be done. I am sure that is why the Leader became agitated when I smiled. I did not say anything, but my smile upset him, and he went red in the face. I am a churchman and that is why he made this reference.

Mr. McKee: Perhaps he has gone walkabout.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, because he does not want to hear what I am saying.

Mr. Coumbe: Was it you he was referring to?

Mr. HUGHES: Of course it was. He was looking at me when he made the statement; I smiled because I knew that he knew it, and he knew it himself. He knows I have been actively associated with church work for over 30 years.

Mr. Quirke: I think that smile on your face is your fixed expression.

Mr. HUGHES: I thank the member for Burra. I say truthfully that during my long and active association with the Methodist Church for 30 years I have never heard it said at our meetings that if the Government would pay some bills the people would give more. That was said by an Opposition member this afternoon.

Mr. McKee: It is a strange change of heart.

Mr. HUGHES: Yes, and after all these years. I have never heard anything so ridiculous as the statement that if the Government is prepared to pay the bills the people will give more. The member for Flinders suggested that assistance should be given in new areas, and that is a good plea. Most churches find it difficult to establish themselves in new areas because they have to supply ministers, do social work in connection with the church,

purchase land, which is not cheap in new areas, and erect buildings. Perhaps some assistance should be given to these churches in these circumstances. However, there should be a proviso that once the church is established the people should realize their obligations to be able to pay their way. About manses and parsonages, every Methodist minister in South Australia would know my views, because I have aired them at various meetings in the past. The ministers of today are paid a reasonable wage, but perhaps not as high as they should be paid because of their high calling and the time taken to prepare them to accept the full ministerial responsibility of a church. However, they receive other concessions by living in a parsonage. If the church is in financial difficulties (and this is news to me), perhaps some obligation should be placed on the minister to meet the commitments for rates and taxes for the parsonages in which they live. That is not an unreasonable suggestion. A person living in a departmental house has to pay rent for it. That is not so for our ministers, as the house is found for them. While the church continues to meet its obligations the parsonage should be provided free, but should the church get into financial difficulties and be unable to pay the levies attached to the manse, then perhaps the ministers should be asked to pay. I am sure no heavy obligation would be placed on them to do that. It was not my intention to speak on this matter until I heard the ridiculous remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition. I oppose the motion.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): In supporting the motion I call on my past experience as a church officer. This concession would be of immense value to churches because, apart from normal church activities, if funds were available the church would be able to support youth clubs to a greater extent. I was amazed and perturbed at the remarks made by the member for Wallaroo. The Premier stated in his policy speech:

I want to make it clear the promises made by Sir Thomas Playford last night as election bait are mostly administrative decisions which will be honoured by a Labor Government.

This statement has been repeated so many times that it would seem unnecessary to say it again, but apparently it has not penetrated into the minds of some people. Sir Thomas Playford, when Premier, said:

Last year the Government received a report from a committee which it had appointed to investigate anomalies in rating assessments. The committee's report has been studied, and particularly a submission which was made by almost all church denominations relating to the rates and taxes levied on church property. Apparently, at that time, the churches made submissions, as well as certain requests, to the committee. The speech continues:

Whilst the committee made no recommendation on these submissions, as such was considered to be outside its terms of reference, it did specifically draw the attention of the Government to the arguments presented on this matter. These arguments appeared to be valid, and, if returned, the Government proposes to amend existing legislation to exempt from rates and taxes not only churches but also residences of ministers of religion owned by churches and vacant land held by churches for the erection of future churches or ministers' residences.

The member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) praised the Premier's memory, but apparently his own memory was not so accurate on this occasion.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I am not so concerned as to who introduced this measure or who has not stood up to a promise. I am concerned only with the matter itself, and, at this stage of South Australia's history, the measure is indeed late. Without apportioning any blame, I say that this exemption should have been provided long ago. Although I do not laud myself as a church luminary, I belong to a church that has a tremendous burden in charitable institutions, in respect of which the church takes second place to no-one. My church has homes for the aged, two orphanages, a boy's home and unlimited schools (as well as all sorts of properties for the benefit of young people), refuges and other institutions, all of which the good people of South Australia support. Our Roman Catholic community is heavily taxed to support this work, and it is always aided by its good non-Catholic friends. Indeed, the church would not be able to support its present undertakings if it relied altogether on its own resources. No-one of my faith would dream of not acknowledging the assistance his church receives from other denominations in the State in carrying out its undertakings. The rest of the community recognizes the worth of this work, but as yet it has not been recognized by the Government.

Mr. Casey: It has been charitable work, with the emphasis on "charitable".

Mr. QUIRKE: We cannot dress hundreds of small children and keep them in schools merely on charity of thought. Material charity is needed to accomplish that. One of the great burdens of the church is its commitment in the way of land tax and water rates, the

latter now being very heavy. I would not be so concerned about other forms of taxation, if some consideration were given by the Government to land tax and water rates. To the extent that this burden were relieved, the charitable work could be increased. That, of course, goes without saying. I appeal to those now in authority to offer some assistance that has been long overdue.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (17).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe (teller), Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Nankivell, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Quirke, Rodda, and Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Messrs. Stott and Teusner.

Noes (19).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Pearson. No—Mr. Corcoran.

Majority of 2 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

TOWN PLANNING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 25. Page 1275.)

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the Bill and commend the honourable member for Gouger for bringing it before the House. All members know of the need for recreation areas, particularly in the future. If one takes the short view, possibly the 15 per cent of the land required to be put aside for this purpose appears a lot, but if one looks forward 50 or 100 years it can be seen that this will provide something necessary. It should be implemented at this stage when the cost will not be great to the community as a whole. These facilities will offer great opportunities to those living near the city.

Anyone who has travelled and seen the big cities in other countries will realize how important these green areas are in closely settled areas. It is amazing to see the area of open space available in a big city like Paris. Surely, in a young country like this, we can show similar vision and provide for these areas. In New York and Brooklyn there are numbers of small parks with artificial lakes. During the weekend these are thickly crowded with people. However, in closely settled tenement areas young people often have to use the streets as playing areas. We should see that this does not happen in South Australia. People get up and condemn modern youth and make comparisons with the youth of other generations. I do not agree with this view because I am aware of the conditions in which young people of today have to live. They do not have the opportunities or the conditions that applied to previous generations.

In my youth I was fortunate enough to live in a house that backed on to Heywood Park. I used to play cricket there, and amongst my friends there developed an international cricketer (R. S. Whitington). There is talk about the wild youth of today. However, I remember that on many Saturday afternoons some boys from another area would come to the park and my friends and I would fight them to decide who should use the ground. If we came to an agreement we would play together, but sometimes the winners played and the losers retired hurt. I believe more recreational land will be essential in the future. The Government is making an effort now in this direction by buying large tracts in far distant areas. One must travel to these areas for enjoyment. However, it is essential that youngsters in the inner suburbs have playing areas. The Government is buying much undeveloped real estate for national reserves, and large sums will have to be spent before these areas will be of much value to the people.

The fact that there is an extra 5 per cent cost has been mentioned, but when this is spread over a number of blocks this cost is counter-balanced. This land is only worth a few hundred pounds an acre and 5 per cent split up among the blocks is only a nominal amount to pay to have the privilege of having playing areas and space close to the metropolitan area. At the most, this means 96 acres to the square mile. This may seem a lot of territory, but if we are going to have flat development this will be necessary. I do not think we should continue, over the next 50 years, to allow the city to sprawl further. Eventually it will spread from Victor Harbour to the other side of Gawler. In the next 50 years, if adequate services are to be provided, it will be essential that closer development take place. The small cost involved is nothing compared with the benefit to be derived in future years. I strongly support the Bill and I very much like the honourable member's idea of giving the right of aggregation to councils.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I commend my colleague, the member for Gouger, for

his interest in introducing the Bill. Undoubtedly modern thinking is towards the provision of greater reserve areas for people to enjoy. More regard is given nowadays to planned subdivisional areas and the provision of greater areas to be set aside for people to use for recreational purposes. In his second reading speech the honourable member said that his Bill was No. 6 on the file, and that the file then contained 25 Bills. I notice that the file now contains 38 Bills, which indicates the pressure of business this session. It also indicates, perhaps, the great pressure on the limited time private members have to discuss matters of interest to themselves.

I do not know to what extent I am allowed to refer to foreshadowed amendments, but I understand that since my colleague, the member for Gouger, has given his second reading explanation he has made a detailed study of the matter and is now able to make suggestions to the House for a number of further improvements to this Bill. I am very pleased indeed to support the second reading.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): This is a worthwhile attempt by the honourable member for Gouger to see to it that subdivisional areas have adequate areas reserved as open spaces. At first sight I thought that 15 per cent was too great an amount to reserve out of a comparatively small subdivision. However, if less than five acres is involved the question does not arise. The main thing that prompts me to support this measure is that the last clause in the Bill gives a Ministerial discretion, and I understand that it is not intended to amend that clause.

Mr. Hall: The amendment corrects certain drafting faults only.

Mr. QUIRKE: We all appreciate that in our inner suburbs (or those suburbs immediately outside the vision of Light which surround the city and the park lands) we have over a period of time rested on our laurels, or the laurels of Colonel Light. We took very little action indeed in the inner suburbs to reserve land for open spaces. Perhaps in earlier days the importance of this matter was not recognized. I do not wish to apportion blame to people of years ago who contributed to the building up of a magnificent city, and if there are some deficiencies in it, as in this case, they can be overlooked because of the splendid job that was done otherwise.

However, we should not continue to make mistakes in this way, and it is our responsibility to see that the mistakes that were made years ago are not repeated today, when it lies within our power to do something about the matter. The actual area to be reserved will necessarily have to be varied; I do not think it can possibly be regimented down to a figure, because the conditions in subdivisions vary. For instance, in a hillside subdivision it would be almost impossible to have playgrounds, and some sort of arrangement would have to be made whereby land in other parts would be accessible to the people living on these uphill sites. I do not wish the House to think that I am an expert in this work, because I am not. However, I am something of an expert in visualizing the deficiencies of the past, because they are so apparent. I treasured the opportunity when I was Minister of Lands of being able to remedy the situation regarding the provision of open spaces as far as I was able.

Mr. Jennings: I thought you did a pretty good job.

Mr. QUIRKE: I give full marks to the present Minister of Lands, who is doing splendid work in this direction. I do not think that has anything to do with prompting on my part, for I think the Minister and I think somewhat alike on these matters of reservation. One need only instance the activities of the National Fitness Council and other bodies. We do not wish to detract in any way from the work being performed by anyone in the interests of the people. I looked at the matter in that way, because that has been my attitude for many years, and when I had the opportunity I endeavoured to put my ideas into practice, with, I hope, some measure of success. I wish to ensure that where people are being concentrated in areas no opportunity is lost in getting open spaces for them.

I now wish to say a few words about Ferguson Square, in Toorak Gardens. That square is well worth a visit by any honourable member of this House. In a closely built up area, with radial roads entering it, there is this glorious garden area with lawns and flower beds. Today it is a riot of *prunus bleiriana*. and it is well worth a trip to see the beautiful blossom there today. The centre of it, in season, is covered with wisteria. There are bedding plants, with pansies and Iceland poppies, and there is seating accommodation. It is an example of a glorious spot in an inner suburb. The cascading bowers of flowers in that spot are something to be admired. It is a council-operated property, but obviously there is a gardener in charge of it who is

responsible for the lay-out and the maintenance of it, and whoever he is I pay my respects to him for the way he maintains that civic feature in that district. If only that could be repeated in the innumerable subdivisions that have been made! Sad to relate, those things are not there. What a glorious place our suburbs could be if that sort of thing were repeated. If honourable members want to see what can be achieved by this type of measure put forward by the honourable member for Gouger, they should go now and have a look at Ferguson Square. I am sure they will come back imbued with the necessity of doing likewise in any suburb of any magnitude where that sort of thing is possible. I support the Bill.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I commend my colleague, the honourable member for Gouger (Mr. Hall), for his assiduity concerning the problems in his own district. This is a case of an active young man keeping an eye on things. I have reservations about this legislation, although he has made out a good case for aggregating small areas into a reasonable size with which something can be done. I have seen odd blocks in the suburbs which were apparently set aside under the Town Planning Act, but which are now mainly rubbish dumps, and are too small or too unsuitably sited to be of much use. Much merit is contained in the proposal to empower councils to accept a cash recompense from the subdivider in lieu of land, so that the council may create a fund to buy a larger suitable area within its boundaries. Not only playing fields are needed but beauty spots, and I pay tribute to Mr. Veale for his excellent work in beautifying Adelaide's environs. We are the envy of all other capital cities.

Much work is still to be done and outlying councils do not have the facilities enjoyed by the Adelaide City Council. Many areas are now being built upon and it is almost impossible to obtain a sufficiently large area within four or five miles of the city. No doubt the member for Gouger has considered the fast-growing areas north and south of Adelaide. Councils should be able to secure larger areas from each subdivision rather than the smaller blocks. I realize that the subdivider, who has to make a donation to the council, will, in turn, add that sum to apply over the whole subdivision, and this may increase, to some extent, the cost of each site. It is agreed that the people paying for these parks, gardens and playing fields within the municipalities will be people living in that area, because they have bought the block. It is better to ask the residents of the area to supply these funds. The purchaser of the land may pay an extra £20 or £30, but this may not be important in an overall payment of about £3,000 to £4,000. By doing this, the owner will ensure an area being available where his children can have outdoor exercise. There is much merit in these proposals, and I commend the honourable member for Gouger in trying to solve the problems in his district. He is trying to do something about it, and it is much better to do something than to do nothing.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I regret that I cannot support this Bill: not that I do not appreciate the motives which have caused the honourable member to introduce it. I agree with many of the objectives which he seeks to establish in the Bill. Unfortunately, the enactment of such a provision at this moment has so many disadvantages that the Government cannot accept it. Advantages are apparent in the proposal that there be some increase in the proportion of a subdivision area provided for open space. At present it is clear that a number of subdivisions have taken place where small and unsatisfactory areas have been set aside, which are inadequate for recreational purposes and a liability to the councils. One only has to look at a few examples in the honourable member's own district to see that this is the case. Also, there are advantages in providing that, instead of setting aside small areas in a subdivision for recreation or open space, money be funded towards acquisition of satisfactory open space areas within the council boundaries. Amendments will be introduced during the course of this Parliament on these two sections. However, these amendments to the Town Planning Act involve a complete re-writing of the Act, which, unfortunately, has become these days a shabby palimpsest of most unsatisfactory and conflicting provisions.

The SPEAKER: Can the honourable member assure me that that is a Parliamentary expression?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: When used objectively and non-personally, yes. The re-writing of this Act will involve schemes at present under negotiation with councils into which the honourable member's amendments will not fit. Therefore, to make provision for

such a fund as he proposes in a council area, will run counter to the proposals at present under consideration for the funding of moneys for the acquisition of open space and support of councils therein, and it would be pointless to incorporate such a provision at this stage in the Town Planning Act where it would not fit into the proposals shortly to come before this Parliament, with the agreement, I trust, of councils. At present there seems to have been a substantial measure of agreement achieved between the councils concerned, and I am hopeful that substantial agreement will have been reached by the time the Bill is introduced. There are certain administrative difficulties about the honourable member's proposals. How do we fix, under his proposals, the sum of money to be accepted in lieu of the provision of 15 per cent of open space? This is not spelt out in his proposal, but it would need to be spelt out because, otherwise, interminable and undesirable wrangles would be created in trying to deal with what would be the appropriate sum of money to be accepted.

Mr. Hall: That provision would work only if all parties were in agreement.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As we propose it, there will be more particular provision set forth as to how it should be done, and as to the basis on which it should be done. In consequence, while I have much sympathy for the aims of the honourable member at this stage, they do not fit into the scheme being prepared on town planning, which the Government is to bring forward later in the session. This measure would only further confuse the present difficult situation under the Town Planning Act, and, if implemented, I hope it would be operable only for a limited period, simply because I hope that before the end of the session we shall have more satisfactory town planning measures overall in force in South Australia. If we do not have them in force, quite frankly, we shall get into further tangles than the situation is already in. Endeavouring to administer the conflicting provisions of the Act at the moment is a grave headache for those involved. While I commend the honourable member's objects in this matter, I, at the moment, cannot support the manner in which he seeks to achieve them, but I hope that his overall objects will be achieved in a somewhat different manner later in the session.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

PROHIBITION OF PREFERENCE AND DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 25. Page 1277.)

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I rise to oppose the Bill introduced by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) in an endeavour to "prohibit the preference and discrimination in employment by reference to membership, or non-membership, of certain associations, unions and other bodies, or to certain other matters". In introducing this Bill the honourable member said that it stemmed from the discovery about three weeks ago of the present Government's adopting a policy of preference to unionists. At the outset, I say that honourable members on this side of the House offer no apologies whatsoever for that policy. We believe in giving preference to unionists, and that is well-known. Indeed, I hope to be able to convince the House that this policy is essentially a practical solution in facing up to a situation that exists in our society today. The member for Mitcham stressed the importance of certain answers he had received from the Premier, but we should analyse the relevant questions and answers to see if the latter were justified. On August 3 the honourable member asked the Premier:

> Yesterday, I was speaking to a member of the Public Service who told me that a report was circulating in the Public Service that the Government intended to introduce what I suppose we can sum up in the phrase "compulsory unionism" in the Public Service, by giving preference in promotion to members of the Public Service Association. Can the Premier say whether there is any truth in this rumour and, if there is, what provisions the Government has in mind?

The Premier replied:

> I consider that the honourable member is better informed than I am, as I have no knowledge of this matter.

That was an appropriate reply to the question asked, because it is evident that, if we examine the honourable member's question, he was confusing preference to unionists with compulsory unionism. I have had much experience in the industrial movement, and I am afraid that I could not exactly understand what prompted the question. The Premier quite rightly replied in those terms, because the question was not accurate. This matter was again raised on August 5, following a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition who wanted to know "what statutory authority the Government possessed for this most arbitrary action". That is hardly a

proper question to be asked by a person who has held the office of Premier of the State for such a long period, and it certainly illustrates his lack of knowledge on the subject. Whilst at times the Leader of the Opposition has taken credit for the good industrial relations that exist in South Australia, it is evident from that question that his own knowledge of industrial matters is limited, for, if it were not, he would not have asked such a question. The Premier duly replied that he would investigate the matter, and following that the member for Mitcham asked a further question, during which he read to the Premier a circular from the department concerned.

Mr. Millhouse: Actually, that came before the Leader's question you know.

Mr. HURST: Even when the member for Mitcham introduced the Bill, he was still confused, and I doubt whether he has straightened out the position even now.

Mr. Hudson: He did it deliberately.

Mr. HURST: This has been done deliberately to try to twist around and distort the facts, and create in the minds of the public suspicion towards the Labor Party and the trade union movement. The State would have progressed much further if honourable members opposite and the associations they represent had acted in the same manner and with the same approach as the Labor Party and the trade union movement. The honourable member for Mitcham quoted an industrial instruction as follows:

Heads of departments are informed that Cabinet has decided that preference in obtaining employment shall be given to members of unions. Therefore, a non-unionist shall not be engaged for any work to the exclusion of a well conducted unionist if that unionist is adequately experienced in and competent to perform the work.

Mr. Hudson: There is no mention of compulsory unionism.

Mr. HURST: No. I disagree with the Bill the honourable member introduced. In the Bill the honourable member has included a clause whereby anybody in employment shall not be detrimentally affected because he is a unionist. That is as it should be. This practice is adopted far and wide throughout industry, and I will elaborate on it later. Not only the Labor movement believes in this; even members of Liberal and Country League organizations believe in adopting this policy, and I will prove it. This is the commonly accepted system. It is obvious that there is no unanimity in the approach of Liberal members. I believe this situation could easily have been overcome by a couple of teaspoons of dill-water. This was a little windy spasm and the matter never received the consideration that it should have received. Opposition members never bothered to inquire or investigate the situation within their own ranks. The industrial instruction from which the honourable member for Mitcham quoted continued:

Cabinet also desires that, where possible, present employees who are not unionists be encouraged to join appropriate unions.

That is proper and it is nothing to be ashamed about. On this side of the House we are proud of it and it seems that many employers (and not small employers either) favour it. I shall deal with this matter more fully later.

Mr. Millhouse: The honourable member is leaving a lot until later.

Mr. HURST: I intend to deal with this matter more fully than did the honourable member in introducing the Bill. It would be difficult to teach the honourable member all about industrial matters in one speech. I can see that there is ample room for instruction on these matters. One of the greatest concerns in this country is industrial relations. This type of Bill is not wanted in industry, and what the honourable member has said would have been better not said. What is needed is logic and thought. We do not want comments on industrial matters from people who do not know what they are talking about; these comments merely aggravate the situation. The actions of these people are provocative, and stimulate discontent which reflects on the State as a whole. The industrial instruction continued:

It is intended that the provision of this instruction shall apply to all persons (other than juniors, graduates, etc., applying for employment on completing studies) seeking employment in any department and to all Government employees. It is not intended that this instruction should apply to the detriment of a person who produces evidence that he is a conscientious objector to union membership on religious grounds.

Mr. Millhouse: What evidence would need to be produced?

Mr. HURST: If the honourable member will wait, I shall deal with that. I believe that this complaint originated from a public servant, possibly of some professional standing, who was receiving the benefits of Public Service Association membership but trying to avoid his obligations to society.

Mr. Nankivell: His obligations to society!

Mr. HURST: Trade unions recognize their obligation to society. While this sort of thing

goes on the trade union movement will become greater. This Bill is obviously ill-founded. I believe the member for Mitcham got a little confused with the difference between an ordinary trade union and the Public Service Association.

Mr. Millhouse: I am not confused.

Mr. HURST: It is quite obvious from the honourable member's remarks that it was a person in the Public Service who raised this objection.

Mr. Ryan: And only one person.

Mr. HURST: Yes. I have checked the membership of the Public Service Association with the association, and the Public Service does not have many non-unionists. However, there are those who are attempting to get something for nothing, and these people should be discouraged by any responsible Government. The desire of any employee to enjoy the benefits of a unionist without belonging to a union should be nipped in the bud. People should be humane and recognize their social responsibility. I have a copy of the Public Service Association constitution with me. I doubt whether the actions of the person who raised this matter would come within the scope of the objectives of this association. Its objectives are sound and humane. One states:

To promote the interests of the Public Service by every means consistent with the Public Service Act and the regulations thereunder, and with loyalty to the Government of South Australia.

What would have happened if, when we were in Opposition, information on what was going on in Government circles had been given to us? The officers concerned would have been dismissed. We expect and receive the same loyalty from the Public Service, which realizes every day that there is a better master. Preference operates when everything else is equal, and so I ask: what other qualities can one turn to when the qualifications, age, and every other factor that one looks for when employing a person have been taken into consideration, other than a person's social activities and his responsibility to the social welfare of the State? Would it not be a logical pointer to the character of a person that he is prepared to face up to his social obligations?

Mr. Freebairn: Have you ever employed labour?

Mr. HURST: Yes, most decidedly. In fact, I am a member of the Federal Executive of an organization that employs about 100 persons and even in the South Australian branch of that organization, I had seven or eight competent and loyal people on my staff. Many girls employed in trade union offices went there when they left school, and I add that they did not all come from working-class families. One of the conditions on which they are employed is that they belong to a trade union and they have to show that they are decent and sincere and are not trying to get something for nothing. If we get someone in an organization trying to ride on the backs of others, we find that we have pilfering or some other trouble sooner or later, and the action that we take is sound; we offer no apologies for it.

There was reference to the fact that preference in employment to unionists was contained in the Australian Labor Party's policy, and we do not deny that. Honourable members opposite will see in the rule books of about 80 or 90 trade unions in South Australia that their policy is preference in employment to unionists. In fact, I do not know any trade union that has not a similar policy. Further, the rules of trade unions are registered in the Commonwealth Court of Conciliation and Arbitration. Nevertheless, if a person does not wish to join a union, there are many non-union shops to which he can go. This preference in employment to unionists operates when everything else is equal and it is on that point that Opposition members are making a grave mistake.

I am able to quote statements by learned gentlemen in regard to industrial matters and the honourable member for Mitcham should be aware of them. I say, with the greatest respect to judges, that the Labor movement and the trade union movement have never had anything handed out on a plate and if people in business were subjected to the same thorough investigation, inquiry and cross examination, things would be a lot different and the workers of this country would start to get a fair deal. There are many business associations with whose members one cannot trade unless he is also a member and some years ago some manufacturers refused to supply goods to certain business houses unless those houses "lined up". Further, the manufacturers would not permit under cutting in prices. Do not tell me that there are not unions or associations outside the trade union movement; they operate in every phase of society. However, the best conducted of all is the trade union movement, yet it is the one that comes under most attack from members opposite.

Mr. Hudson: The legal profession at one stage required a person to pay in order to become an articled clerk.

Mr. HURST: I understand that the situation has got so bad in the legal profession that the clerks themselves are forming an association to ensure that they receive a fair wage for the work they perform in accordance with their qualifications. The honourable member for Mitcham would probably oppose such a move, because he may have some clerks working for him. However, action is being taken by the articled clerks in an endeavour to secure just wages and conditions, because they have not been paid commensurate with other classifications in society. The honourable member for Mitcham is smiling, but he knows that that is a fact and it is this type of oppression that brings about the formation of trade unions. The Australian Medical Association insists on membership.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: A few doctors will be in trouble under this Bill!

Mr. HURST: It is not before time. Every member knows that conciliation and arbitration are accepted by the people as a whole. Emphasis is on conciliation; it is only when conciliation fails that things need be arbitrated on.

Mr. Ryan: That principle is accepted by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. HURST: Yes, and not only by that Government. This Bill is contrary to the attitude of members opposite. Before the election the present Leader said that he would not see workers in this State at a disadvantage compared with those in other States; he also said how well off they were. Legislation has been passed in the Commonwealth Parliament and to a lesser extent on a State level covering conciliation and arbitration. For some time the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act has contained a provision giving ample scope for arbitration courts, after hearing evidence, to give preference to unionists.

Mr. Ryan: This is done on nearly every application to the court.

Mr. HURST: Yes. In some instances orders are not made, but the matters are dealt with in conference. No Arbitration Commissioner or Conciliator in Australia does not have to deal with this matter, as conciliation is a fundamental principle of the Commonwealth legislation, which was set up to settle industrial disputes. How can any fair-minded man settle an issue if he is restricted by legislation? That is like giving someone a job to do and saying, "You can do only what we tell you", and then blaming him if he is wrong. I could read some decisions that show that arbitration courts and all other courts have determined that compulsory unionism is correct and proper, and they write into awards a provision for preference for unionists. Compulsory unionism is entirely different from giving preference to unionists, and it is the right of any employer or Government to issue instructions to subordinate officers that a policy of preference should be pursued. A book called *Federal Industrial Law* by Nolan and Cohen, which is an authoritative book that is used extensively, states:

> Until 1947 the Act provided: "The court or a Conciliation Commissioner by its or his award, or by order made on the application of any organization or person bound by the award, may—(*a*) direct that, as between members of organizations of employers or employees and other persons (not being sons or daughters of employers) offering or desiring service or employment at the same time, preference shall, in such manner as is specified in the award or order, be given to such members, other things being equal.

That is the principle that has been laid down.

Mr. Ryan: The legal fraternity argues along those lines in court.

Mr. HURST: Yes. Surely this State is not so backward that it will ignore established principles, customs and traditions set up in courts. The member for Mitcham should have made himself conversant with the subject, as he has much to learn. If the trade union movement got hold of him for a while it could bring him up to the required standard in industrial matters. He is not even expressing the policy of his Party in this measure; it is something that he dreamed up overnight. Clause 30 of the Theatrical and Amusement Employees Awards provides:

> Preference of employment shall be given to financial members of the Australian Theatrical and Amusement Employees Association and to persons who undertake to join such association within 14 days of accepting employment.

This provision has been written in by responsible authorities for other industries. It is not possible to get waterside employment without being a member of a union. It is not practicable for an employer to negotiate individually with employees. Any industrialist realizes today that it is far better to recognize and acknowledge it through the appropriate organization and the recognized machinery; otherwise, there is no end to disputes. Employers see the wisdom of it and, as a result, insist on their employees being members.

I have mentioned the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Act. I turn now to the States. The Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act of 1961 in Queensland states, in section 12 (2):

—Where it is mutually agreed by the parties concerned or considered advisable by the commission that preference be granted, either generally or to any industrial union, such preference shall be granted subject to such conditions as the commission may approve.

We all know that during the regime of the Labor Government in Queensland this was compulsory, but there has been a change in Queensland and this provision still remains in the Act. That, again, goes to show that the policy expressed by the member for Mitcham is not in accordance with that of his own Party. Section 129B of the New South Wales Act reads as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act the commission, a committee or an apprenticeship council shall upon application made therefor insert (by way of variation or otherwise) in an award or industrial agreement whether made before or after the commencement of the Industrial Arbitration (Amendment) Act, 1959, a provision providing—

(a) for absolute preference of employment to the members of the industrial union or unions specified in the award or industrial agreement. Such preference to members of such industrial union or unions shall be limited to the point where such a member and person who is not such a member are offering for service or employment at the same time or, in the case of retrenchment, to the point where either such a member or a person who is not such a member is to be dismissed from service or employment.

That indicates clearly that in New South Wales there is a provision, on a State basis.

Then, if honourable members care to examine the Western Australian Act, they will find that, although it does not specify a preference to unionists, it follows principles that have been set down by the recognized authorities. The commission in Western Australia writes clauses into the awards and determinations giving preferences to unionists.

Mr. Millhouse: Does your Government intend to introduce such legislation?

Mr. HURST: We shall deal with that when the Industrial Code comes to be amended. It is the policy of the Labor Party and of the trade union movement. It is accepted by society. The honourable member for Mitcham is not expressing the views of members of his own Party when he says that this is a pose. He should have consulted people engaged in industry, even if they were on the opposite side of the fence; he should have talked to them about it. Victoria is another large industrial State, second only to New South Wales in the number of people it employs. What is the situation there? By and large, most employees in Victoria are covered by Commonwealth awards and determinations. Victoria has a system of wages boards and, in the true sense, they are not courts of conciliation and arbitration as we know them: they are only wages boards, with employer and employee representatives on them; they are limited in their duty and functions. Let us look at the figures and percentages for employment in Victoria. There are fewer people employed under State awards than under Commonwealth awards. I think the figures are 28 per cent males and 47 per cent females working under State awards in Victoria. These percentages are lower than those of other States. Most people there work under Commonwealth jurisdiction. Here again, we find that people who work under a jurisdiction that has the right to grant preference are in the majority in the State sphere. In Victoria the demands for alterations to and streamlining of their Act are not as great as they are in other States, where the functions are much wider.

There is a similar set-up in Tasmania, which has not a court of conciliation and arbitration but a system of wages boards. However, although those two States have a different system from that operating in other States, I venture to suggest that there would not be a chairman of a wages board in those States who, on some occasion or other, had not struck a situation where he had been confronted with having to decide in certain circumstances whether it was desirable to grant preference or not. Anyone with experience in the industrial field knows that that is so and I say without hesitation that those wages boards chairmen, although there is no provision in the Act, on some occasions follow the general principles accepted by the authorities, particularly the Commonwealth authority, and give effect to them, because they know that, if they do not act reasonably and attend to the job with which they are confronted, there will be amendments to the Act that will compel them to, so they adopt the practical approach to it. It is clearly demonstrated that most Governments provide for preference to unionists. Private industry, too, favours this. It works very well.

Mr. Hudson: What about a man seeking employment with General Motors-Holden's?

Mr. HURST: Let anyone try to get a job at General Motors-Holden's without being a member of a union! His employment will not even commence. I suggest to the member for Mitcham that it would take more than his persuasive powers to convince the directors

of General Motors-Holden's that their policy was wrong. They are one of the largest employers of labour in South Australia. Another large employer is Chrysler Aust. Ltd. Practically the whole of the motor-building industry in South Australia lays it down as a condition of employment that men must join a trade union.

Mr. Ryan: What would happen to those two companies if this Bill were to go through?

Mr. HURST: They are under a Commonwealth award. All that would happen as far as most of the employees were concerned would be that it would confuse the young industrial officers and young people trying to learn the industrial business to such an extent that they would have a dispute on their hands and, more probably than not, employees would be dismissed through being incompetent. The effect of it would not be worth twopence, because people would ignore it. It is not the intention of any Government to introduce legislation if it is to be ignored by most people. I suggest that the Opposition, when introducing Bills on this matter, consider these facts. I can remember the Leader of the Opposition on many occasions when we went to him with requests saying, "We can't do this. We could not give effect to the law, so what's the use of introducing a Bill that cannot be policed?" I say it could not be done under State legislation, because it would apply only to a minority. At least this Government can (as it is doing) indicate its intention clearly. I also mention Simpson Industries, and no-one can say that firm rushes into things foolishly. When Sir Barton Pope was an industrialist, it was a condition of employment with Pope Industries that a person be a member of a trade union.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you believe in the universal declaration of human rights?

Mr. HURST: An employee has certain rights and an employer has certain rights. I will touch on that matter presently. I know very well from experience that some employers have discriminated in the engagement of labour. Employers who can hold their heads in the air and face trade union officials are not concerned whether or not people are members of a union, although they prefer them to be, because, as I have said, they acknowledge that the trade unions are a very important part of society. For business administration purposes it is a great advantage if all the employees are members of unions. I have had many years' experience, and I have never yet seen a fair-minded industrialist who is opposed to trade unions. I could quote instances where the trade union movement assists employers. Advertisements issued by the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited invariably ask that applicants produce their indentures of apprenticeship or other evidence that they are acceptable to the trade unions as tradesmen.

Mr. Hudson: The B.H.P. Company would not be an acceptable example to the Opposition.

Mr. HURST: Even the B.H.P. Company, although it has not got compulsory unionism, would not oppose it in principle. Circumstances arise in which it finds it most helpful if people are members of unions, for it assists in the administration.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What about this universal declaration of human rights?

Mr. HURST: I think members opposite would be wise to keep off that subject, because I have a clear recollection of something that happened. A Liberal Government wanted to legislate to forbid a certain political organization, and I emphasize that I do not agree with the views of that organization. Members opposite should be the last persons to talk about human rights. They cannot have certain views today and the opposite views tomorrow: they should be consistent. Their background throughout this issue has shown complete contempt for the declaration of human rights, and I think it is most improper for them to suggest that we should think about human rights when in fact the trade union movement is the most humane organization in the world. The person that approached the member for Mitcham (if he ever did) should find out what happens. I have seen these people before; they are indignant about joining a trade union, but they finish up getting into a ton of trouble and most of them come crawling on their hands and knees to accept membership. I can remember one who would not join because he said that a union was dictatorial and communist-controlled, but only about two months later he decided he wanted a job in a factory where unionism was a condition of employment, and rightly so. He found out that the grass was greener there. This is what will happen to this person that has approached the member for Mitcham. He would be one of the first persons to run to the Public Service Association to try to get it to protect him and put him into a job. I believe in human rights. The person I referred to had a right not to join the union.

Mr. Nankivell: He wouldn't get a job if he didn't.

Mr. HURST: I suggest that members should give a lot of thought to this matter, because there are occasions when the tables can turn completely. This Bill does not contain much substance; in fact, there is nothing in it that could not be removed with a couple of teaspoonsful of dill-water and a rub on the back from the honourable member for Adelaide.

Mr. Lawn: I can do better than rub his back.

Mr. HURST: That would be sufficient. This is one of those Bills that are deliberately designed to mislead and provoke. The member for Mitcham was confused when he was asking questions, because he asked about compulsory unionism. He could not distinguish between compulsory unionism and preference. I am sure that all members agree that preference for unionism is desirable in our society today. Under this Bill:

> "association" means any trade or other union, or branch of any union, or any association, society, or body composed of or representative of employees, or for furthering or protecting the interests of employees:
> "employee" includes a person employed in any capacity in the public service of the State.

This Bill is not consistent, and if the honourable member wants to restrict trade unions and associations, he should control monopolies and combines too, as these are more dangerous to our society than asking whether a man is a member of a trade union or not. I am sure that no legal authority in this State can analyse the provisions of this Bill. The Public Service Association is not affiliated with the Australian Labor Party, but if a person does not desire to affiliate, there is machinery within the trade union movement. Clause 3 states:

> Except as provided by any Act or law of the Comonwealth—

The honourable member should know (or perhaps someone told him prior to the drafting) that Commonwealth law supersedes State law. This short-term measure will not have the effect desired by the honourable member. I remember that a South Australian employers' organization applied to the Arbitration Court on an issue, but the court granted conditions much better and more favourable to the trade union movement than existed in the previous legislation and which the firm had attempted to overcome. This Bill cannot apply in the Commonwealth field, but only to one or two State organizations, and any application would have to be made in the Commonwealth sphere. That is why this Bill is laughable: it is unsound and unconstitutional, and would not stand a challenge in the court.

The honourable member for Mitcham has not referred to the position where an employer has asked whether a person was a member of a trade union. That question, if asked, could be discriminating, because the employer is trying to find out something to discriminate in the selection of the employee. The member for Mitcham has confused the issue of unionism with that of race and colour. The trade union movement does not differentiate between colour, race or creed. It is trade qualifications that are accepted, and this is one distinction of which I am proud. This Bill is not acceptable to my Party, nor is it acceptable to society, and obviously shows that the Opposition is introducing measures contrary to the opinion of most people in this State. It is trying to create a situation that is going to retard the progress and development of this State, although the Opposition attempts to make the public believe that it is concerned with these things.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENFIELD BY-LAW: ZONING.

Order of the Day No. 8: Mr. McKee to move:

That by-law No. 20 of the Corporation of the City of Enfield, in respect of zoning, made on November 23, 1964, and laid on the table of this House on July 27, 1965, be disallowed.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie) moved:

That this Order of the Day be now read and discharged.

Order of the Day read and discharged.

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

HIDE, SKIN AND WOOL DEALERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to provide stricter controls over the activities of certain itinerant hide, skin and wool dealers. Experience has shown that there are dishonest itinerant dealers who take advantage of the absence of the farmer or stockowner from his premises to take and carry away his hides, skins or wool for purposes of sale. They return later to the farmer and stockowner and give him a price for the hides, skins or wool, which is often well below their true worth. There are occasions when such unauthorized taking and selling of these goods

his interest in introducing the Bill. law as, for example, when a theft can be proven. It is felt, however, that resort to the criminal law does not always meet the circumstances of the case. It is therefore proposed that these amendments to the Hide, Skin and Wool Dealers Act, 1915-1959, which have been agreed to in consultation with the Police Department, are designed to give protection to owners who have hides, skins and wool to sell as well as to honest dealers who may buy such goods for cash only to discover that they are subject to a lien and not therefore the property of the seller.

In addition, this legislation would go some way to reduce the activities of dishonest itinerant dealers (and consequent losses to farmers and stockowners) and at the same time it would preserve the position of honest itinerant dealers who have a standing arrangement with the stockowner to collect any of his hides, skins or wool. Clause 3 provides that persons licensed under the Act who buy or receive into their possession any hides, skins or wool shall record the particulars of the transaction in a record book and cause the entry to be signed by the owner (or his agent). Subsection (1) thereof so provides. By subsections (2) and (3) any person who fails to comply with the foregoing provisions or makes false entries in his record book or signs any defective entry commits an offence under the Act.

Provision is made under section 12b for the owner of any hides, skins and wool to confer a written authority upon a licensee to buy or receive his hides, skins or wool. When such licensee has such written authority he would be obliged to record the particulars of any transaction made under this authority in the record book but would not be required to obtain the signature of the owner to such entry. This would safeguard the position of itinerant dealers with whom the stockowner etc. has a standing arrangement to collect his hides, skins or wool.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

PETROLEUM PRODUCTS SUBSIDY BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It amends the Associations Incorporation Act to provide that where the name of an association is a name by which a company or foreign company could not be registered under the Companies Act or by which a business name could not be registered under the Business Names Act, the association shall not be registered by that name under the Associations Incorporation Act except with the consent of the Attorney-General.

Section 10 (2) of the principal Act provides that an association shall not be registered by a name by which a company or a foreign company could not be registered under section 22 or section 353 of the Companies Act or a business name could not be registered under section 9 of the Business Names Act. The object of that subsection was to bring the policy governing the control of names of registered associations into line with the policy governing the control of names of companies and business names.

Section 22 of the Companies Act provides that, except with the consent of the Minister, a company shall not be registered by a name of a kind that the Minister has directed the registrar not to accept for registration. Section 353 of the Companies Act and section 9 of the Business Names Act contain similar provisions in relation to names of foreign companies and business names respectively.

Pursuant to sections 22 and 353 of the Companies Act and section 9 of the Business Names Act, directives have been issued by the Minister to the Registrar of Companies and the Registrar of Business Names directing that no company, foreign company or business name should be registered without the Minister's consent if the name included certain words (for example, the word "Royal"). Thus if a company wishes to be registered by a name which includes any of the words forbidden by the relevant directive, registration of that name could not be effected except with the Minister's consent. Unfortunately the Associations Incorporation Act does not contain a provision whereby the name of an association which contains a word forbidden by one of the directives issued under the Companies Act or Business Names Act could be registered with the consent of the Minister.

Recently the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (South Australia) Inc. requested permission to prefix the word "Royal" to the name of the society's Southern (Metropolitan) Branch which is itself an incorporated association. The permission sought, however, could not be granted because of the defect in the Associations Incorporation Act I have referred to. The amendment contained in the Bill, if approved by Parliament, would enable the request to be granted and would bring the principal Act more into line with the policy governing the control of company names and business names.

Mr. QUIRKE secured the adjournment of the debate.

MARKETING OF EGGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes three important amendments to the Marketing of Eggs Act relating to the filling of casual vacancies on the Egg Board, the voting qualification at elections for producer members of the board and the nomination by a company of a candidate for election to the board. The Bill has been prepared after consultation with the Chairman of the board. Clause 3, by paragraph (*a*), inserts a definition of hen into the principal Act to accord with recent Commonwealth legislation imposing levies on certain producers. As the Egg Board will use the returns required for the Commonwealth levies in the compilation of the electoral rolls it is desirable that the definition in our Act should conform as far as possible with those in Commonwealth legislation. Paragraph (*b*) of this clause makes a consequential amendment to the definition of producer.

Clause 4, by paragraph (*b*), adds a new subsection to section 4 of the principal Act so as to enable the Governor to appoint a person to fill the casual vacancy on the board. Under the principal Act an election would be necessary which unfortunately is a very expensive process. Paragraph (*a*) makes a consequential amendment. Clause 5 makes several amendments to section 4a of the principal Act dealing with the election of producer members of the board. New subsection (5) provides that producers who on the relevant day were keeping 250 or more hens will be entitled to vote at any such election. At present under section 4a the qualification is delivery of 3,000 dozen eggs to the board in a financial year. In new subsection (1) inserted by clause 5 (*a*) the relevant day is defined as the last day in the period between June 30 and September 30 last preceding an election on which levy was payable by the producer pursuant to the Commonwealth Acts. New subsection (6), which corresponds to existing subsection (6), provides for a producer who keeps his hens in more than one electoral district. Under new subsection (6a) the number of hens kept by a producer will be determined conclusively by the amount of levy he is required to pay. This will enable the board to compile the electoral rolls directly from the returns which are required by the Commonwealth Acts and which are furnished to the board. Clause 5 (*d*) makes a consequential amendment.

The next amendment, proposed by the Australian Primary Producers' Union, is contained in clause 6, which inserts in the principal Act new section 4b relating to companies which are producers. The new section enables such a company to nominate by notice in writing a person to vote on its behalf at elections for producer members and also enables such a person to be elected as a member of the board at any such election. Subsection (3) of the new section provides for the revocation of any such nomination and subsection (4) provides that a company nominee who is himself a producer may vote both in his own behalf and as such nominee. Clause 5 (*b*) makes a consequential amendment. Clause 7 makes a consequential amendment to section 8 of the principal Act by providing that a company nominee who is elected to the board shall, upon the withdrawal of his nomination, vacate his office, unless he was qualified to be elected as a producer in his own right. Clause 8 makes two amendments of section 34 of the principal Act consequential on the enactment of new section 4b. I commend the Bill to the House.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

NOXIOUS TRADES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The object of this Bill is to amend the Noxious Trades Act, 1943-1955, so as to remedy a defect in section 13 of the Act (which deals with protection conferred upon licences under the Act against action for nuisances) which was revealed in a recent prosecution of a

company charged, in general terms, with causing a nuisance on their premises. The owner or occupier of these premises was licensed under the Act to carry on his noxious trade. More specifically, the owner or occupier was charged before a Court of Summary Jurisdiction under section 83(2) of the Health Act, 1935-1963, and section 540a of the Local Government Act, 1934-1963, with causing the state of his premises to be a nuisance by allowing emission of smoke, soot and ash in such quantities as to constitute a nuisance. The owner or occupier was acquitted on the charges by virtue of the protection afforded to him under the provisions of section 13(2) of the Noxious Trades Act, 1934-1955. This subsection afforded a defence to the charges, since the owner or occupier was licensed under the Act to carry on the noxious trade of tanning, fellmongering and wool scouring and the nuisance arose from the carrying on of such noxious trade.

Section 13(2) of the Noxious Trades Act confers protection from prosecution upon any person carrying on any noxious trade under a licence under this Act for "any nuisance arising" from the carrying on of such noxious trade. As the law now stands it makes no difference so far as exemption from criminal liability is concerned that the person has failed to carry out the noxious trade in accordance with his licence or has caused a nuisance which arises from the carrying on of the noxious trade whether such nuisance is directly related to the particular trade or not or could be avoided or remedied by the taking of reasonable precautions.

It is considered that the protection granted under both subsection (1) and subsection (2) of section 13 of this Act, which confers protection both from civil and criminal proceedings, is too wide having regard to present industrial and social conditions. It is, therefore, proposed that this protection should be limited in much the same way as the protection afforded an occupier of a factory under section 4 of the Manufacturing Industries Act, 1937, has been limited, with regard to the prevention of noise and vibration in a factory under that section. Clause 3 accordingly provides for an additional curtailment of the protection conferred by section 13 (1), so far as civil remedies are concerned, by adding at the end thereof the passage "unless it is shown that the noxious trade was not conducted in a proper manner to prevent the same becoming a nuisance".

The protection conferred upon any person under section 13 (2) of the Act is for immunity from criminal proceedings in respect of any nuisance arising from the carrying on of any noxious trade under licence under the Act, and this protection is likewise limited by the addition of the above-quoted passage. The other minor amendments to subsections (1) and (2) are consequential on the foregoing amendments and are inserted to avoid drafting detailed saving provisions with regard to pending proceedings.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Second reading.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its object is to amend the Veterinary Surgeons Act, 1935-1957. One of the main reasons for amending the Act is to provide for more comprehensive control over advertising and merchandising by members of the veterinary profession. This is sought by the profession itself as a measure of self-discipline. This amendment appears in clause 15, which amends section 34 of the principal Act by providing for regulations to be made prescribing a code of professional conduct in the same terms as are embodied in legislation regulating the conduct of other professional groups, such as dentists.

Clause 5 amends section 21 of the principal Act, and provides that no person shall be registered as a veterinary surgeon until he has paid the appropriate fee, or, in the case of renewal, a renewal fee. This clause facilitates collection of fees. Clauses 4, 6 and 10 confer power on the Veterinary Surgeons Board to prescribe the fee to be paid in respect of registration rather than lay down a set fee as at present.

By clause 8, which amends section 25 of the principal Act, the board would have power to cancel or suspend the registration of any veterinary surgeon who has become incapable of practising as such owing to mental or physical infirmity. This clause, like clauses 13 and 15, is designed to strengthen the authority of the board and improve ethical standards in the profession.

Clause 9, amending section 28 (*a*), and clause 11, amending section 28 (*c*), confer wider discretionary powers on the board as regards issue of permits to enable the interim

registration of permit holders to treat sick and injured animals where no qualified veterinary surgeons are available. At the same time these provisions enable the board to encourage the establishment of qualified veterinary surgeons in all country areas of the State where livestock populations are capable of supporting a full-time qualified service. In this connection it is to be noted that South Australia is the only State that permits registration of unqualified persons. By clause 12, the penalties in sections 29, 30, 30a and 31 of the principal Act are increased from £50 to £100. The reason for this increase is to bring the penalties into line with changing money values.

By clause 13 section 30 of the principal Act is extended so as to make it an offence for the holders of permits to cause themselves to advertise or hold themselves out as veterinary surgeons, etc. At present the section makes it an offence only if a person himself advertises and does not extend to the situation where, for example, another advertises on his behalf. Clause 14 is intended to limit the scope of section 31a (1) to the extent that an unregistered person may not advertise himself as qualified to castrate, etc., dogs and cats though he may castrate, etc., other animals. The clause also amends section 31a (2) by providing that any person so treating any animal must not claim reimbursement of any expenses incurred for such treatment. Experience has shown that unregistered persons have been avoiding the provisions of the section, that no fee or reward must be charged, by claiming reimbursement of expenses incurred in the treatment. It was the intention of the section that no remuneration whatsoever should be recovered for such treatment.

Clause 15, in addition to making provision for making regulations for prescribing a code of professional conduct, increases the penalty that can be prescribed for a breach of the regulations from £10 to £100. The reason for this increase is like clause 12, to bring the penalty provision into line with present-day money values. The other amendments are of a minor nature and are designed to remove anomalies and outdated features in this Act and to improve its administration. I commend this Bill to the House.

Mr. NANKIVELL secured the adjournment of the debate.

ESTIMATES OF EXPENDITURE.

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended the House of Assembly to make appropriation of the several sums for all the purposes set forth in the Estimates of Expenditure by the Government for expenditure during the year ending June 30, 1966.

Referred to Committee of Supply.

THE BUDGET.

In Committee of Supply.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I am deeply conscious of the honour accorded to me by the electors of this State and by the members of the majority Party in Parliament in calling upon me to prepare and submit this Budget. I am, moreover, very conscious of the duty and privilege to serve to the best of my ability the whole of the people of this State, who have over many years demonstrated those outstanding qualities that have made them admired and respected throughout the Commonwealth and beyond. I have been particularly assisted in preparing this Budget by the smooth-working and efficient staff of the Treasury, and would mention that there has been no change in that staff since the election of the new Labor Government. I propose to follow the method, traditional in this and many other Parliaments, of reviewing the finances of the past year as well as dealing with the expenditure proposals of my Government for the ensuing year, and with the ways and means of securing the necessary finance to make those expenditures.

Without any intention of unreasonable criticism of the financial operations under the previous Government or of withholding the credit due in proper circumstances, I am bound to give some attention to the past year's operations, if only because the current problems could not otherwise be seen and dealt with in their proper perspective. The past year opened with a surplus of £1,922,000 on Consolidated Revenue Account plus a surplus of £680,000 available from the Uranium Production Account, which was in fact subsequently transferred to Revenue Account. The previous Government budgeted to use these balances of £2,602,000 during the course of 1964-65 and to run into deficit to the extent of £570,000. In other words, it proposed a current overspending of £3,172,000. In point of fact, for reasons and in ways which I shall explain later, there was an improvement of £1,181,000, and instead of the year finishing with a net deficit of £570,000 it finished with a balance of £611,000 in hand. Balances were run down during the year by almost £2,000,000. The situation from which this Government has had to face its first full year is one in which the

Consolidated Revenue Account had been running in deficit at the rate of £2,000,000 a year, and with £611,000 only in reserve. Indeed, the situation could have been more than £1,000,000 worse if the 1964-65 Budget estimates had not been bettered.

From a situation like this it is quite impossible, other than with unacceptably severe financial measures, to alter the run of finances so as to produce a fully balanced Budget in the first year. New revenue measures by the Government, requiring as they do administrative preparation and in most cases legislative enactment, cannot be effective without some delay, and meantime current expenditures must be met. Accordingly, for 1965-66 the Budget will provide for a current deficit of £1,541,000, which, after bringing into account the residue of past surpluses brought forward, would leave a net deficit of £930,000. It is to be anticipated that the revenue measures will be much more effective in assisting next year, and in the circumstances the Government feels justified in taking the view that to plan a two or even three year period to achieve a balance in finances is reasonable. I would add that the Government is taking a comparable view as to the appropriate period over which it feels entitled to spread the implementation of its election undertakings, although, as will become apparent as I proceed, we will progress with them a very long way in the first year.

Within the first three months of the Government's taking office, I, in association with the Premiers of the other Australian States, had to negotiate with the Commonwealth a new financial arrangement which is ordinarily described as the tax reimbursement grants. Whilst this had to be concluded immediately upon the change of Government in two of the States, and in a climate of increasing economic difficulties on both local and international fronts, the new arrangements can fairly be regarded as moderately favourable in the circumstances. The aggregate amount available to all States together for 1965-66 as finally arranged was rather better than may have been anticipated, and a significant improvement upon the Commonwealth's first offer. The procedure for determining future increases, particularly in relation to betterment, is a marked improvement on the previous procedure, and follows in substance the lines which the former Premier of New South Wales and I mutually agreed to propose at the first conference. It is felt that the Commonwealth would have been justified in giving relatively better treatment in the commencing distribution to South Australia. However, there will be available to this State as a financial assistance grant for the current year about £43,290,000, which is 11 per cent greater than last year's grant, and which is 11½ per cent of the estimated aggregate distribution to the States.

Having determined the minimum expenditure requirements of the State for 1965-66 in relation to the revenue likely to become available, including the newly determined financial assistance grant from the Commonwealth, the Government has made an examination of the ways and means of securing further revenues. To supplement the funds available to finance the expenditure proposals which will be submitted to Parliament, the Government has decided to take action to increase revenues in a number of ways. Some of these will secure additional revenues immediately after appropriate legislation is passed or the appropriate regulations made, whilst others will of necessity not produce significantly increased revenues until after a lapse of time. A few are already in operation.

Action has already been taken to increase the charges for excess water and to reduce in a broadly corresponding degree the amount of quota water which is available to a ratepayer without additional payment. This will only bring in minor revenue increases in the current year, but probably larger amounts next year when the excess charges for current consumption are payable. However, the main design of these changes is to discourage the use of excess water and to save immediate pumping costs, and, if possible, to delay the time when increased capital provisions for water supplies have to be made. At the same time the minimum rate charged upon smaller houses with small water usages has been reduced. It is estimated that some £600,000 additional water and sewer revenues will be secured this year from increases in assessments resulting from a periodical review of valuations of properties. I may say, however, that the valuation of city and urban properties generally has been made upon a very conservative basis, and is probably of the order of about 80 per cent of a full modern commercial value.

With succession duties it is proposed to bring down legislation for the approval of Parliament, in accordance with the terms of the Government's election promises. The amendments will raise the exemption for widows and for children under 21 years from £4,500 to £6,000, raise the exemption for widowers, ancestors, and descendants from £2,000 to £3,000,

and provide for additional exemption from duties for these same categories of beneficiary where primary producing land is concerned. They will make provision to close gaps in the present legislation whereby succession dues are greatly reduced or avoided by special dispositions of estates, and will also provide for increases in rates on higher successions in line with effective rates levied in other States and elsewhere. Because of the lapse of time between death and payment of succession duties, the net increase in revenues this year from these adjustments is likely to be less than 5 per cent, and £150,000 is anticipated in the Budget. For next year a much greater increase would be anticipated.

The Government has examined the land tax provisions and finds that the effective rates are generally considerably lower than the Australian average for unimproved values in excess of £5,000. An adjustment to bring these up to the general level is proposed, which should increase revenues by some £425,000 this year. The Government will bring down legislation to facilitate the operation of the new decimal currency from February next, and in the course of this will have to amend a number of taxes and duties. Most of these will involve only minor changes. It is proposed, for instance, that the halfpenny per ticket duty on betting tickets should be four dollars a thousand, which is a small reduction. Opportunity will be taken to rationalize the stamp duty upon receipts whereby there will be extended exemptions but some increases, with probably a small net increase overall. The duty on cheques will be revised as from the introduction of decimal currency, and, as an additional revenue measure, it is proposed this shall be five cents a cheque. Increased revenue of about £150,000 should be received this year, and £450,000 in a full year, from the new duty on cheques.

Action is proposed by the Minister of Marine to revise charges by the Harbors Board. These have not been altered for nine years or so. It is expected that the revision will be operative from November next, will result in increased revenues to the extent of £300,000 this year, and mean between £400,000 and £450,000 in a full year of operation. It is proposed to take measures shortly to protect and augment railway revenues by instituting transport control on competitive routes, with a different approach and emphasis from that which has been hitherto adopted. Rather than adopting the method of prohibiting competitive operations, it is proposed in general to permit them to continue as far as practicable, but to require the competitive services to make an appropriate payment for the privilege. By these means it is hoped in due course to realize the Government's election target of at least £1,000,000 a year extra revenue. This would be secured by diverting traffic to rail, allowing the Railways Commissioner to abandon a number of the special rates which unrestrained competition has forced on him, and of course from the payments made by the competitive operators. This proposal, however, is a longer term project, and it would not be practicable to gain much revenue therefrom in 1965-66.

Notwithstanding these proposed increases in revenues, there will remain a gap in the current Budget for 1965-66 of about £1,541,000, and, bringing into account the £611,000 balance of surpluses brought forward from prior years, there will be a prospective deficiency of about £930,000. However, as I have already pointed out, several of the new revenue proposals of the Government will be expected to bring in much greater increases in 1966-67 than this year, and it is anticipated that the deficit at June 30 next could be absorbed by the better result in 1966-67. I will now proceed to a more detailed survey of the past year's results and current proposals.

THE YEAR 1964-65.

The Budget presented a year ago anticipated receipts of £110,076,000 and payments of £112,568,000, and thus an estimated deficit on the year's operations of £2,492,000. Actual receipts of £111,091,000 were £1,015,000 in excess of estimate, while payments of £112,402,000 fell short of the original estimate by £166,000. The final deficit was thus £1,311,000, an improvement of £1,181,000 on the forecast at the beginning of the year. The main factors leading to the improvement in receipts were a very good rural season and sustained economic activity despite uncertainty in some fields, notably the share market. Taxation receipts overall were £332,000 above estimate, the major item being stamp duties with an increase of £212,000. Receipts of the Betting Control Board were £100,000 above estimate, partly due to an amendment to turnover tax during the year and partly to increased volume of betting, the first significant increase since 1960-61. Other increases above estimate were motor vehicle registration and licence fees £76,000, and land tax £35,000. The only shortfall of note was for succession duties, which follow no set pattern, and which at one stage seemed likely to be £500,000 below estimate. A sharp improvement late in

the year left the final result £98,000 below the original forecast.

For the receipts of business undertakings the main variation was in water and sewer rates, which exceeded estimate by £143,000 due to expanding services. Harbors Board receipts showed a moderate increase of £63,000. Despite the good rural season the slower rate of shipment led to receipts from the bulk grain loading facilities falling a little short of the expectation. The fall was more than offset by increased business from most of the board's other activities. The Railways Department's small increase of £36,000 did not reflect the effect of increased earnings from the carriage of wheat, barley, other grain, and general merchandise. Whereas the original estimate of cash receipts anticipated a reduction in outstanding accounts, there was a small temporary increase in the amounts earned but not paid until July, 1965. Among departmental fees and recoveries there were three marked increases above estimate: Education Department £207,000, Law Courts £93,000 and Public Trustee £30,000. The increase for Education Department was mainly in recoveries from the Commonwealth to match further State grants for university purposes. The Law Courts and the Public Trustee Department handled a much greater volume of business.

Territorial receipts were £79,000 above estimate because of unexpected settlements for land transactions and reductions in outstanding amounts, while the calculation of Commonwealth grants based on final figures for population and wage movements resulted in a grant £78,000 in excess of the earlier tentative estimate. The shortfall of £166,000 in payments as compared with estimate was made up of many individual variations, some above and some below the appropriations included in the Budget. Because the variations may not be offset for purposes of appropriation, it was necessary for Supplementary Estimates to be considered by Parliament in May to give authority for payment of a number of increased commitments. The final accounts for the year reveal that the major excess above estimate was £294,000 for "Minister of Education—Miscellaneous", under which it was necessary to provide for further grants to the University of Adelaide and the Institute of Technology towards higher academic salary scales made retrospective to the beginning of 1964. These gross provisions were partly offset by increased recoveries from the Commonwealth. For the same reasons an excess of £58,000 occurred under "Minister of Agriculture—Miscellaneous", where the grants for the Waite Agricultural Institute are appropriated.

For social services as a whole, however, there was no impact beyond the original provisions, as the additional costs for educational purposes were offset by underspendings in health activities. Under "Chief Secretary—Miscellaneous" actual payments fell £296,000 short of the provision in the Estimates as hospitals and institutions requested progress payments under approved subsidies less than had been provided. For Hospitals Department savings of £64,000 as compared with the estimate occurred because of the difficulty of attracting and holding suitably qualified staff. Among the business undertakings the largest variation was for Railways Department, a shortfall of £426,000 from the Budget, due largely to the delayed delivery of motors and other equipment required for maintenance of rolling stock. Harbors Board Department had actual payments £48,000 less than the original appropriation as dredging equipment was used on reimbursement works rather than for maintenance. The payments of the Engineering and Water Supply Department exceeded the original estimate by £82,000, the main reasons being increased maintenance and service pay. Other large variations in payments were a saving of £90,000 for Agriculture Department as provisions to combat fresh outbreaks of fruit fly were not required, an excess of £60,000 for Public Buildings Department to cover additional commitments for service pay and maintenance of Government buildings, and two unforeseen payments under "Special Acts". They were £100,000 towards subsidies for country electricity supplies and £100,000 towards satisfaction of a guarantee under the Industries Development Act. As I made clear when introducing the Supplementary Estimates, the cost to Revenue Account in 1964-65 for service pay granted in accordance with the election undertaking was about £355,000. Its impact was widely spread, and, except for the Engineering and Public Buildings Departments, it was not a large factor in individual excesses above estimate.

Before leaving the review of 1964-65 expenditures I should like to direct the attention of members to a grant of £215,000 shown under "Treasurer—Miscellaneous" and paid to the Electricity Trust in respect of the costs of connection of Kangaroo Island with mainland electricity supplies. This amount was voted on the Estimates submitted by the previous Government and strongly endorsed by both

sides of this Parliament. The previous Government, prior to the March elections, had also been carrying out negotiations with the Broken Hill Associated Smelters at Port Pirie to arrange for the supply of electricity at a rate adequately favourable to develop a major industrial project in the recovery of zinc from the large slag dumps. These negotiations were strongly encouraged and supported by the present Government Party whilst in Opposition, and it finalized the arrangements which had been well advanced when it assumed office. Whilst the rates agreed for the supply of electricity are expected ultimately to be economic, the Electricity Trust will be involved in certain early capital and other costs, which would not be recovered. It was accordingly agreed between the trust and the Treasury that the amount of those costs would be reasonably balanced by a capital contribution of £350,000. This assessment seemed to my Government reasonable, and, accordingly, I exercised the power given to me under section 27 (5) of the Public Finance Act and reduced the Loan debit of the trust to the Treasury by £350,000. This was done as part of the adjustment of Loan expenditure debits required under the Public Finance Act to correspond with public debt cancellation through the sinking fund arrangements of the Financial Agreement. A record of these adjustments will be shown in Statement E of the Treasurer's Accounts for 1964-65, which will be published and reported upon in the Auditor-General's Report.

ESTIMATES FOR 1965-66.

RECEIPTS.

I estimate that receipts on Consolidated Revenue Account from all sources will amount to £119,977,000 in 1965-66; that is, £8,886,000 in excess of actual receipts for 1964-65. The Estimates of Revenue show that the receipts are expected from:

	£
State taxation	19,565,000
Public works and services—charges, recoveries and fees	55,326,000
Territorial receipts	1,092,000
Commonwealth grants	43,994,000
Total	£119,977,000

For State taxation, the total of £19,565,000 anticipates receipts £2,115,000 in excess of actual receipts last year. Land tax receipts in 1964-65 included much higher than normal recoveries of arrears and receipts of deferred tax. This is unlikely to recur this year, and on this account I anticipate a minor reduction of £20,000. The legislation I have foreshadowed will be introduced as quickly as possible to amend the present rates of tax designed to yield additional revenues of about £425,000 a year. This will be fully effective in 1965-66, and, after allowing for the minor decrease on account of collection of arrears, the expected increase in cash receipts from land tax this year is therefore estimated at £405,000. I anticipate that motor vehicle taxation receipts will continue to grow steadily, and that they will reach £6,000,000 this year—£324,000 above actual receipts for 1964-65. An increase in this item has no net effect on the Revenue Budget result, as it is made available entirely for expenditure on construction and maintenance of roads.

Revenues from the various stamp duties are expected to reach £5,290,000, which is an increase of £833,000 on last year's total. Of this increase, some £400,000 is due to the operation for a full year of increased rates of duty, which were effective for part only of 1964-65. The proposal to increase the stamp duty on cheques to five cents with decimal currency in February next will mean increased revenues of some £150,000 in 1965-66. Movements in succession duty receipts are rather unpredictable, but I would consider it reasonable to anticipate a normal annual growth of about £300,000. This, together with the net £150,000 approximately anticipated from the proposed new rates and exemptions I have announced, will make the estimate for the year £3,750,000.

For publicans' licences, I expect receipts this year to be about £550,000, which is an increase of £27,000 above last year due to the granting of new licences and to increased volume of liquor turnover. Betting taxation is expected to yield about £720,000 this year, an increase of £28,000 due to the full year's effect of amended rates of turnover tax introduced last November. The estimate assumes that the volume of betting, which showed an unforeseen increase last year, will be maintained at the higher level but not increased significantly. The total of £55,326,000 estimated for public works and services is £2,564,000 above the actual receipts of 1964-65. The increase is expected to come from:

	£
The operation of public undertakings	1,833,000
Recoveries of interest and sinking fund	550,000
Other departmental fees and recoveries	181,000
Total	£2,564,000

Receipts from the operations of the water supply and sewer services are expected to increase by £1,003,000 to a total of £9,861,000. The increase will consist of about £400,000 from the further expansion of water and sewer services to keep pace with the State's growth and development, and about £600,000 from increased rates following the periodical re-assessment of properties to take account of changing property values, with a minor increase on account of increased charges for water supplied.

The estimate of £15,107,000 for railway freights and fares is £321,000 above actual receipts last year. The main component of the expected increase is the carriage of ores and concentrates from Broken Hill to Port Pirie. Both the volume of the traffic and the rate at which it is carried are expected to increase. It is also anticipated that an increased volume of grain will be carried. The carryover of grain at sidings awaiting transport at the end of June last was almost twice as great as 12 months previously, and therefore there should be heavier traffic in the period July to December, 1965, than in the corresponding period of 1964.

The receipts from wharfage, tonnage rates, handling and other charges of the Harbors Board are expected to increase by £437,000 to reach a total of £3,500,000 this year. Of this I anticipate that some £300,000 will arise from the proposed revision of rates, and the remaining £137,000 is expected to arise from a greater volume of business, particularly in the bulk handling of grain carried over from last season and in the import of oil and phosphate.

The annual contribution by the Woods and Forests Department from surpluses derived from the exploitation of forests will rise from £540,000 to £600,000. The increase of £60,000 in the contribution to Revenue stems from the increased volume of timber being processed, and, given reasonable market conditions, this contribution may be expected to increase gradually.

I estimate that recoveries of interest and sinking fund will increase by £550,000 above last year's actual recoveries to reach a total of £10,901,000. The Housing Trust, the Electricity Trust, and the State Bank each repay in full to the Budget the debt services applicable to the Loan funds made available to them, and, as those advances increase, the recoveries of debt services increase likewise. The increases in recoveries from the three authorities this year will be £255,000, £203,000, and £24,000. There will also be greater recoveries from departmental reimbursement, stores and working accounts. The running down of Revenue and Loan balances in 1964-65 and the expected Revenue deficit for 1965-66 mean a depletion of cash holdings at the Reserve Bank, and therefore the interest earning on such balances will fall.

For other departmental fees and recoveries I expect a relatively small increase of £181,000 to a total of £10,648,000. Whereas the 1964-65 accounts included a special repayment of £680,000 from funds made available for purposes of uranium production, this year's Revenue Budget will receive no such assistance. There will, however, be a number of increases by various departments. For education purposes I expect an increase of £410,000, of which £387,000 will be additional recoveries from the Commonwealth as its proportion of grants to the University of Adelaide and the South Australian Institute of Technology. For Hospitals Department, recent experience indicates that increased patients' fees and increased recoups from the Commonwealth will lead to total receipts some £235,000 in excess of last year's receipts. There has been a steady upward movement in the fines and fees received by the Law Courts, and a further increase of £45,000 is expected this year. A greater number of transactions will increase the fee income of the Registrar of Companies and the Registrar-General of Deeds Departments.

The operation of the formula for taxation reimbursement grants will mean an increase of about £4,212,000 for 1965-66.

PAYMENTS.

Before dealing with provisions for particular departments and services, I would make two comments about salaries and wages appropriations which have general application to all departments. In explaining the Supplementary Estimates for 1964-65 I pointed out that the total cost of service pay for six months to June, 1965, was of the order of £500,000, of which £339,000 affected Revenue Account directly as salaries and wages, while a further £16,000, met in the first instance from certain working accounts, became a recharge to Revenue Account indirectly. The cost of service pay for the full year 1965-66 will be about £1,100,000, of which some £780,000 will be a charge to Revenue Account, about £750,000 directly and about £30,000 indirectly. Provision for service pay is included under the ordinary headings of salaries and wages in the Estimates of Expenditure. As members

will be aware, the authority to pay the appropriate rates derives from the conditions of employment determined for the daily and weekly paid staff by the employing authority, whether it be the Minister, the statutory authorities, the Public Service Commissioner, the Railways Commissioner, or other properly responsible person. It is not necessary to show service pay separately so as to secure authority to make the payment, and in any case it would be a practically impossible task to separate these particular payments from the other components of wages.

Provision is made in the Estimates for the payment of the 1½ per cent increase in margins which, following the decision of the Arbitration Commission, is being extended through most awards and agreements. Because at the time of preparation of the Budget details by no means all sections of Government employment had been covered by these particular increases, the appropriation is shown as a separate line for each department. The provision in the Estimates will not in itself constitute an authority or decision to pay the increase, but it will constitute a provision to meet the additional costs if and when they are awarded or determined by the appropriate authorities. The aggregate of provisions made in the Estimates for these purposes is about £685,000. Other than for the 1½ per cent special adjustments still pending, the Estimates take no account of salary and wage rate variations subsequent to August 18, 1965.

In the Estimates of Expenditure provision is included for:

	£
"Special Acts"—being payments for which appropriation is contained in special legislation	31,828,000
Proposed payments for departments and services for which the financial authority will derive from the Appropriation Bill	89,690,000
Making a total of payments proposed for 1965-66 of	£121,518,000

My comments on the detailed proposals will be brief and confined to the major or unusual provisions. Under "Special Acts" the proposed payments totalling £31,828,000 are expected to exceed last year's actual payments by £1,874,000. The largest increase will be in interest and sinking fund payments in respect of Loan funds borrowed to finance capital projects. Interest alone is expected to amount to £21,300,000, an increase of £1,482,000 compared with an increase of £1,370,000 in the previous year. The increased impact of interest will be due to the greater volume of borrowed funds outstanding and to the effect of higher rates both on new borrowings and on conversion of previous issues. In the early part of last financial year the long term bond rate was 5 per cent. For the April, 1965, loan the rate advanced to 5¼ per cent, and at the same time there was a sharp upward movement in the medium and short term rates. Higher rates have increased the annual cost of servicing the £42,000,000 which matured in 1964-65, and will increase the annual cost of the £53,000,000 of public debt which reaches maturity during 1965-66, and which previously carried interest at relatively low rates ranging from 3 per cent to 4¼ per cent.

The other large upward movements under "Special Acts" are in the State's contribution to the National Debt Sinking Fund, which at £4,159,000 will increase by £322,000, the transfer to the Highways Fund expected to increase by £167,000 to £4,322,000, and the State's contribution to the payment of superannuation, which at £1,512,000 will increase by £100,000. In accordance with its election undertaking, the Government proposes to introduce amendments to the Superannuation Act to provide conditions comparable with those given in other public services, and agreement on the form of the amendments has been virtually reached with the employees' superannuation committee. The 1965-66 estimate includes an allowance for the increased payments which are expected to follow the passing of the amending legislation.

The departmental proposals include considerable increases in the provisions for the social services, for public undertakings, and for development and maintenance of State resources. For the medical and health services the Hospitals Department has the major provision, £9,149,000, which is an increase of £827,000 or almost 10 per cent above last year's payments. After allowing for certain changed accounting procedures because of the projected operation of the new group laundry and the closing of individual hospital laundries, the increases are about 11 per cent for the mental health services and about 7½ per cent for all other hospitals. Under "Chief Secretary—Miscellaneous" the provision of £5,077,000 is primarily for grants and subsidies to hospitals and institutions operated by independent boards. This provision towards

running expenses and capital projects anticipates an increase of £958,000, about 23 per cent, compared with an increase of £636,000 in 1964-65. It has been the experience for many years for underspendings against estimate to emerge as hospitals and institutions have subsequently claimed progress payments on building projects at a slower rate than forecast. I wish to make it clear that no such comparable underspending is likely to occur in 1965-66. The contract work is now proceeding quite rapidly, and I am satisfied that the overall provision is a realistic estimate of requirements.

For education services the Government proposes to allocate funds to enable both the extent and quality of services to be improved. The Education Department has been allocated £19,577,000, an increase of £1,613,000, or 9 per cent. This includes £205,000 to meet the cost of higher allowances recently approved for students at the teachers' colleges in accordance with the policy of the Government stated at the recent elections. The provision also includes funds specifically to enable the Minister to improve the staffing of high schools. The total of £6,266,000 for "Minister of Education—Miscellaneous" provides for an increase of £647,000 above last year's payments. Of this increase £613,000 is for additional payments to the University of Adelaide, £300,000 being for special teaching hospital purposes and £313,000 for other purposes at North Terrace and Bedford Park. There is also a small provision under "Special Acts", and for the Waite Institute section an increased grant under "Minister of Agriculture—Miscellaneous". At Bedford Park two major building contracts were let late in 1964, and work is progressing as planned so that academic buildings will be ready for occupation at the beginning of 1966, when the enrolment of about 470 first-year students is expected for the faculties of arts and science. The Commonwealth Government in its legislation dealing with university finances provided for a grant of £220,000 in the 1964-66 triennium towards a hall of residence at Bedford Park on condition that the State Government likewise provide a grant of £220,000. A decision on the project had been earlier deferred because the Commonwealth had delayed its formal endorsement and then because of other higher priority demands for university funds. My Government gave further consideration to this matter during the course of preparation of this Budget. Having regard to other urgent demands for limited funds, and to the fact that a favourable decision now would not in any case enable the building to be ready at the beginning of 1966, my Government has further deferred a decision until next March. Should the financial prospects then permit a favourable decision, it would be possible for the building to be erected in time for the 1967 academic year.

Under "Minister of Education—Miscellaneous" are two smaller but important provisions to bring into effect election promises of the Government. The sum of £35,000 is proposed for financial assistance to students in meeting their fees at the University of Adelaide and the Institute of Technology. The Government proposes that in 1966 a more liberal approach be taken in giving assistance to students who do not hold scholarships or cadetships, or receive help from employers, and who may experience hardship in the payment of fees. This provision compares with £17,000 in 1965. The sum of £10,000 is provided for the cost of concessions for children who travel to school by private bus services licensed by the Municipal Tramways Trust. The children are now able to obtain passes at costs comparable with those for trust services, and the Government will reimburse the licensed operators the difference between this and the normal charge.

For the services of law and order the main provision is for the Police Department, an allocation of £3,720,000, which is £234,000 or 7 per cent more than last year's expenditure. The Prisons Department has £686,000, an increase of £44,000. Among the public undertakings the major increases are for the Engineering and Water Supply, Harbors Board, and Railways Departments. The provisions for the Engineering and Water Supply Department total £5,249,000, an increase of £588,000 above 1964-65 payments. The total comprises £103,000 for South Australia's contribution to the Murray River Commission for maintenance works, £760,000 for electric power for pumping through the two major pipelines, and £4,386,000 for operation and maintenance of water supply and sewer works. Of the £760,000 for power for pumping, £310,000 is provided for the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline and £450,000 for the Mannum-Adelaide pipeline. The latter provision exceeds last year's cost by £302,000. Because of the very dry winter it was necessary to commence full-scale pumping in July to supplement metropolitan storages. Useful rains in mid-August made it practicable to revert to off-peak pumping, but at this stage it is most unlikely that the catchment areas will receive falls sufficient to avoid considerable pumping between now and April next.

The appropriation for the Harbors Board for the operation of bulk handling plants, for maintenance of structures, and for normal services is £1,794,000, an increase of £145,000. For the Railways Department the proposed allocation of £15,295,000 is £664,000 in excess of last year's payments. In the maintenance and development of State resources the main provisions are for the Agriculture and Mines Departments. The £1,100,000 appropriation for Agriculture Department contains a provision for control of fruit fly should a fresh outbreak occur. For Mines Department the allocation of £941,000 includes a provision to cover the costs of an investigation into the feasibility of constructing a natural gas pipeline from the North of the State to Adelaide.

It is the declared policy of the Government to assist in the setting aside of suitable areas for open spaces and recreation facilities for the growing population, and I would point out two important provisions for this purpose. Under "Minister of Lands—Miscellaneous" is an appropriation of £81,000 for the purchase of areas suitable for national parks and wild life reserves. This exceeds last year's payments by £12,000. Under "Minister of Local Government—Miscellaneous" a sum of £125,000 is provided to subsidize local government authorities in the acquisition of land for public parks and open spaces. The Town Planning Report recommended an annual provision of £250,000 towards such acquisitions in the metropolitan area, £125,000 to be provided by the Government and £125,000 by councils. There is some evidence that the need is for a higher annual rate of contribution, but for its first year the Government has decided to make provision to the extent of £125,000 which is the amount recommended by the Town Planning Committee. This is £95,000 more than the actual payments for 1964-65. If this £125,000 is not all required to support purchases of suitable land by councils this year, any unspent balance will be transferred to a deposit account to be used towards future purchases.

At the time of the Budget presentation in September it is normal for a State Treasurer to make some reference to seasonal conditions, which, as well as affecting the rural community, have their influence throughout the State and of course an effect on the Budget itself. The 1964-65 season was a very favourable one. The spring rains ensured good yields of cereals, high stock carrying capacity, and particularly good intakes into our reservoir system so that the cost of pumping from the River Murray was relatively low. The present season is in the balance. Intermittent rains have been sufficient to keep cereal crops and pastures growing, but over wide areas there is no reserve of subsoil moisture. Good spring rains would ensure an excellent season, but dry weather from now on would have serious effects on production. It is encouraging that the widespread rains of mid-August eased the situation in the drought-affected northern pastoral areas. However, rains to date have failed to give good intakes into the reservoirs, and holdings at the moment are well below those of 12 months ago. It is clear that the cost of pumping from the River Murray will be much greater than in 1964-65. I believe that the overall state of the South Australian economy is healthy and full of promise. Some observers see dangers in the Australian economy from a growing pressure on physical resources and on our international currency reserves, and all States will share to some extent in any problems if they should arise in this way. However, the people of South Australia have always shown themselves to be resourceful and responsible, and I have no doubt that they will remain so in helping to increase our productivity and to raise our standards of living. The Government for its part will continue to consider carefully the priority of all proposals before it, and within the funds available will make every effort to provide the basic capital projects required to support the development of the State and the social services required for acceptable modern living standards. I am confident that the Government and the community will be able to co-operate in building a bright and secure future.

In conclusion, I express my own thanks and those of the Treasury officials to the Government Printer and his staff. They have done a magnificent job under circumstances that are by no means ideal. This year, also, they were under exceptional pressure of Parliamentary and other work. One honourable member asked me earlier to consider presenting these Estimates also in decimal currency, but it would have been impossible for the Government Printer to do this in the time, although the conversion from pounds to dollars is a simple matter of doubling. I hope, in due course, to supply honourable members with a re-statement of the principal Budget figures in decimal currency. However, I feel that after the heavy printing work with the Budget Papers the Government Printer should give priority to the Auditor-General's report before

I ask for further special work. I pay a high tribute to members of this Chamber for the interest they have taken in my presentation of this Budget. I also pay a special tribute to the Treasury personnel. I have mentioned the Government Printing Department, and I hope some improvement, which is long overdue, will be possible in its accommodation.

Mr. Chairman, I move the adoption of the first line.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

REFERENDUM (STATE LOTTERIES) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 31. Page 1361.)

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I support this measure, not in its entirety but in its main principle. One of my reasons for doing so is that I know the Government is pledged to this form of procedure in obtaining or proposing a lottery for this State. It is required to seek a referendum and, as it says, to act on the will of the people. With that we cannot disagree, but I disagree with the idea of taking a referendum before people know what the outcome of a favourable vote will be. I think that is rather inexcusable; as a matter of fact, to use the vernacular, it is a pretty gutless policy, because there is no guarantee that the will of the people will be obeyed. When the measure for a lottery is introduced into this House members will have had an opportunity to scrutinize closely the result of the referendum. They will have been able to study the results at each polling booth and assess their chances at the next election. I think this could have a big bearing on the way they vote.

Mr. McKee: You will have the same opportunity.

Mr. QUIRKE: I always get an opportunity, and I exercise it, too, However, it will not affect me very much, will it? Even if it did, it would not make the slightest difference.

Mr. McKee: I agree with you on that.

Mr. QUIRKE: I have never refrained from voting on social matters. I do not think a referendum should be held, although I intend to support this measure. It is an utter waste of money. The result is a foregone conclusion. The Gallup polls indicate that an overwhelming majority of people favour a lottery for South Australia but they do not know whether it will be a lottery run by South Australia or by someone else. It will not be a very payable proposition for South Australia, although it will give the people an opportunity to invest in a lottery, as so many of them desire. We shall be up against grave difficulties in running it and, according to the wording of the proposition that will be put before the people, it may already be in the mind of the Government that it will evade the responsibility by calling in somebody else to do the job. Whether that is good or bad I am not prepared to judge at present, but the wording of the resolution to be placed before the people—

Mr. Jennings: How can it be a resolution?

Mr. QUIRKE: All right—the honourable member can correct me on that: a submission to the people. The submission that goes as a referendum can be read in two or three different ways. Honourable members opposite know that, too, and I think it has been clearly designed to give one or two loopholes. If it has not, then accept an amendment that can be made to what is being placed before the people. Much has been said here in passionate orations about the evils associated with lotteries and gambling I wonder when we in this State shall do a bit of growing up. Back in the early part of this century there was a dear old lady referred to in *Punch* as "Mother Grundy"—and, by heavens, she is not dead: she is everlasting!

Mr. Hudson: She is in the Opposition now!

Mr. QUIRKE: We had another dear old soul in the First World War named "D.O.R.A.", Defence of the Realm Act, and, if she is not still with us, her progeny is. I remember years ago in the times when the City Council never used street sweepers it relied on the skirts of women walking along the streets to do the job for it; and some bright people dared to go about wearing what they called harem skirts. Some honourable members are too young to remember that, but it was a divided skirt, a great big pantaloon. Those people were hounded in the streets.

Mr. Casey: This has nothing to do with a referendum.

Mr. QUIRKE: Their progeny is still with us, too.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: Legitimate?

Mr. QUIRKE: I would not pass any comments on their parents or parentage, but they are still with us. I have had the bitter experience of entertaining people at a dinner in a hotel (this is past now, but it did happen) when the waiter came along and took away the wine bottles at 8 o'clock flat.

Mr. Casey: The wine was flat?

Mr. QUIRKE: We have got away from that but today a similar sort of thing happens.

The member for Port Pirie of course is among the elect: he does not know whether he is going to vote for a lottery or bookmakers' shops or T.A.B. or anything else. He has the best of three Heavens, and he is not at all concerned. He has a genial look on his face, and one can almost imagine him saying, "Let the rest of the world go by; whatever happens I am safe, because if all things fail I still have the betting shops."

Mr. McKee: More than you have got.

Mr. QUIRKE: Exactly, it is more than we have got. I do not know why Port Pirie should be so privileged, even if it does have the greatest dump in the world.

The SPEAKER: I take it the honourable member will link up his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, I am linking them up, Mr. Speaker. A person cannot get a legal bet in a country district; it is completely immoral in the country, yet it is completely moral on a racecourse. It seems that one of the things that brings about the immorality is that the Government and the racing fraternity do not obtain any money from a bet made with a starting price bookie in the country, of which there are plenty, God bless them.

Mr. McKee: What has this got to do with the lottery?

Mr. QUIRKE: The honourable member should possess his soul in patience. We have had all those things, and all those prohibitions are still with us, in different degrees.

Mr. McKee: You supported them for a long time.

Mr. QUIRKE: I have supported every advance away from Mother Grundy. The position today is that it is still with us. We have listened to lachrymose speeches here of the evils attached to having a ticket in a lottery. Well, I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what evil accrues from that. I have never thought that anything I did in that regard was evil, and if I had my satchel here now I could produce at least four or five tickets on which I have done my money. I propose to go on with that, and if there were a lottery here in South Australia I would support that, too. I have had a lot of pleasure out of not winning anything in Tattersalls. Actually, on one occasion I did win £5, and I was so uninterested when I never received an urgent telegram saying that I had won a big prize that it was not until a month later that I bothered to open the envelope in which I found my £5 prize. I can afford to take a lottery ticket, and I have had a great deal of pleasure in doing so.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: The great pleasure of anticipation!

Mr. QUIRKE: Yes, and as the Minister would know, that is the greatest of all pleasures.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: What's that got to do with the lottery?

Mr. QUIRKE: There are various forms of lottery. I take exception to the attitude of some people. I let every man hold his own ideas on these matters, and if he is opposed to lotteries and he likes to get up and say he is opposed to lotteries because he thinks they are bad, he is quite entitled to do that. What I do object to is the type of speech that says, "You are not as I am." Well, thank God I am not. I do not like that attitude. I believe in letting everyone have his own ideas in relation to matters like this; I have mine, and I am expressing them now. I consider that people who pay 5s. for a lottery ticket can get quite a deal of interest and pleasure out of it, even though they do not win anything. One of the pleasures I get out of it is getting the results and reading the syndicate names used by the people who have won big prizes. How often, if the syndicate name is true, can you appreciate that the winner must have received great pleasure, and the relief that must have been given to some through the win. I like reading those things, and appreciate the pleasure of those who win. I am not disturbed when I do not win, because I know the odds are 200,000 to one against winning a prize, but I am prepared to accept that: it is a lottery. One part of this legislation I do not agree with—the compulsory clauses. I intend, when in Committee, to move to delete clause 15. If anything is bad about this Bill it is the compulsory clauses, and I am surprised that people who see bad in many things have not recognized the bad in the compulsory call on the people to give their expression on a social question. That should never be compulsory. Thousands of people in this State will resent the idea that they are forced to vote "Yes" or "No" or pay a £2 fine or put in an informal vote. They should not be placed in that position.

Mr. Curren: All they have to do is get their names crossed off the roll.

Mr. QUIRKE: Why should they have to do that? Members opposite had better advertise that, because there are 250,000 who won't know anything about it. They are going to be forced to do this, and if there is anything immoral about a lottery it would be this way of attempting to get one. I heard in this debate

that this is the democratic way of doing it—by going to the people and asking their opinion. Well, it is not. If anyone thinks that democracy consists of compulsion he must have a different idea of democracy from mine. If that is any element of democracy, it is a bad one.

Mr. Clark: How do you feel about compulsory voting in general?

Mr. QUIRKE: I will not have anything to do with compulsory voting, and I thought my opinion was well known. Anyone not prepared to face up to his responsibility to vote for the Parliament that has legislative powers over him is not worth considering for a vote, and not worth much when compelled to vote. At present there is a non-compulsory vote for the Legislative Council, much to the disgust of members opposite.

Mr. Hudson: Also a restricted franchise.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am not worried about that at present. I am speaking of the vote. Honourable members opposite know that dummy candidates have been put up in order to pull out the Legislative Council vote as far as possible where there has been no Assembly vote.

Mr. Clark: That is because it is not compulsory.

Mr. QUIRKE: That is the reason why people will not vote unless it is compulsory, and I would not worry about them.

Mr. McKee: You are turning another somersault. You have always supported this before. You supported the gerrymander in this State, and you supported the franchise vote in the Legislative Council.

Mr. QUIRKE: I have my own views on that, and the honourable member need not drag that into it. I have never supported compulsory voting.

Mr. McKee: What about the gerrymander in this State?

Mr. QUIRKE: That gerry has a red head and is dead. Compulsion to vote is provided in this Bill, and that is wrong. I have heard honourable members say that democracy means a vote of the people by the people for the people, which is, of course, taken from Abraham Lincoln's Gettysburg oration, but I think I have a better quotation than that, which, although not as well known, nevertheless appeared in one of Abraham Lincoln's letters. Lincoln was asked by a friend how he defined democracy and, similarly to the way in which he delivered his Gettysburg address, his reply was short and to the point, for he said:

As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master. This expresses my ideas of democracy. Whatever differs from this to the extent of the difference is no democracy.

"To the extent of the difference" is the salient expression. This proposal for a referendum is undemocratic, if it is to be made compulsory, and that is my main objection to it. Although I intend to vote for the second reading, I shall move to delete clause 15 of the Bill when it reaches the Committee stage. By doing this, I shall at least have given an expression to my ideas, in that I do not believe—

Mr. McKee: That will give you an opportunity to have a shilling each way.

Mr. QUIRKE: It will give me an opportunity to say something else, for I shall have thought of much more by then. I notice the member for Port Pirie is becoming disturbed, but he need not, because he will vote for it, whatever anybody says, and whatever convictions on this issue anybody may have.

Mr. Nankivell: He has to!

Mr. QUIRKE: If it is his Party's policy that this must be a compulsory provision, then I shall concede the point that he is bound by his Party's views on this matter. However, I do not think his Party says that it shall be a compulsory vote, and that is where this provision is wrong. I shall concede that it is necessary for members opposite to conduct a referendum on this measure, but it is not necessary for the Government to insist on a compulsory vote. No referendum on a social question should ever be on the basis of a compulsory vote.

Mr. Ryan: Why?

Mr. QUIRKE: Because thousands of people conscientiously object to being compelled to vote on social questions. The correct attitude of the people of South Australia, if voting were compulsory, would be for thousands of them to take the cue, and not vote at all. I should then suggest that we try to use the provisions of clause 15 against those people to see where we would get.

Mr. Ryan: Where else in Australia is a referendum voluntary?

Mr. QUIRKE: I do not know about that, but on social questions where has there been a referendum compelling people to vote? Was voting on the question of six o'clock closing compulsory?

Mr. Ryan: That is so far back we do not even remember it.

Mr. QUIRKE: It is the only referendum conducted on a social question.

Mr. Ryan: That was in 1916.

Mr. QUIRKE: It was in 1915, and it was a non-compulsory vote, which brought about six o'clock closing. The State has deteriorated in these matters since then and now there has to be a compulsory vote on everything. This is a social question, and I have my opinion on it. I have not denied members opposite the right to their opinion, although I disagree with many of them. I disagree with those members who have said that a lottery is evil. Evil can accrue from anything, even from overeating at Christmas dinner. I like to think that one day, in the history of the State (and at the progress we are making I will not live long enough to see it), every man, woman and child will accept their personal responsibility to do things that are right. That is what must be aimed at, and the Government should not coerce people into giving an expression of opinion on a question like this by providing for a compulsory vote.

Mr. Clark: The honourable member has not really made his point; he has said only what he thinks.

Mr. QUIRKE: The point I make is that I think it is undemocratic and wrong to force people to say "Yea" or "Nay" on a social question.

Mr. Ryan: The election of Governments in this State has been undemocratic.

Mr. QUIRKE: I am not concerned about that at this stage.

Mr. Ryan: Why?

Mr. QUIRKE: Because I am not dealing with it. The honourable member is not in any way concerned with the finer points being considered. He will vote with his Party whether it is right or wrong.

Mr. Ryan: The honourable member's Party has a policy, the same as my Party has.

Mr. QUIRKE: Whatever the honourable member's Party lays down is right, as far as he is concerned. I do not disagree with his adopting that view, but he should not intrude his ideas on me. Let him take his way and I will take mine. An instance of this occurred during a debate this afternoon. When I spoke I knew that the Government could not take certain action, for the good and sufficient reason that it was impossible for it to do so; it would have had to obtain the consent of the Federal Executive of the Party to do what it wanted to do this afternoon. Honourable members opposite knew that, and this came out later. Why did not any honourable member opposite defend the Premier when he was struggling under the lash and being accused of making a certain comment at the election?

Mr. Hughes: I defended him.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member for Burra to relate his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE: Thank you for your correction, Mr. Speaker. I am answering a point about the compulsion to vote; I am against it on this measure. Honourable members opposite support it because they are governed by compulsion and they cannot see any other way out.

Mr. Ryan: Rubbish!

Mr. QUIRKE: All right, get up and deny it. I know why the episode occurred this afternoon, and I sympathize with honourable members opposite. Incidentally, I let them down lightly, as they must agree. Mr. Speaker, I know that I am worrying you and I am sorry. Perhaps I have wandered away from the subject in some respects, but the point I make now is that I am in favour of a lottery for the people of South Australia.

Mr. McKee: But the honourable member must vote against it.

Mr. QUIRKE: I will not vote against it. Even if I cannot have clause 15 deleted, I will still vote for it but I will make my point and I will endeavour to correct the wrong that the Government intends to impose on the people of South Australia.

Mr. Clark: You will have to tell us right from wrong and you have not done that.

Mr. QUIRKE: I must have something in reserve, and I shall have plenty in reserve when I reach clause 15, because I intend to tell members a lot about it. I have to give honourable members who have not been here for a long time an opportunity on every point before I make it, have I? I deplore this compulsion on a social question. I support the idea of a lottery for South Australia as being quite harmless to responsible people and hope that ultimately we shall get a lottery. There is no starting price bookmaker here but I would make an even money bet that if the people of South Australia vote in favour of a referendum the Government will not pass the Bill to introduce a lottery, because the fear of the electorate will enter the souls of Government members. Honourable members opposite will vote against it, because everyone has that right on a social question; there is no compulsion there.

The Government will have considerable difficulty in getting such a measure passed if it is introduced. It is true that the measure

might pass because of members on this side voting in favour of it but there will be more Government members opposed to it when it comes up.

Mr. Ryan: This Bill only deals with a referendum, not with a lottery. You are getting away from it.

Mr. QUIRKE: As I see it, this is a gutless measure and if honourable members opposite had a complete internal economy, they would put the measure that they propose before the House, take a vote on whether we should have a lottery and then submit the deliberations of Parliament to the people for their consent, as the Government Party has to do under its rules. However, the Government has not done that. It has put the cart before the horse, and, in such cases, members opposite have the breeching on their chests. With few reservations like that, I support the measure.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I have some definite ideas about a lottery. I admire the previous speakers who have stated their strong views on the question. This Bill is a backhand way of dealing with the matter and I do not favour it to a great extent. We have had other indefintie Bills from the Government side of the House during this session. The Constitution Act Amendment Bill was vague and indefinite, as many interpretations could be placed upon it.

Mr. Clark: There is nothing indefinite about the Constitution Act Amendment Bill. It is not a lottery!

Mr. McANANEY: People could put different interpretations upon it. The question proposed to be put to the people under this measure is, "Are you in favour of the promotion and conduct of lotteries by or under the authority of the Government of the State?" The Government does not tell us what sort of lottery it proposes. However, I find in the rules of the Australian Labor Party (and I borrowed the book; I could not afford to pay 5s. for it) that the Party is in favour of a State lottery and yet the Government is not asking the people to vote on a lottery. Tonight the member for Port Adelaide (Mr. Ryan) said that something was 30 years out of date and that therefore we should not talk about it. I went to a Labor-sponsored meeting last week at which 22 people—12 Liberals and 10 Labor—spoke about the Capital and Corporal Punishment Bill. One of the Labor men asked when this had been discussed at a Labor conference, and another said that it was discussed 50 years ago. I think the Labor Party platform would be more up to date if it were discussed more often.

The Premier said that when the Bill was brought before the House members of his Party would regard it as social legislation and vote as they liked. The referendum will cost the State £32,000 and each of the 562,000 voters will lose at least 10s. in time, inconvenience, and petrol. Even after the referendum there will still be nothing definite to vote on. The question "Is a lottery desirable?" is asked. I could answer that by saying that it is not desirable. Each year £178,000,000 is spent on tobacco. I do not smoke and I do not believe in smoking, but just because of that I do not believe in bringing in a rule that people cannot smoke.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. McANANEY: To the question "Is a lottery desirable?" I say that possibly it is not, but there are many indications that the people of this State want a lottery. The member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said last week that at a Gallup poll 80 per cent of people interviewed indicated their desire for a lottery, so why should we go to the expense of having a referendum? The people of South Australia indulge in lotteries now. If one goes to a hospital fete, for instance, it is liable to cost one £2 or £3 for tickets in raffles conducted by charming young ladies for a bottle of wine or some other article, but people taking part in these raffles usually come away with very little return.

It is said that the next step is the poker machine. However, these are not permitted at present, and it is possible for the Government to stop their introduction. I do not think a lottery is a step in that direction, and I am going to speak in favour.

Mr. McKee: Did you say you were in favour of a lottery?

Mr. McANANEY: I am just getting to a good part of my speech.

Mr. McKee: I thought you said something I could understand.

Mr. McANANEY: It has been said that it is not in the interests of this State to have a lottery, but so much money goes to other States that it can be said that if we had a lottery at least that money would be retained here. When a Bill for a lottery comes before the House, I will definitely support it, under certain conditions.

Mr. Clark: It is against your principles but you will vote for it because it will bring in money?

Mr. McANANEY: At no time have I said it is against my principles to support a lottery. I take a ticket occasionally at fetes, and I can see no evil in that. I support the Bill for a lottery, under certain conditions. There should not be a lottery in every little shop in the street. Everyone should be able to have a go on a lottery but it should not be forced down his throat. If this Bill were not so vague, I would support it. I have not made up my mind about this, but I will support a lottery, under certain conditions.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): This is the second attempt to deal with social questions this session. It leads me to believe that the Government is afraid of coming to grips with the social issues of betting, in the two forms of a Totalizator Agency Board and a lottery. In the case of the former, the Government has seen to it that a private member has drawn the fire (if any is to be drawn) for T.A.B., the totalizator agency board system of off-course betting. It appears now that, although a Gallup poll has openly resolved the question whether or not the people of South Australia want a lottery, the Government will not shoulder the burden of introducing a Bill into this House. So we are given legislation to promote a referendum on the question of a lottery without any definition of the type of lottery to be introduced if the referendum is answered affirmatively. I was interested in what the Minister of Works said about a lottery. He said he was strongly opposed to one, and added:

I believe a lottery is dishonest, deceitful and undesirable.

Further on, he emphasized this by repeating the words "undesirable" and "deceitful". Then he said:

Our Party is not prepared to bind its members on any social question whatsoever, and it leaves its members entirely free to vote as they wish on social questions.

Mr. McKee: He was not speaking about the referendum.

Mr. HALL: He said, "Although there are undesirable aspects about a lottery in South Australia, I will support a Bill for it."

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Did I not say that, if the people decided, I would accept the decision?

Mr. HALL: No; that is not true.

Mr. Hudson: You have quoted the Minister wrongly.

Mr. HALL: I have not misquoted the Minister.

Mr. Hudson: If he can get away with it, he will.

Mr. HALL: The fact remains that he will support a Bill for a lottery, even though he thinks it undesirable.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: I said I would bow to the will of the people.

Mr. HALL: That makes it even worse. The Minister's stand should be to reject this referendum rather than come here and say he will support it even though he believes a lottery to be absolutely deceitful.

The Hon. C. D. Hutchens: Would you like me to ignore the will of the people? I shall not do that, nor will anybody make me.

Mr. HALL: I will demonstrate further how this Government is afraid to grapple with social questions. This can be expected of a new Government. It took our Government some time to grapple with these questions. Last year the previous Government came to an agreement on the establishment of T.A.B. in this State.

Mr. McKEE: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I cannot see any reason why the member for Gouger should discuss T.A.B.

The SPEAKER: I have allowed fairly wide latitude to other speakers during the debate, hoping that they would eventually link their remarks to the Bill. As my attention has been drawn to this matter, I ask the honourable member for Gouger to speak to the Bill. I also remind honourable members that interjections are out of order and that the speaker must be heard.

Mr. HALL: I am sorry if I have offended you, Mr. Speaker, or any other members in not relating my remarks to the Bill. I thought the attitude of the previous Government in dealing with a social question could be related to the attitude of the present Government in dealing with this social question. My only purpose in referring to T.A.B. was to say that we had resolved this question after much thinking within our Party, and we went to the last election with a definite proposal to introduce that system, which I should not mention lest I offend the honourable member for Port Pirie. We went to the last election with that proposal, as the member for Victoria can tell this House. A definite proposal was put to the people of South Australia (fearlessly, if I may say so) at an election, and as much as members opposite may scoff, they are afraid to come to a similar decision here this session, next session, or any session. As I say, they have gone to a private member in one instance to draw the fire, and in this instance they are bringing forth a proposal for

a spurious referendum. I say "spurious" because it does not detail the manner in which the lottery would be set up.

Mr. Hudson: Do you think holding a referendum is like putting poison in the hands of children?

Mr. HALL: I do not know about that, but I am doubtful about what the Government has in mind, because it will not tell us. I do believe that the reason the proposals for the lottery are not here is because the Government does not know what sort of a lottery it proposes for this State. At least one member of the Government has declared that he will not support it. Is it fair to ask the people of the State to vote on something they do not know about? I say it is not fair.

Mr. Shannon: It was suggested by a certain member that they should not know, anyway.

Mr. HALL: Although repetition can become rather tiresome, I suppose that when members speak on this question it is only right that they should say what their beliefs are. I agree with those speakers who do not oppose a lottery. I have a lottery ticket in my drawer now. That ticket is in one of the other State's lotteries that has not filled for the last three weeks, and I am getting nervous lest there has been some clerical error and my ticket has not been noted somewhere.

Mr. Jennings: I think you want a check-up from the neck up!

Mr. HALL: Every time I go through my drawer I receive a little psychological lift in anticipation of a win, a point that was mentioned earlier by the member for Burra. I do not see any harm in a lottery, and if a properly drafted Bill for a lottery is introduced I shall support it then without any qualms or reservations. However, I am not willing to support a Bill for a referendum that does not do the justice of telling the South Australian people what is proposed.

Mr. Clark: That is an excuse, not a reason.

Mr. HALL: I do not care what any member likes to call it. At least the Government should be fair and brave enough to say what it means. Why can't it agree on what type of lottery we should have?

Mr. Ryan: For a change why don't you say what you mean?

Mr. HALL: I am in favour of a lottery if the finances can be worked out properly.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Are you one of the children into whose hands poison should not be put?

Mr. HALL: I am sure Government members have derived much amusement from those words, but the Leader did not mean them literally.

Mr. Shannon: I think the Leader may have a supporter in the member for Wallaroo.

Mr. HALL: He may have a supporter or two on the Government benches. I believe that the public of South Australia can look after itself with regard to drinking, betting and lotteries so long as the Government ensures that these things are properly controlled. We ought to know the position about lotteries. Some peculiar legislation has been introduced this year, so why should we trust the Government to introduce a sensible Bill? When an electoral Bill brings in country and city boundaries that were fixed in 1954—11 years out of date—how can we trust the Government to introduce a sensible lottery Bill? We need look no further than the one attempt to bring in a ridiculous, unfair, and out-of-date provision. The Government asks us to trust it to bring in a proper lottery Bill, but on its record I would not trust it to do so. Let us be fair to the people of South Australia and give them the facts: until that is done I will oppose the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I realize that this measure has been well debated and that some honourable members have given their opinions on it, but some have given their opinions on a lottery. We are not debating a lottery or, at least, I am not. This legislation deals with the holding of a referendum, not whether we should have a lottery. I shall not tonight express my opinion of lotteries. I oppose this Bill for several reasons. First, the holding of a referendum will cost the taxpayers about £30,000, and we will find out something that we already know.

Mr. Shannon: That will be the profit from the first year's lottery.

Mr. HEASLIP: It could put things in the red because the profit may not be as much as that in the first year. I oppose the Bill because Government members, time and time again, have told the Opposition that they have a mandate to govern from the people of South Australia. Yet, the first time the Government has any doubts it does not make a decision but wants the people to decide the matter.

Mr. Ryan: That was part of the mandate.

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Government received a mandate regarding a referendum on corporal punishment? It would not suit honourable members opposite to conduct such

a referendum, because the people would vote against it.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What about egg marketing?

Mr. HEASLIP: When a rather ticklish situation arises, the Government is not prepared to say what is good for the people, and so it decides to hold a referendum.

Mr. Ryan: There is nothing ticklish about this.

Mr. HEASLIP: Why are all honourable members opposite voting for this measure? They are supposed to be free to vote on social matters as their consciences dictate.

Mr. Lawn: Why don't you grow up!

Mr. HEASLIP: Several Government members have indicated that they will oppose a lottery but they do not oppose a referendum.

Mr. Hughes: Only one has said that so far.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know whether one, two, three or four have said it, but I do know that honourable members opposite are 100 per cent behind a referendum, and only 99 per cent behind a lottery. Why do we have this difference? This is a social question on which Government members are allowed to express their own opinions. We on this side are always allowed to do that.

Mr. Lawn: That is why you are so demoralized. Last year you had to do as the master told you, but now that you have a free hand you are demoralized.

Mr. HEASLIP: In all the time I have been in this House I did not know that I had a master. We on this side are democratic. We are free to vote as we like, not only on social questions but on all questions.

Mr. Lawn: Questions such as the gerrymander? That was democratic, wasn't it?

Mr. HEASLIP: That is not related to the matter of holding a referendum. When a Bill for a lottery is introduced I shall have something further to say. We have no Bill for a lottery and I am not in the habit of signing a blank cheque. If a member says tonight that he favours a lottery he will, in effect, be signing a blank cheque. Nobody knows what will be in the Bill dealing with a lottery. I oppose the holding of a referendum on this matter. Indeed, it is a sign of weakness on the part of any Government to go to the people for an opinion on how that Government should legislate, for it really means that it cannot govern. I will not delay the House any longer. I have expressed my opinion, and I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): The House is debating whether we should have a referendum on the matter of lotteries. I do not think one is necessary. A Bill should be introduced and members should vote on whether they favour lotteries. I am in favour of them, because I can see no harm in them. I cannot accept the argument of those who say that by introducing lotteries in this State we are doing something evil. A person can easily get a lottery ticket by buying a 5d. postage stamp and applying for one. The benefit derived from tickets purchased in other States goes to those States, and they have found money for the building of homes for the aged, hospitals and other institutions. Honourable members who have visited Western Australia and Queensland know that homes for the aged have been built from moneys derived from lotteries.

Mr. Ryan: That is very good.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Yes, it is. Although some of the denominations are becoming more active in building homes for the aged than they have been in the past, I do not think enough is being done in South Australia in that regard. If the holding of a lottery provides money for building such homes then I am all for it.

People cannot be prevented from buying a lottery ticket. This is 1965, and most definitely young people of this day and age want to be treated as adults and not as children. Consequently, they can see no harm in buying a 5s. lottery ticket. From this they obtain much pleasure and fun and it does not hurt them two hoots. The controversial question that arises concerns the type of lottery that will be introduced if the referendum is held and people favour lotteries. I have no doubt that the referendum will be carried by an overwhelming majority. I am perfectly free to speak for the people in my district; I have asked them what they feel about the holding of lotteries, and they have said, "Vote for it—we are all with you." That is the opinion of most people in my district. I do not think a referendum is necessary, and my view is that a lottery is all right. It is the Government's policy to have a referendum on this question; that is its affair and I do not argue about it.

Mr. Ryan: It was an election pledge; doesn't the honourable member think we should honour it?

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Maybe it was a pledge. I should like to see a Bill introduced setting out details of a lottery. I take it that the Government will be obliged to introduce a Bill if the referendum is supported by

the people. If a Bill is introduced all members will have the opportunity to move for the insertion of new clauses or to make amendments to it.

Some angles concerning a lottery need to be examined carefully. The tendency today is for the smaller type of lottery (5s. and 10s.) to fill more rapidly than the larger lotteries. That proves that most people in States where lotteries are legal are prepared to accept them. I cannot see how people in the other States are any different from people in South Australia, and they are no more evil than people in this State. I cannot accept that argument at all and do not believe that it is doing any harm. The sooner we have a lottery the sooner will our hospitals and charities, such as, probably, Alcoholics Anonymous and other organizations, benefit. This is a source from which we can help them and, if we can help people in need, I am all for it. People will not be prevented from buying tickets in lotteries. If we do not have a State lottery they will buy a fivepenny postage stamp and invest money in other States. In that way, we would lose the benefit and I cannot see any harm in our having our own lottery. It would provide a lot of fun for the people, an outlet for them, and we should remember that this is the modern age of 1965; we are not away back in 1885.

Let us be modern and let the people get some fun and enjoyment. The first time our young people over 21 years of age go out of the State, the first thing they do is take a lottery ticket. They enjoy looking to see whether they have a number in the frame. We have to guard against conducting a lottery on a scale so small that it will take too long to fill, because if that happens, notwithstanding that we have a legal lottery here, the people of South Australia will go after the bigger prizes in other States. In addition, consideration will have to be given to whether we should do what Tasmania did when that State become an agent of Tattersalls in Victoria and got a percentage of the proceeds. I do not believe that the Government should have introduced a Bill for a referendum; it should have introduced a measure for a lottery straight out. The Government has the mandate from the people to govern and, if it were to introduce a Bill for a lottery, I would vote for it. However, the Government is to have a referendum on it, and I predict that that referendum will be carried by an overwhelming majority.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (20).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey, Clark, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Quirke, Ryan, and Walsh (teller).

Noes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Messrs. Rodda, Shannon, and Stott.

Pair.—Aye—Mr. Corcoran. No—Mr. Teusner.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.10 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 14, at 2 p.m.