

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, October 14, 1965.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL.

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

QUESTIONS

REFERENDUM (STATE LOTTERIES) BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Since the conference in respect of amendments to the Referendum (State Lotteries) Bill, several reports have emanated from the Returning Officer, one such report appearing in this morning's *Advertiser* and purporting to have come from the State Electoral Office. The reports, in my opinion, are not in accordance with the agreement reached at the conference of managers from this House and the Legislative Council. There are two serious defects in the statements that have been made, and I believe it is necessary, if we are to go into conference with another place and to arrive at an agreement, that the terms of that agreement should be scrupulously carried out. I make it clear that I am not in any way charging the Premier with a breach of faith. However, the statements made by officers of the Government are not in accordance with the decisions of the conference and raise the question of what is the position of people elected to attend conferences on behalf of this House if, after an agreement is arrived at, that agreement is deviated from to the slightest degree. Will the Premier obtain from the Crown Solicitor a statement explaining the obligations on people to vote at the referendum, and will he ensure that that statement is given to the Returning Officer and made public so that there will be no misconception of the terms of the agreement made at the conference and so that all people will know their obligations? Further, this will prevent any charge being made by members of another place that this House has not scrupulously honoured the agreement entered into.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am prepared to consult the Attorney-General on the matter

of obtaining a Crown Law opinion. If he considers this to be necessary, we will obtain that opinion and make it known to the House.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The first part of the agreement states:

For the purposes of this section it shall be a valid and sufficient reason for a failure to vote if an elector has a conscientious objection to voting at the referendum.

I emphasize the words "the referendum". I think the House of Assembly managers (of whom I had the honour to be one) left the conference with the firm impression that this related to a point which was specifically raised and which had a particular intent. It was inserted in the agreement as something additional to the usual concept of what is conveyed in the provisions of the Electoral Act, which specifies the categories of conscientious objector. Had that not been so, there would have been no point in the conference's agreeing to insert this point as a special provision in the agreement, because it already existed in the Electoral Act. Indeed, it was not a point at issue at any time in respect of the ordinary interpretation of "conscientious objector". Yesterday's *News* states:

The referendum on whether the Government should conduct a lottery will be held on either November 20 or 27. The Premier said this today.

Then follows this statement, which is not attributed to any particular person:

It was also indicated that "conscientious objectors" would comprise only a handful of *bona fide* members of certain minority church movements and special societies.

In my opinion that is the narrowest—

Mr. Jennings: You can't put an opinion in a question.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I thought we could expect some courtesy in this place.

Mr. Jennings: Ask your question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask his question.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: In view of the obvious intention and of the interpretation placed on the clause by the managers at the conference, does the Premier consider that the statement to which I referred is, in fact, correct, and that it indicates the intention of the managers?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: When I reported the result of the conference to the House yesterday I read the recommendation referred to by the member for Flinders, and

I went on to say that I dissociated myself from interpretations placed on the meaning of "conscientious objector".

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: I heard the Premier say that.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: I didn't hear him.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I am not here to give opinions. I have often told the House I held a certain view, but that is not an opinion. It is not a case of whether we desire to do something in this matter, or whether anybody else desires to do something. A judge is the Chief Electoral Officer of the State, and when that officer has made up his mind as to what should take place, as a result of the conference and its recommendations, we shall all know where we are going. I see no good purpose being served by my expressing a view over and above the view of that officer.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: When I rose to ask my question of the Premier a short time ago I read an extract from yesterday's *News*. In fairness to the Premier, I want to say that I was not aware that he has dissociated himself from the article in the *News*. If I was in the House when he made the statement, it did not register with me. I regret that the Premier may have thought that I had in any way cast doubt upon his meaning in this matter. I am delighted to know that he has dissociated himself from the press report.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Premier issue an instruction that no further unauthorized statements be made until a decision has been given on the meaning of the words agreed upon?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: There will be no statements from me on the matter.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It is the Returning Officer, inspired by another Minister, who does it.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I resent the Leader's implication if it is directed against my colleague, the Attorney-General. If the Leader expects the courtesy of the House to be extended I should think he has had long enough experience in this place to at least extend some courtesy on matters on which heat has been engendered because of differing interpretations. I assure the Leader

that I will make no statement on the referendum until I have been able to obtain a report. I have already said that, if the Attorney-General indicates that it is necessary to obtain an opinion from the Crown Solicitor, he will undoubtedly get one. I will not go to the Crown Solicitor myself because he is not directly under my control; I will have to go through the proper channels, as I always do. I have already stated who is the Chief Electoral Officer, and I do not think any member of this House or another place would suggest that this gentleman could be influenced.

SALISBURY EAST CROSSING.

Mr. CLARK: In this morning's *Advertiser* appeared the following report:

Concern for the safety of 250 Salisbury East children who cross the Main North road twice daily to attend the Brahma Lodge school was expressed at a meeting of the Salisbury Council last night. The City Engineer (Mr. J. Harris) reported to the council that the Road Traffic Board had refused to reduce the speed limit there and that the Highways Department had rejected a request for financial help in providing a temporary pedestrian crossing. Council efforts to have temporary school accommodation east of Main North road had also failed.

Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Roads to call for a report on this matter and to see whether further consideration cannot be given to reducing the speed limit at this crossing and to installing traffic lights? If this move is unsuccessful, will the Minister of Education further investigate the possibility of providing temporary accommodation for these children east of the Main North Road? It has been suggested to me that part of the new Salisbury East High School (which is being built at the moment) might be used for this purpose. I do not know whether that is possible but I should like the Minister's opinion.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to take up the matter with my colleague and to examine thoroughly the point raised by the honourable member.

STRIKES.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier a reply to my question of last week concerning strikes in the building industry?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: After considering the four statutory declarations received by the Chief Inspector of Factories

alleging that strikes had occurred in the building industry, the Attorney-General states:

- (1) There is no evidence that would support a charge that a strike or an act in the nature of a strike is threatened, impending or being done within the meaning of the Industrial Code.
- (2) It is therefore not proper for the Chief Inspector to lay any information concerning allegations of breaches of section 104 of the Code.
- (3) The matters contained in statutory declarations received by the Chief Inspector could not warrant information being laid in respect of offences against any other provisions of the Code.

In view of that advice, no further action in the matter was taken by the Chief Inspector.

TORRENS ISLAND POWER STATION.

Mr. RYAN: Recently, when I visited the new project of the Electricity Trust on Torrens Island, I saw that this enormous project had reached the stage where certain tenders had been let. I imagine that other tenders will be called and major contracts entered into soon. Will the Minister of Works obtain from the trust the names of the successful tenderers for the major projects, and will he also discuss with the trust the question whether, when it calls for tenders for further major projects, favourable consideration will be given to South Australian tenderers whose prices are comparable with those of other tenderers?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will see whether I can obtain the names of the firms that have been accepted as contractors. I am confident that where the work of tenderers was comparable a South Australian firm would certainly be given preference. Nevertheless, I will discuss the matter with the trust and inform the honourable member of the outcome.

SEEDS OFFICERS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Recently I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question concerning the appointment of additional seeds officers for the South-East, and the Minister said certain positions were to be filled. Can he now make a further statement on this matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Two new appointments are being recommended to the Public Service Commissioner today, and one officer will be transferred from the Weeds Branch to the Seeds Branch of the Agriculture

Department. This will mean that we will have three of the four officers required. When applications were called, five people applied, and they are being recommended for interviews by the Public Service Commissioner in the hope that the other officer for the Seeds Branch will be obtained and that the officer being transferred from the Weeds Branch will be replaced.

WOOL PACKS.

Mr. CASEY: Over the past 80 years there has been an agreement between the Victorian and South Australian Wool Buyers Association and the Adelaide Wool Brokers Association (it applies in this State, and I imagine it applies in other States as well) that the weight of a new wool pack is about 11 lb. When a wool pack is filled and sent to the wool stores, the client is automatically deducted an amount in respect of the weight of 11 lb. Over the past few years secondhand wool packs have been used extensively throughout this State. Those packs, of course, were new originally, but some have travelled around the world and when they come back here they are cleaned and sold to the farmers. Although those packs average only about 9½ lb. in weight, the sellers are still being deducted an amount in respect of the new wool pack weight of 11 lb. Will the Premier take up this matter (even on a national scale) to ensure that woolgrowers sending wool to stores in secondhand packs are not charged more than the average weight of a secondhand wool pack (about 9½ lb.) as this could result in a saving of as much as £60 a clip?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will take up this matter and try to get all information possible for the honourable member.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS.

Mrs. STEELE: In the debate on the Estimates I asked for information about the establishment in respect of occupational therapists at the various public hospitals. Has the Premier received this information from the Minister of Health?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The following statement shows the existing establishment in respect of occupational therapists in the various branches of the Hospitals Department:

Title	Classification	Occupant
Royal Adelaide Hospital—		
Occupational Therapist Gr. I	3 S.P. £1,095-£1,298 ..	J. K. Hogarth
Occupational Therapist Gr. I	3 S.P. £1,095-£1,298 ..	Vacant
Queen Elizabeth Hospital—		
Occupational Therapist Gr. I	3 S.P. £1,095-£1,298 ..	M. E. Thomas
Occupational Therapist Gr. I	3 S.P. £1,095-£1,298 ..	Vacant
Mental Health Services—		
Hillcrest:		
Occupational Therapist Gr. I	3 S.P. £1,095-£1,298 ..	Vacant
Occupational Therapist Gr. II	3 S.P. £1,359-£1,481 ..	Vacant
Parkside:		
Occupational Therapist Gr. I	3 S.P. £1,095-£1,298 ..	Mrs. I. W. C. Harley
Occupational Therapist Gr. II	3 S.P. £1,359-£1,481 ..	C. Bearup
Also there is a Mrs. A. J. John who works as a part-time Grade I at Parkside. She is over the approved establishment, but the department advises that she is regarded as occupying one of the positions at Hillcrest.		
Day Hospital:		
Occupational Therapist Gr. I	3 S.P. £1,095-£1,298 ..	Mrs. S. A. Sandiford
Enfield Receiving House:		
Occupational Therapist Gr. I	3 S.P. £1,095-£1,298 ..	Mrs. D. Johnson
Morris Hospital:		
Occupational Therapist Gr. I	3 S.P. £1,095-£1,298 ..	Vacant

A request for the establishment of a school of occupational therapy is currently before the Council of the South Australian Institute of Technology. Whether the Government desires to make any representations to the council in support of such a proposal is a matter of Government policy. No doubt the council would be influenced by the extent of financial support the Government could give because such a course would certainly need a substantial subsidy.

In the meantime, they have three occupational therapy students studying under Government scholarships at schools in other States and, provided suitable applicants are available, additional scholarships will probably be awarded in 1966.

TRAFFIC LIGHTS.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Roads an answer to my question concerning traffic lights in the heart of the city?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague the Minister of Roads assumes that the honourable member's question refers to the disobedience by pedestrians of traffic lights. He reports that under the Road Traffic Act it is an offence for a pedestrian to disobey a signal given by a traffic light. It is also an offence to cross a carriageway outside and within 100ft. of either a pedestrian crossing at which flashing lights are operating or a marked cross-walk adjacent to traffic lights while the lights are operating. The enforcement of these provisions is a matter for the

Police Department, and the board will take up the subject with the Commissioner of Police.

TRAMWAYS TRUST CONTROL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Premier, representing the Minister of Transport, a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the Tramways Trust's taking over control of certain parts of the Tea Tree Gully council area?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: On September 30, 1965, a proclamation was issued under the provisions of the Municipal Tramways Trust Act to extend the trust's control to that portion of the District Council of Tea Tree Gully west of lines drawn from a point one mile due east of the intersection of Greuffell Road and Haines Road to: (1) the junction of the boundaries of the District Council of Tea Tree Gully, the District Council of East Torrens and the Corporation of the City of Campbelltown; and (2) to the junction of the boundaries of the District Council of Tea Tree Gully, the District Council of Munno Para and the Corporation of the City of Salisbury. The proclamation will take effect on and from November 1, 1965.

The Minister of Transport recently requested the Transport Control Board and the Municipal Tramways Trust to conduct a joint investigation as to areas surrounding the metropolitan area where, because of statutory provisions, neither the board nor the trust exercised control over the licensing of passenger bus services or licensing was duplicated by a number of local government authorities. As a result of the investigations it was decided to extend

Municipal Tramways Trust control to portion of the area of the District Council of Tea Tree Gully, with the Transport Control Board being in a position to control the remainder of that council area. The investigations have shown that this action together with a future minor amendment to the Road and Railway Transport Act would provide, for the present, adequate facilities for the control and licensing of passenger services in areas surrounding the metropolitan area.

The proclamation does not mean that at this stage the Municipal Tramways Trust would operate its own buses in the Tea Tree Gully area. Any extension in this direction would depend on factors such as the public interest and whether present services were satisfactory. The District Council of Tea Tree Gully expressed its agreement to the extension of Municipal Tramways Trust control to the above portion of the District Council of Tea Tree Gully.

GEOPHYSICAL ALLOCATIONS.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked during the debate on the Estimates about the reduction in the sum devoted to geophysical surveys?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: My colleague, the Minister of Mines, reports that the reduction in the provision for geological and geophysical surveys by an amount of £49,703 reflects the decision to use only one seismic party instead of two parties as had been possible over the last several years. This decision was forced on the department by the loss of senior staff in the seismic section of the geological survey.

WEST BEACH SANDHILLS.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Recently I have noticed that work is in progress levelling the sandhills adjacent to the West Beach caravan park. As this is a large area, will the Premier seek information from the West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust about its future intentions in respect of the use of this land?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I understood that extensive preparations were being made for further caravan parks. However, I shall be pleased to obtain a report.

ANGLE PARK SCHOOL.

Mr. JENNINGS: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Works about a drainage problem affecting the oval of the Angle Park Girls

Technical High School. Has the Minister a reply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As the honourable member indicated, there is a great drainage difficulty at the Angle Park Girls Technical High School because of the low-lying area. In an endeavour to bring about a more satisfactory drainage system than previously existed, approval has been given for additional expenditure of £500.

WALLOWAY BASIN.

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Mines, a reply on a matter I raised concerning artesian water in the Walloway Basin?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member referred to this matter about a week ago, during the Estimates debate. The Minister of Mines reports that the Mines Department has completed a survey of the Walloway Basin in the Orroroo area, and will shortly commence a drilling programme adjacent to the former Pekina irrigation project. The main problem in developing underground water in this area lies in preventing the very fine sand from entering the bore. Included in the present investigations are some experiments in the use of specially prepared plastic screens made by the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories.

LOXTON HIGH SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Recently, at my invitation, the Minister of Education was good enough to visit the Loxton High School and inspect the damaged walls there. I believe he was rather appalled at what he saw, and he said that he would inquire about having something done. Can he report on what he is prepared to do about the unfortunate damage at the school?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The Public Buildings Department is investigating the matter, and I hope to have a report for the honourable member soon.

QUARRY DAMAGE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: By letter dated August 30 last, I took up with the Minister of Mines on behalf of Mr. J. D. Luscombe of Hawthorndene the matter of damage that Mr. Luscombe alleged had been done to his property and other properties by explosions in a nearby quarry. I received an answer from the Minister dated September 6, in which the Minister said:

The quarry owner has been given definite instructions to prevent flying stones—

that was one of the complaints made—

and also to try to obviate the noise nuisance. The Mines Department is keeping a close watch on the position.

Last evening Mr. Luscombe telephoned me to say that up until yesterday there had been no further trouble but that at about 5.15 p.m. yesterday his wife had heard a loud explosion, had then seen a stone hurtling through the air, had seen it land in the Luscombe property and had heard a couple of other stones fall as well. This is not only dangerous but it is naturally upsetting to Mr. and Mrs. Luscombe and others in the vicinity. Will the Minister of Agriculture take up this matter with the Minister of Mines and ask him to investigate it again to ascertain the position in an effort to prevent this happening again in the future?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

BEDFORD PARK HOME.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Social Welfare say whether, when the Bedford Park Remand Home is closed, the officers at present in control of the home will be placed in positions similar to those they now hold?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We are at present looking to see whether there is any possibility of establishing another institution of the Bedford Park kind, in which case the staff would go over to the new institution. If that is not possible (and so far we have not found suitable premises), they will be absorbed elsewhere in the department. At present there is under-staffing in almost every existing institution of the department. The positions to which the staff will go will be a matter for the Public Service Commissioner rather than for me.

Mr. Rodda: Will they retain their status?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far as possible we would naturally want to see that that occurred.

FESTIVAL OF MUSIC.

Mr. CLARK: Last week I sincerely congratulated the Minister of Education on the beautiful concert at the Festival of Music. For many years I used to try to teach singing—rather unsuccessfully. Can the Minister say whether in future a telecast of the festival could be made, particularly in the interests of country viewers?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I am happy to say that the Schools' Choir Festival this year was recorded by radio station 5AD, and highlights of the programme are to be rebroadcast from 9.35 p.m. to 10 p.m. on Sunday, October 17. The question of a telecast will be examined, and if it can possibly be telecast next year I shall be very happy.

ROLLING STOCK.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Early this session I put questions on notice concerning the South Australian Railways Department. One of these sought information about the height of tunnels and asked whether pick-a-backing of semi-trailers had been considered and, if so, whether we had the right type of vehicle in this State for that purpose. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Transport draw the attention of his colleague to an article appearing at page 3 of *Railways of Australia Network* of September, 1965, which describes a new French type of pick-a-backing called a kangaroo pick-a-back low-loading truck, on to which semi-trailers can be loaded and by means of which clearance heights can be reduced because a well type of truck is used? Will he also ascertain whether in the circumstances the Railways Department might consider the construction of such types of vehicle to enable pick-a-backing of all types of semi-trailer loads of goods that now use the highway between Adelaide and Melbourne and so provide an alternative service by rail as opposed to that now provided by road?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will have the matter investigated and let the honourable member have a reply.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: In the same edition of the railways magazine, I noticed a fine photograph of modern rolling stock built by the New South Wales Railways Department. The photograph depicts a new aluminium-body wheat hopper waggon to serve the New South Wales Grain Elevators Board. Will the Premier ascertain from the Minister of Transport whether the Railways Commissioner has plans to build similar rolling stock?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will obtain a report from my colleague.

BEDFORD PARK UNIVERSITY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: My question is directed to the Minister of Education. During the consideration of the Estimates the question of the halls of residence at Bedford Park was discussed. The Minister then said he would again look at the problem

and make an early statement on it. Has the Minister had a chance to look at this matter, and has he already made a statement?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have made no statement since the Leader raised the question. I am still considering the matter with a view to seeing how much of the Commonwealth grant available within this triennium can be taken up by the State, and I hope that this matter will be determined within a week or so.

KINDERGARTENS.

Mr. COUMBE: Last week I asked a question of the Minister of Education concerning grants for the Kindergarten Union. Has he a reply?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The grant for 1965-66 for the Kindergarten Union of £221,200 is an increase of £7,900 over the grant on the 1964-65 Estimates. Of this, £5,000 is for the normal increase which has been granted in recent years and the remaining £2,900 is to provide additional amounts sufficient to bring the allowances for training kindergarten teachers up to the same relative position as the new teachers college allowances.

PENOLA PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. RCDDA: Can the Minister of Education say whether any progress has been made on additions and repairs at the Penola Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I do not have the information with me at the moment, but I shall be pleased to inquire.

SALISBURY DRAINAGE.

Mr. HALL: Over the last several years negotiations have taken place between the Salisbury City Council and the Government (both the previous Government and, I believe, the present Government) regarding drainage of the Salisbury area and also of the adjacent local government areas. I was associated with a deputation to the previous Government in which the then Premier said that the Government would approve the submission to the Public Works Committee of a comprehensive drainage scheme for the area with a view to establishing a scheme modelled on the south-western suburbs drainage scheme already operating. I believe that since then another deputation (on which I could not attend) was taken to the present Government and that a similar offer was then made. Subsequent to that again, two of the Government's Ministers, in company with the honourable member for Gawler and me, as well as councillors, inspected the work done in the Salisbury City Council

area. As this question of drainage has been raised by constituents in several areas in the southern part of my district, will the Minister of Education ascertain from the Minister of Local Government whether this offer, to subsidize the cost of a comprehensive drainage scheme in this area, still stands, and, if it does, what progress has been made?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to refer this matter to my colleague.

GRASSHOPPERS.

Mr. CASEY: I was informed this morning that large hatchings of grasshoppers had occurred in the Hawker district and that the district council had acted promptly to see that spray was available to property owners. This is a serious matter, as we are having the type of season in the North in which large hatchings occur. It has often happened in the past 10 years that I have been literally wiped out by grasshoppers. Will the Minister of Agriculture ask his officers to keep a close check to see that these hatchings do not get out of hand as they have got out of hand in the past?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will certainly do that, and I thank the honourable member for drawing my attention to this matter. He will recall that a few weeks ago I answered a question from the member for Angas on this matter, and I assure all members that I am anxious to co-operate in every way.

GOODWOOD SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Recently, with the member for West Torrens (Mr. Broomhill), I visited the Goodwood Boys Technical High School and, whilst there, noticed a new art room in the course of construction. The school committee is perturbed that it has not been completed. Can the Minister of Works say when it will be completed? If he cannot, will he obtain a report?

The SPEAKER: Order! When questions are being asked I ask honourable members to assist the Chair by not walking across the Chamber unnecessarily, or in engaging the attention of Ministers. These practices are not fair to members asking questions. The question was addressed to the Minister of Works, and I ask him whether he wishes to reply?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, Mr. Speaker. This building is being constructed in conjunction with the Education Department, and I am unable to give a detailed reply. However, I will inquire and inform the honourable member of the position.

BARLEY.—

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have asked the Minister of Agriculture a series of questions about the receipt and handling of barley at bulk centres this year. Has the Minister a reply to my last question about the relationship of the moisture content of barley tests by two different methods?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: From tests taken on various occasions to determine the variation of moisture content between the ground grain and whole grain method, we have found that, in batches of 50 samples tested, the results show the ground grain method reveals an average higher moisture content of 5.38 per cent than the whole grain method. The determinations have been made by using the Marconi moisture meter and the variations range between .1 per cent of 1 per cent and .9 per cent of 1 per cent, the average, as stated, being 5.38 per cent. In the last batch of 50 samples tested, 25 samples showed a variation of .5 per cent and less, and 25 samples gave a variation of between .6 per cent and .9 per cent. From this it will be seen that it would not be practicable to work on the average variation. On the other hand, if growers worked on the highest variation of .9 per cent of 1 per cent, most growers would be over-estimating the variation, which could be to their disadvantage. As mentioned, the tests carried out have been with the Marconi moisture meter which gives a truly relative comparison. The board has, on occasions, carried out tests comparing Marconi moisture results with another moisture machine, but the variations have been much greater and not as consistent, and it would therefore not be practicable to lay down any fixed or average variation between the Marconi and other types of moisture measuring equipment.

ENGINEERS.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister representing the Minister of Roads ascertain from his colleague the funds allocated to engineers in the eastern and south-eastern regions of the Highways Department's undertakings for the year ended 1964-65 and for the current year?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

ST. KILDA FORESHORE.

Mr. HALL: It has recently been stated in the press that land for depositing rubbish by local councils in South Australia will be running out within the next few years, and that it will be difficult for councils to obtain

suitable areas for depositing destructible refuse. I draw attention to the successful dumping operations taking place in the St. Kilda foreshore area, which is being built up from useless low-lying land to an area useful for recreational purposes. This scheme of rubbish dumping has the highest commendation, I believe, of the health authorities. Will the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government ascertain from his colleague whether, when the need arises, certain councils will be able to make a co-ordinated effort to deposit refuse in the St. Kilda foreshore area?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Yes.

POTATOES.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Last Tuesday the Minister of Agriculture was kind enough to give me an answer (following one given by the Premier in the Minister's absence last Thursday) about the price of potatoes in South Australia. In the course of his reply he said:

I assure the honourable member that what the Premier said last week was perfectly correct. A shortage of potatoes in South Australia definitely exists. It is thought that there is less than 500 tons in the State that have been declared.

I have no doubt that the Minister has seen the report on page 3 of this morning's *Advertiser* to the effect that some growers have been turned away when they have brought their potatoes to Adelaide. As this report is completely at variance with the information given by the Premier and the Minister (and, indeed, with the report from the Potato Board which the Minister read out), will the Minister comment on the press report and, if necessary, seek a further report from the board?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Seeing the article in this morning's *Advertiser*, I called for a report. I find that the gentleman concerned who said he was turned away and told to bring his potatoes back this week was, in fact, told to deliver his potatoes on the Thursday. Through some misadventure (and, I understand, through no fault of his own) he was unable to deliver the potatoes on the Thursday but brought them in on the Friday afternoon when all trading had ceased. Naturally, he had no alternative but to take the potatoes away and to bring them back the following week. This statement of the situation is different from the impression conveyed by the press report.

Sometimes, although a report may be partly true, a misconception can be placed on what is a perfectly legitimate situation. The Potato Board has a job to do, and I have

never endeavoured to interfere with its functioning, as it has a much better understanding of existing situations than I have. At times I have questioned some of its actions, but I have always been given its reasons. The working of the board is complicated, and I believe it could be given further powers. Although I have not taken the matter to Cabinet as yet, I am confident that Cabinet would agree that a representative of the Housewives Association be appointed to the board to represent consumers generally. I believe that such an appointment would have some merit. I have some further ideas that will need investigation with a view to introducing certain legislation. The board does everything in its power to ensure that growers, merchants and consumers receive the best possible consideration, often in difficult circumstances.

ADVANCED EDUCATION.

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Education an answer to the question I asked last week about the Commonwealth Advisory Committee on Advanced Education?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: At the recent conference with Senator Gorton the matter of advanced education and probable developments in South Australia was discussed at some length. As I explained to Senator Gorton, I have appointed an expert committee to consider ways in which advanced education may be developed in this State and to report to me. Until I have received and considered the report fully, I would prefer not to comment about probable long term developments. On the matter of special interim capital grants, I have taken all possible steps to obtain the Commonwealth Government's support for building proposals of the South Australian Institute of Technology. The council of the institute wishes to erect a new building on the Frome Road site and has had sketch plans drawn up for a building likely to cost, with furniture and equipment, about £648,000.

The building is intended to be used in the tuition of degree students and of students in advanced courses other than degrees. The Australian Universities Commission has recognized the need for such a building and as a result of its recommendations the Commonwealth Government has agreed to share with the State pound-for-pound in grants to a total of £438,000, towards the university level proportion of such a building.

Following its consideration of the Martin Report the Commonwealth offered to join with the States in providing grants pound-for-pound

towards urgently needed capital projects for advanced education in the period to December 31, 1966. The total grants envisaged for the South Australian Institute of Technology in this period are £250,000. I have made certain specific proposals to Senator Gorton who appears to have been favourably disposed towards them, and arranged for Dr. Wark to come to Adelaide recently to see at first hand what the institute wishes to do. I am very hopeful that I will hear shortly of the Commonwealth's agreement to join with the State in financing the specific projects submitted.

MAINTENANCE BILL.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This week the Maintenance Bill was discussed at some length at a Party meeting of members of this side, and it was decided that I should ask the Attorney-General whether he would be prepared to delay consideration of the Bill for about 10 days, so that Opposition members might examine one or two of its clauses more closely.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe we can accommodate the Leader by postponing consideration in Committee until the end of next week. However, he will appreciate that this Bill has now been on the Notice Paper for a long time in order to give members as much time as possible to deal with it. It is impossible to make administrative arrangements which were part of the Government's election policy until the Bill goes through.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: It may be helpful if consideration of one or two clauses can be postponed until the rest of the Bill has been considered.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall endeavour to accommodate the Leader in this way. The Juvenile Courts Bill to be introduced this afternoon has some bearing on the Maintenance Act Amendment Bill. I wanted to introduce the Juvenile Courts Bill before we commenced Committee consideration of the Maintenance Bill. Perhaps we can give Opposition members until the end of next week to consider the matter further.

GOODWOOD ROAD.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Roads, a reply to a question I asked arising out of the tabling of the report of the Garden Suburb Commissioner, and concerning the state of Goodwood Road?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Roads, reports that plans for

the reconstruction of Goodwood Road between Daws Road and Grange Road are nearing completion. Work is expected to commence late this financial year.

ELECTRICITY CHARGES.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Premier a further reply to my recent question concerning electricity charges applying to Commonwealth instrumentalities?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Leader's earlier questions were understood to relate to concessions in respect of electricity supplied to Commonwealth instrumentalities, and these were effectively the words he used on October 12 in inquiring whether further information was available. A reference is now made to supplies provided by the Commonwealth. These are different matters. Where the Commonwealth is prepared to assist a local community by supplying electricity to the public the Government is continuing and will continue to provide subsidies to reduce charges to the public in accordance with the formula generally current. It is only in the supply from a private supplier to a Commonwealth instrumentality that the Government is not providing a subsidy on the accounts rendered to such an instrumentality. The Electricity Trust satisfies itself that the charges before subsidy, and accordingly those to the Commonwealth, are not unreasonable in regard to the supplier's costs, and as I pointed out earlier it is a standard arrangement between Commonwealth and State that each shall not expect to gain or lose at the expense or benefit of the other.

HILLS ROAD.

Mr. SHANNON: The Highways Department is busily engaged in building a third lane on certain sections of the Mount Barker Road between Stirling and Aldgate. I do not know how far it is intended to extend this third lane, but problems will arise, as problems have arisen in other States where three-lane highways operate. I have already observed the dangerous situations that can occur when a third lane is operating. Some firm, understandable rule should be laid down before the lane is ready for use so that accidents can be avoided. Will the Minister of Education take up this matter with the Minister of Roads?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to refer it to my colleague.

CITRUS INDUSTRY INQUIRY.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture) laid on the table the report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Citrus Industry in South Australia.

Ordered that report be printed.

JUVENILE COURTS BILL.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to consolidate and amend the law relating to the powers of courts to deal with neglected and uncontrolled children and with certain offences by young persons, and matters connected therewith, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed mainly to consolidate and improve the law relating to the powers of courts to deal with neglected and uncontrolled children and with certain offences by young persons and incidental matters. At present the law relating to these powers of courts is contained in five separate Acts, namely, the Juvenile Courts Act, the Justices Act, the Maintenance Act, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the Children's Protection Act. The fact that this law is so scattered has made it difficult for all concerned in the administration of justice in relation to young persons, including justices of the peace both in city and country areas, to appreciate and understand fully the appropriate powers and procedures of the courts. The provisions of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the Children's Protection Act relating to the corporal punishment of children are being repealed by another measure and are therefore not dealt with in this Bill which, however, will incorporate with improvements the provisions of the present Juvenile Courts Act and the relevant provisions of the Justices Act and the Maintenance Act.

The Bill is also based on a number of recommendations submitted to the Government by the Special Magistrate of the Adelaide Juvenile Court, Mr. J. Marshall, S.M., who made a thorough study of corresponding legislation in England, New Zealand and the other Australian States and consulted a number of persons well qualified on the subject. Amongst the people so consulted was Mr. Scales, S.M., a former magistrate in charge of the Juvenile Court in Adelaide, who has had long experience in this field and who has been associated with work for young people over a long period.

Part I of the Bill, which deals with preliminary matters, consists of clauses 1 to 7. Clause 2 provides that the Act shall come into force on a day to be fixed by proclamation. This will enable the preparation of regulations and forms to be used under the new legislation and will also enable other necessary administrative action to be taken before the Bill becomes law. Clause 3 repeals the present Juvenile Courts Act and certain provisions of the Justices Act which have been incorporated in this Bill with certain improvements. Clause 4 sets out the arrangement of the Bill. Clause 5 contains the definitions necessary for the purposes of the Bill. Some of these definitions are based on definitions and provisions contained in the Maintenance Act Amendment Bill. Clause 6 contains necessary and usual transitional and saving provisions. Clause 7 provides, in effect, that any reference to a juvenile court in any legislation shall be deemed to be a reference to a juvenile court constituted under this Bill.

Part II of the Bill, which deals with the constitution and jurisdiction of juvenile courts, consists of clauses 8 to 13. Clause 8 defines a juvenile court, for the purposes of the Bill, as a court of summary jurisdiction constituted either of a special magistrate or of two justices chosen from a panel of justices prepared in accordance with clause 9, but provides that, where it is not reasonably practicable for a court to be constituted of a special magistrate or of two justices whose names are included in such panel, any two justices may constitute a juvenile court. Clause 9 provides for the preparation by the Attorney-General of the panel of justices who are in his opinion specially qualified to hear and determine proceedings against or in respect of children. Clause 10 re-enacts section 7 of the present Juvenile Courts Act which provides that where a juvenile court is to be held, if there is a special magistrate available, such court shall be constituted of such magistrate and not of justices. Clause 11 provides in effect that a juvenile court must not sit in a building in which any other type of court is sitting, and that a juvenile court within the metropolitan area, as defined, shall sit only in such room or place as is approved by the Minister for the purpose. Clauses 12 and 13 virtually repeat the provisions of section 6 of the present Juvenile Courts Act dealing with the jurisdiction of juvenile courts. In effect, a child must be brought before a juvenile court if he has not attained the age of 18 years unless otherwise provided by the Bill, but no conviction, order

or adjudication of a court shall be invalid by reason only of a contravention of this provision, and any justice may sit in any convenient room or place for the purpose of issuing any process or hearing an application for bail.

Part III of the Bill, which deals with the general procedure and powers of courts, consists of clauses 14 to 24. Clause 14 repeats with minor variations the provisions of section 9 of the present Juvenile Courts Act enabling a case to be referred by one juvenile court to another for hearing. Clause 15 makes provision for two eventualities. First, where, in the course of any proceedings before a court other than a juvenile court, it appears to the court that the person against whom the proceedings were instituted is a child, the court may either proceed with the hearing as if it were a juvenile court or refer the case for hearing and determination by an appropriate juvenile court. Secondly, where, in the course of any proceedings before a juvenile court, it appears to the court that the person against whom the proceedings were instituted had attained the age of 18 years before the commencement of such proceedings, the court may either proceed with the hearing as a court of summary jurisdiction or refer the case for hearing and determination by an appropriate court of summary jurisdiction. Under the present law, difficulties arise in some cases where a juvenile turns 18 during the currency of proceedings, and this will clear the matter up.

Clause 16 deals with the case of a child against whom proceedings are commenced who attains the age of 18 years before the proceedings are finally determined. In such a case the court may deal with him as though he had not attained the age of 18 years. In some cases the completion of the hearing might be delayed and it would be unfair to the defendant if, by reason of such delay, he were to be punished as an adult. Subclauses (2) to (5) of this clause extend the principle to cases where the child attains the age of 18 years before the Supreme Court makes an order upon committal or appeal from a court of summary jurisdiction.

Clause 17 deals with the case where charges are laid jointly against a child and an adult. In such a case a special magistrate will decide whether the interests of justice would best be served by a joint hearing in a juvenile court or an adult court or by separate trials. Clause 18 repeats with minor amendments the provisions of section 14 of the present Juvenile Courts Act enabling a juvenile court, which

finds a charge against a child proved, to refer the case to the Adelaide Juvenile Court to be dealt with. As a matter of practice many such cases are referred, under the existing provision, to the Adelaide Juvenile Court from country courts. Clause 19 enables a court to order the attendance of a parent or guardian at the hearing of proceedings against a child. This provision is considered desirable although in practice most parents or guardians voluntarily attend such hearings. Clause 20 deals with the adjournment of cases and the remand of children to an institution if not allowed to go at large and not released on bail. The provision allows the court, from time to time, to remand a child to an institution or other suitable place (not being a prison) or in the temporary custody of a suitable person for a period not exceeding, in each case, 21 days. Subclause (2) of the clause confers on the court concerned or the Adelaide Juvenile Court power, if necessary, to revoke the order and make another order of a similar kind. Subclause (3) empowers a juvenile court constituted of a special magistrate to remand the child for a period exceeding 21 days but not exceeding 35 days if the child, or his parent or guardian, consents to such remand.

Clauses 21 and 22 repeat with minor amendments the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the present Juvenile Courts Act. They deal with the taking of evidence by a justice from a child who is unable, in the opinion of a legally qualified medical practitioner, to attend the court. Those provisions are seldom used, but it is considered desirable to retain them. Clause 23 enables a court, on its own view, to determine whether a person charged is a child, in the absence of proof of the age of a child. Clause 24 enables a juvenile court to have a child brought before it medically examined where the court has reason to suspect that the child's mental condition is such that he may not have been capable of forming the necessary intention to commit the offence with which he is charged.

Part IV, which deals with special provisions relating to the hearing and determination of charges, consists of clauses 25 to 43. Clause 25 provides that, subject to the provisions of the Bill, the provisions of the Justices Act will apply to the hearing of proceedings in a juvenile court. Clause 26 repeats with minor amendments the provisions of section 17 of the present Juvenile Courts Act. The clause provides that the court shall satisfy itself that a child (not represented by counsel) understands the charge and empowers the court to

cross-examine witnesses and ask questions of the child so that the charge may be fully investigated to the satisfaction of the court. Clause 27 repeats with minor modifications the provisions of section 161a of the Justices Act which enables a child to plead guilty in a juvenile court to any indictable offence (other than homicide). The procedure in such a case will, subject to the Bill, be similar to the procedure for similar cases under the Justices Act. Clause 28 provides that a juvenile court constituted of a special magistrate may, where a child charged with an indictable offence does not plead guilty, decide whether the child should be tried in the juvenile court or in the Supreme Court before a jury. Under the existing law, the parents of the child would have the right to demand a jury trial for an indictable offence even in the case of a child of tender years. As this is clearly undesirable, the clause provides that a special magistrate, who is in the best position to determine the matter, should decide where the child should be tried; but before making his decision, the magistrate is required to take into consideration the representations of all interested parties and make a decision that will best serve the interests of justice, having regard to the age of the child and other relevant factors known to the court. This provision will also enable a court, in a case of serious crime, or where the child is involved with adults, to commit the case to the Supreme Court for trial.

As a juvenile court will have jurisdiction to hear and determine all offences by juveniles other than homicide, the power to try any case of an indictable offence where the child does not plead guilty has been limited to special magistrates. Justices are not equipped to exercise this jurisdiction. In this clause, as in other provisions of this Bill where a juvenile court may exercise far-reaching powers, it has been provided that the trained special magistrate shall have jurisdiction to the exclusion of justices. These provisions involve no criticism of the work of justices, but recognize the fact that it would not be reasonable to expect them to exercise jurisdiction in a field which requires specialist knowledge of the criminal law and the rules of evidence. Clauses 29 and 30 deal with procedural matters relating to the summary trial of offences by children.

Clause 31 allows a juvenile court constituted of a special magistrate, which has found a child guilty of an indictable offence (other than homicide), to exercise a discretion as to whether to sentence the child or commit the

child to the Supreme Court for sentence. Past experience suggests that there will be few occasions on which a magistrate will exercise his power to commit a child to the Supreme Court for sentence and, as in clause 23, the magistrate will be required to exercise his discretion in a manner which will best serve the interests of justice. Clause 32 deals with procedural matters. Clause 33 repeats with amendments the provisions of section 13 of the present Juvenile Courts Act. It enables the court to call for a specialist's report on a child's mental or physical condition, and a general report as to his home environment and history. These reports are of great assistance to the court when considering the question of penalty. Under the present law the child and his parent, guardian or solicitor, must be given the opportunity of seeing any part of a report which is detrimental to the child. Subclause (3), however (and this is a departure which I should draw to the attention of honourable members), will allow the court a discretion as to whether the whole or any part of a report should be withheld from a child. This safeguard is necessary because such reports sometimes contain very personal information regarding the child or his parents which could adversely affect the child if made known to him, and is properly left to the discretion of the court.

Clause 34 empowers a juvenile court which finds a charge against a child proved to apply the provisions of the Offenders Probation Act or order the child to pay a fine not exceeding £50 or, if a lesser maximum penalty is prescribed for the offence, a fine not exceeding that maximum. Subclause (2) enables the court, without recording a conviction against a child, to exercise its powers under subclause (1) or to impose such penalty or make such other order as it could have done if it had convicted him of the offence charged. This is an important consideration, as a conviction for an offence can have far-reaching and disastrous effects on the life of a child and his rehabilitation especially at the stage when he is seeking employment. Under the clause the court will exercise its discretion on the question of penalty without being bound by the minimum penalty (if any) prescribed for the offence alleged against the child.

Clauses 35 and 36 contain provisions which govern the manner in which children found guilty and convicted of an offence are to be dealt with by a juvenile court. They provide that a court constituted of a special magis-

trate will have power to commit a child so convicted to a reformatory institution, or to place him under the control of the Minister until he attains the age of 18 years, but if the child is over 16 years, he can be committed to a reformatory institution or placed under the control of the Minister until he attains the age of 18 years or for any period not less than one year nor more than two years, so long as the period does not expire before he attains the age of 18 years.

Clause 37 precludes a juvenile court constituted of justices from committing a child to a reformatory institution. This is another clause which limits the power of justices. It is not intended as a reflection on the ability of justices but a recognition of the fact that the making of an order of this kind is more appropriately a matter for a special magistrate who, because of his special training and experience, will be in a better position to determine whether or not a child should receive corrective training in an institution.

Clause 38 confers on a juvenile court, upon a charge against a child being proved, power to make an order disqualifying the child from holding or obtaining a licence to drive a motor vehicle if the court is satisfied, having regard to all the facts before the court, that the child is not a fit and proper person to hold or obtain such a licence. Under the Road Traffic Act such a disqualification can be imposed only upon conviction of an offence involving the use of a motor vehicle. The clause provides that the court may make an order of disqualification without necessarily convicting the child. This provision is widely supported by persons concerned in the administration of justice and road safety. Many responsible persons are of the opinion that the age for obtaining a driver's licence in this State should be raised from 16 years to 17 years, but it is considered that this provision would more fairly deal with those young persons who demonstrate the fact that they are too irresponsible to be trusted with a licence, rather than penalize the majority of young licensed persons who cause no trouble. We have had reports from the Commissioner of Police that demonstrate there is no discernibly higher rate of offence against the Road Traffic Act amongst persons of 16 years than amongst persons in other age groups. I think this provision will be much more effective.

It is also considered that a disqualification from obtaining a licence, even for a short period, would have an excellent deterrent effect

on juveniles, and would be much more effective as a punishment than a fine. Clause 39 confers on a juvenile court constituted of a special magistrate the powers of a court under sections 77 and 77a of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. Those sections give courts certain powers in respect of persons (including children) suffering from venereal disease and those who are found to be incapable of controlling their sexual instincts. The clause provides that these powers may be exercised by the juvenile court without necessarily convicting the child.

Clause 40 empowers a juvenile court to award compensation, not exceeding an amount of £200, against a child and his parents or guardian, where the child has been proved guilty of any offence involving loss or damage to any person. In this State the courts already have certain powers to award compensation, for example, following conviction for an offence involving wilful damage to property, damage to a vehicle when it is illegally used, assault, etc., and there is no reason why the same principle should not be extended to all offences involving loss or damage to any person. The amount which may be awarded is (subject to the limit of £200) left to the discretion of the court and will depend on the particular circumstances of each case. It has been found that the parents or guardian of a delinquent child are usually willing to assist in making restitution, but it is more desirable to empower the courts to make an order against them which can be enforced, if necessary. At present the courts are sometimes obliged to accept a promise by a parent which may or may not be honoured.

In some cases in the magistrates' courts a child has been released on a bond after an assurance has been given that restitution will be made. There have been cases where promises of restitution have not been honoured, and this provision will make it possible to see that there is enforcement of the promise of restitution. The amount of £200 has been prescribed as being a reasonable limit to the operation of the clause. Section 4 of the Offenders Probation Act contains a similar provision limited to £200. In the case of damage caused to a vehicle while it is used illegally, a court has power under section 44 of the Road Traffic Act to order such a sum as the court thinks proper by way of compensation for any loss or damage suffered by the owner.

Clause 41 allows a Supreme Court judge on conviction of a child for an offence (other

than homicide) to exercise the powers of a juvenile court constituted of a special magistrate, or to refer the case back to a juvenile court for sentence if the judge feels so disposed. This alternative power would be needed only in rare cases, but it is considered to be a desirable provision in case a judge should consider that it is a proper case to be referred back to the juvenile court. Clause 32 deals with the powers of the Supreme Court in respect of a child found guilty of homicide (other than murder). The judge is given a discretion to punish the child within the limits provided for the offence under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, or to exercise the powers of a juvenile court constituted of a special magistrate in a case of any offence punishable by imprisonment.

Clause 43 repeats with minor amendments the provisions of section 24 of the present Juvenile Courts Act. The clause, however, limits application to the offence of murder. Part V, which deals mainly with neglected and uncontrolled children, consists of clauses 44 to 52. Clause 44 is consistent with sections 102, 103 and 106 of the Maintenance Act. It sets out the powers of a juvenile court in relation to neglected and uncontrolled children. Such children may be committed to an appropriate institution or placed under the control of the Minister. In either case the child will become a State child under the provisions of the Maintenance Act and the Minister will become responsible for his or her welfare. In this type of case it sometimes becomes apparent to the court that all the child requires is a short period of detention or control and subclause (5) allows the court to adjourn the case to give the child, and sometimes his parents, the opportunity of correcting bad habits without the necessity of making a final order by virtue of which the child would become a State child for a lengthy period. The clause contains adequate safeguards to enable the Minister to exercise effective control of the child during the period of the adjournment and, depending on the child's progress, the court has power to dismiss the charge or make an order under subclause (1).

Clause 45 provides that a child found to be neglected or uncontrolled is not to be regarded as having committed an offence. I draw the attention of the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke) to this provision. Subclause (2) allows the court to determine a complaint charging a child with being neglected or uncontrolled in the manner which appears to the court to be in the best interests of the

child. Clause 46 is consistent with sections 111 and 112 of the Maintenance Act as amended by the amending Bill introduced during this session, so far as neglected and uncontrolled children are concerned, except that an uncontrolled child cannot be sent to a reformatory institution except where a special magistrate considers that the child ought to be sent to such an institution. Clause 47 provides that a juvenile court constituted of justices cannot send an uncontrolled child to a reformatory institution. This is in line with the policy explained earlier in relation to orders of committal to reformatory institutions.

Clauses 48, 49 and 50 relate mainly to procedural matters in connection with the apprehension and taking of proceedings against neglected and uncontrolled children. Clause 51 is in line with the provisions of the Maintenance Act, as amended, which enables a court to further remand a child under the age of 12 years without requiring his or her attendance before the court. This is an important provision. Unfortunately, under the present provisions, children have to be brought before the court when a further remand is made, if they are neglected or uncontrolled. Sometimes we find the present juvenile courts building cluttered up with bevvies of young children from various institutions, such as Seaforth Home, whom it is required should be brought to the court in order to make an order that they should go away to the home for a further period before being dealt with. This will obviate the manifest inconvenience of that procedure. Clause 52 is in line and consistent with the effect of section 108 of the Maintenance Act. It enables the court to receive as evidence any report from a member of the Police Force or an officer of the Department of Social Welfare and contains safeguards similar to those contained in clause 33. Part VI of the Bill deals with appeals from, and reconsideration of penalties by, juvenile courts and consists of clauses 53 to 55. Clause 53 allows a Supreme Court judge when hearing an appeal from a juvenile court to make any order that could have been made by a juvenile court constituted of a special magistrate.

Clause 54 is an important addition to the law in that it allows a juvenile court to review its own decision on the question of penalty. Under the existing law the only way in which a sentence can be reviewed is by appeal to the Supreme Court. It sometimes happens that an incorrect order is made by a juvenile court (that is, incorrect for the benefit of the child,

in all the circumstances), or that the circumstances relating to the child change materially after an order has been made. In either case it is desirable that there should be some easy and inexpensive means of obtaining a review of the order. Under the clause an order may be reviewed by the court which made it or by the Adelaide Juvenile Court. The clause contains certain safeguards as to time limits and prevention of overlapping between an application for reconsideration to a juvenile court and an appeal to the Supreme Court. The clause also provides that the Adelaide Juvenile Court may entertain an application by an officer of the Social Welfare Department for reconsideration after the expiration of the time limit for appealing against the order or making an ordinary application for reconsideration. This provides an additional safeguard to correct an invalid order after all other remedies are no longer available. Rights of appeal to the Supreme Court are preserved except in the case of an application by an officer of the department to the Adelaide Juvenile Court after all rights of appeal have expired.

Clause 55 repeats with minor alterations the effect of sections 21 and 22 of the present Juvenile Courts Act. The clause enables the courts to rectify any errors made in the belief, subsequently found to be wrong, that a person is over or under the age of 18 years. Part VII of the Bill, which consists of clauses 56 to 68, contains general provisions. Clause 56 makes it clear that a juvenile court is not an open court and that only persons directly concerned in the case before the court are entitled to be present. Subclause (2) provides that the court may order a child or his parents or guardian to retire from the courtroom during the hearing or any part of the proceedings. This power is necessary as it happens, not infrequently, that a child or his parent or guardian wishes to say something to the court in the absence of the other. Clause 57 re-enacts the provisions of section 23 of the present Juvenile Courts Act which provide that a child under eight years of age cannot be found guilty of any offence.

Clause 58 is consistent with section 111 of the Maintenance Act so far as it concerns the committal of convicted children to reformatory institutions. Clauses 59 and 60 relate to procedural and administrative matters and are consistent with the existing provisions of the Maintenance Act. Clause 61 deals with the punishment of persons who fail to comply with an order or judgment of a court of

summary jurisdiction. The clause is consistent with subsection (2) of section 113 of the Maintenance Act and enacts with minor alterations the substance of sections 92a and 92b of the Justices Act. These sections of the Justices Act are being repealed by clause 3 and the schedule of this Bill. The clause contains necessary powers to enforce orders for the payment of fines and other monetary penalties. Clause 62 is consistent with section 105 of the Maintenance Act and with the Maintenance Act Amendment Bill, and enables the court, in certain circumstances, to punish the parent or guardian of a neglected or uncontrolled child or a child offender where the default of the child was due to some fault of the parent or guardian.

Clause 63 relates to procedural matters and is consistent with section 179 (1) of the Maintenance Act. Clause 64 deals with the publication of reports of proceedings in juvenile courts or in the Supreme Court on appeal or committal from juvenile courts. The existing provisions of section 12 of the Juvenile Courts Act have been expanded to cover publication by radio and television in addition to publication in newspapers. The clause enables publication unless the court otherwise orders, but, unless permitted by virtue of a court order, the name, address or school of the child concerned must not be revealed.

Clause 65 deals with the use of forms and needs no explanation. Clause 66 is consistent with section 205 of the Maintenance Act which provides that before a warrant for the apprehension of a child is issued the complaint must be substantiated to the satisfaction of the justice on oath. Clause 67 contains the regulation-making powers, and clause 68 provides for the summary disposal of offences against the Bill. The schedule repeals certain provisions of the Justices Act which have been incorporated in this Bill, or relate to corporal punishment of children, or are inconsistent with this Bill.

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

HIDE, SKIN AND WOOL DEALERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINISTERS).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 2130.)

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): Unlike some legislation that has been introduced this session, this Bill is remarkably short. It does not go to 444 clauses and 600 pages or something like that; it is short and to the point. The Bill's principal features are contained in clause 3, which provides simply that there shall be nine instead of eight Ministers in the State and six instead of five Ministers in this House. I think I can truthfully say that the House has seen the Bill before. We could say it is almost a hardy annual, as we saw it last year and the previous year. As I have said before in the House, I believe it is necessary that the State should have sufficient Ministers to enable the functions of Government to be properly carried out.

When I previously introduced a Bill in, I think, precisely the same form as this Bill, I made no excuses for introducing it. I confess that I have not changed my mind. The Cabinet should be able to cover the functions that the increasing development of the State makes necessary. For that reason, I say at the outset that I support the Bill. The number of matters that rightly fall within the scope of the Government and under the consideration of Parliament is also increasing. There is not the slightest doubt that the Government is dealing with many matters now that it did not deal with a few years ago. For instance, I remember when the State had no function at all with regard to housing, which was regarded entirely as a matter for financial institutions and for private arrangement. Today, however, the State is involved in a big way with housing. Experience has shown that many functions have to be guided rather than allowed to grow haphazardly. Therefore, I believe that no apology is necessary from this Parliament for the appointment of an additional Minister.

When the Premier announced his new portfolios I said then (and I say it again now) that it was not reasonable to expect any Minister to carry out the functions of agriculture and lands under the one portfolio. The volume of work in the Lands Department (and I associate with that irrigation and other branches of this type of work) has grown considerably. I speak with experience,

as I was employed in the Lands Department for one year. The work of this department represents a full-time job for any Minister if he is to do the job properly and provide for the development that I believe is necessary in the interests of the State as a whole. Similarly the work of the department of the Minister of Agriculture, with which I associate forests and other branches of primary production, is a full-time job, and no Minister could be expected to undertake, part-time, the work of this portfolio, particularly when it is associated with the Lands portfolio.

These two departments are of tremendous importance to the welfare of the State. We rely on these departments for the export production and earnings that make it possible for us to enjoy the standard of living we enjoy. The Labor Party has a good record in some matters but it has a bad record in this regard. The usual practice of the Labor Party in the past has been to lump the portfolios of Lands and Agriculture together. That has been a feature of Labor Administration in this State over the years except for one brief occasion when, as a temporary measure, the Lands and the Agriculture portfolios were held by two Ministers. It is entirely wrong for these two departments to be administered by one Minister because they are not minor departments. Although I give all credit to the importance of the Education and other departments, none of them can tick successfully unless the State has modern practices developed on its farms and unless it has successful occupation of its large areas of Crown lands. I make it clear to the Premier and to honourable members opposite that my support of this Bill has the reservation that an amendment shall be accepted to make it clear for all time that the Agriculture Department shall be under the control of one Minister and the Lands Department under the control of another Minister. I believe it is essential that this should not be left to future exigencies, and therefore my acceptance of this Bill is conditional on the acceptance of an amendment to provide for that. I believe this is something that we should insist upon.

I realize that our secondary industries are of growing importance, but I consider that there should be at least two Ministers with a voice in the Government on behalf of rural activities and functions. I regret that it is necessary to outline this amendment. However, I repeat that the present position is not something that has been forced upon the Government

or the Premier; it is something that has happened before. If, as the Premier has stated in his second reading explanation, it is desirable to separate the control of these two departments, the amendment will not cause him any problem. However, when the amendment comes up for discussion we will discover whether the separation is intended to be only temporary. Subject to the amendment, I support the second reading, and I will support the third reading if these two portfolios are so separated.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: Surely that's not a threat.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: No, it is a promise. The amendment in itself should not cause the Government any problem.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: You would like the Bill to go through the Committee stages now, would you?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: That would be all right with me, although I do not wish to stop other members speaking on the Bill if they wish to do so. It is essential that we provide adequately for our rural industries. I introduced legislation twice previously to increase the size of the Cabinet, but on both occasions we did not have a constitutional majority and the Bill lapsed. I hope that this Bill will pass, in view of the great importance of the rural areas and the export income we derive from them.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I have pleasure in supporting the amendment spoken to by the Leader. I agree entirely with the principle of this Bill, and I say this for three reasons: first, I believe the present Minister of Agriculture and Lands is grossly over-worked, and that this may have some effect on his health and efficiency; secondly, I believe that these two portfolios require separate Ministers, and I trust that this is in the mind of the Government; and, thirdly, I have consistently supported in this House an increase in the size of the Ministry to nine. In fact, I did this as recently as February 18 last year.

We all know that the duties and responsibilities of Ministers are increasing year by year. This is because of the increased Loan and Budget funds to be handled, more activities in their departments, the branching out into many more facets of administration, and, of course, the larger staff under their control. I think this is especially important in respect of the two portfolios covering rural matters. Although a city member with little of rural interest in my district, I realize the significance and importance of these portfolios to the welfare of the State. Honourable members

have heard me in the House advocating the expansion and encouragement of secondary industry, and it is my pleasure now to support a move which I believe will help promote primary industry.

We all know that a similar Bill was introduced by my Party in the previous Parliament. At that time emphasis was distinctly placed on the desirability of a ninth Minister to concentrate on attracting and assisting secondary industry to come to this State.

Mr. Freebairn: One could make out a good case for a tenth Minister.

Mr. COUMBE: That may be so. At that time the previous Government had separate Ministers administering the Agriculture and Lands Departments. Subsequent to the election, on the re-arrangement of portfolios by the present Government, we heard very little (in fact, nothing at all) about the Minister who was to devote his time specifically to the encouragement of secondary industry, and it would appear that the cadre to assist in this work was absorbed in the new Premier's Department under the administration, care and nurture of the present Premier. Instead, we found that the portfolios of Agriculture and Lands were merged into one. Therefore, we saw a different set of circumstances entirely from that which existed when the Bill was introduced by the previous Government last session. Instead of being discharged by a Minister of Secondary Industry, these duties were absorbed into a small section under the control of the present Premier, and the Ministries of Agriculture and Lands were joined, perhaps to the detriment of the two departments, to the functioning of the personnel in the departments, and to the services the departments give to the State. I recall vividly that, during the debate on the Bill introduced by my Party, member after member of the Labor Party spoke against the Liberal Government's suggestion of a ninth Minister.

Mr. Millhouse: Did they say what grounds they gave?

Mr. COUMBE: Yes. The Bill was defeated by the Speaker, who gave a casting vote on the third reading. Perhaps this was much to the surprise and consternation of Labor members then in Opposition, who speciously argued that they would not agree to a ninth Minister being appointed until the number of members in the House had been increased. They forgot that at that time we had introduced a Bill to increase the number from 39 to 42. The irony of it is that now the same position exists with the numerical

strength of the House being 39, but the Government has introduced a Bill to create a ninth Minister, and has another Constitution Bill to increase the number of members of the House. This, of course, has not been passed and there is no guarantee that it will be any more than was the Bill the former Government promoted.

I support the principle of the Bill, but will vote for the Leader's amendment. The duties for which Ministers are responsible have increased enormously and warrant an extra Minister, as the last increase in the number of Ministers occurred some years ago. The main purpose of the Leader's amendment is to ensure that in the allocation of duties to the ninth Minister there will be two separate Ministers administering the rural portfolios of Lands and Agriculture. On February 18, 1964, the member for Hindmarsh (now a senior member of Cabinet) said:

We have been told that a new Minister is needed, but the duties that he will perform have not been outlined although many suggestions have been made about what he will do.

Surely the same position exists today. No indication has been given as to which portfolio will be allocated to the ninth Minister. We hope and trust that the Government will appoint a Minister to control one of the rural portfolios, and so relieve the present Minister of some onerous duties he is performing. I am also concerned at the comment by the member for Enfield during the debate on the Bill introduced by the previous Government. Now, in the new regime he has been promoted to Government Whip and we congratulate him on his elevation and on the way he is performing his duties.

Mr. Freebairn: The Minister-elect, perhaps?

Mr. COUMBE: I know there are many heirs-apparent, but with his apt comment, the member for Enfield, when speaking on the merging of the portfolios of Agriculture and Lands, said, "Why can't Lands and Agriculture be co-ordinated?" That is what worries me, and these comments are no doubt the reasons for the amendment. Opposition members will support wholeheartedly the appointment of a ninth Minister. We tried to do it, but were prevented by the tactics of the then Opposition. It is in the interests and welfare of the people of this State (and an important section of the people) that we should have two separate Ministers administering the portfolios of Agriculture and Lands, and I say this is a member representing city interests.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): Members on this side have often thought it necessary to say that the members on the opposite side are capricious. They do not usually agree with us when we make that charge, but on this occasion they must admit that they have slipped a little, because the Government is introducing a Bill which we welcome but which they, for several years, have capriciously blocked for reasons unconnected with the good government of South Australia. "Caprice" comes from the Latin word meaning a goat, which is an animal remarkable for its freaks. A freak is a sudden turn of the mind without apparent motive, a whim, a mere fancy.

Mr. Jennings: Now I know why you were born under Capricorn.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I doubt if one could get a more accurate description of the attitude of the Government on this question. When the Premier introduced the Bill he was aware that for several years his Party had blocked this measure, and he considered it necessary to say that he had done so, because he said:

I frankly admit having opposed similar legislation last session, and I gave as a reason then my belief that executive control should not be extended further without an increase in the number of members of Parliament. Although I do not object to criticism of the Government on account of the amalgamation of the portfolios of Lands and Agriculture, I do not want it said that I have overloaded one Minister to the extent that his health must suffer.

That is the nearest thing to an apologia that one is likely to get from the Premier in this respect, but I recall one or two things the Premier said when dealing with the Constitution Bill last year. Surprisingly, the then Leader of the Opposition was the only speaker on his side of the House. He said:

It is all very nice to get on the band waggon, wave a big flag, and say we are going to give so many hundreds of pounds to this and £1,000 to something else; but there is a Parliament and, if Parliament cannot deal with the matter, why do we have to seek another Minister to further Executive control? You, Mr. Speaker, know as well as I do that too many such pronouncements are made from the other side of the House. Apparently, Parliamentary life is a very good social life as long as one does not have to sit in Parliament. Apparently it is all very nice to have an Executive, to further increase the Executive power, and then to come along and ask Parliament to agree to what the Executive has done. A halt must be called to this practice, and it is about time the Government itself considered the matter.

Later the then Leader of the Opposition said:

On broad principles, there is no getting away from the fact that there is too much Executive control to grant the appointment of another Minister.

Mr. Millhouse: You will make some of the aspirants cry in a minute if you go on with this.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: It is necessary to point these things out to the Government when it behaves as irresponsibly as it has behaved in this matter. We on this side are consistent in our view that a ninth Minister should be appointed, but this matter was a political plaything of the Government when it was in Opposition, and it still is now that it is in office. The member for Mitcham who has just interjected made a prophetic statement last year when he said:

The opposition to this Bill is a far better example of playing politics than anything I have known in this House during the nine years I have been a member.

That statement could scarcely have been more dramatically verified by the Government's action on this occasion. In the previous debate the then Leader of the Opposition, complaining that not sufficient members of the then Government side had spoken, said:

When we consider the number of silent members on the other side, very little debate is heard from the Government. This is not consistent with true democracy.

As if to throw the then Leader into confusion, not one other member on his side spoke in that debate. Those members who were so silent and apparently very undemocratic got away without saying anything that could be held against them later. The voting against the creation of a ninth portfolio on that occasion was as follows: Mr. Burdon (in the House this session), Mr. Bywaters (now on the front bench), Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hurst, and Hutchens (now a Minister), Mr. Langley, Mr. Lawn and Mr. Loveday (now a Minister), Mr. McKee (listening to the debate today), Mr. Riches (now the Speaker), Mr. Ryan, Mr. Frank Walsh (teller), and Mr. Fred Walsh—all good democrats who could not think of anything to say, but who were happy to vote against the measure. Now they ask us would we mind considering the Bill again; it was all a big mistake, and they agree that we need a ninth Minister. Naturally inspired by hope, all these members are looking forward to the creation of a ninth portfolio. Somebody has to be disappointed, but let us hope that whoever is disappointed will not take it too much to heart.

Mr. Millhouse: It will be more than one, I think.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: During an even earlier debate than the one to which I have referred, much the same things were said, and almost the same attitude was taken. The then Leader of the Opposition said:

This Bill seems to be just so much window dressing by the Government, for it is not necessary.

That was in the 1963-64 session. The present Minister of Works at the time said:

I oppose the second reading.

The present Minister of Agriculture said:

I oppose this Bill. I appreciate the amount of work they (the Ministers) do, but, nevertheless, while the House is constituted as it is, with only 39 members, my Party and I feel there is no justification for increasing the Executive control.

I like this phrase "Executive control". I have never seen so much of it exercised as has been exercised in the last six months (and as I have been able to demonstrate previously). We on this side have not changed our view: we think a ninth Minister is necessary. My Leader properly advanced the theory that it had been a practice of Labor Administrations to combine the portfolios of Agriculture and Lands. However, we must insist that those portfolios be separated, and I expressed this view during the Address in Reply debate. Actually, I believe that the order of seniority in Cabinet puts the one Minister holding those two portfolios into the most junior Cabinet position. Whether that makes any difference or not I do not know, but I believe it is correct. The Minister of Agriculture and Lands is the most junior in precedence of the present eight members of the Cabinet.

Mr. Jennings: That applied last year.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No, it did not.

The Hon. Frank Walsh: Wasn't the Lands portfolio the most junior last session.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: In the former Ministry the Minister of Agriculture was about fifth in position, I think, and the Minister of Lands eighth. This Government has been able so to improve on this situation that it can combine the two portfolios, giving them to the one man, as well as putting him at the bottom of the class. We desire to ensure that that person will not continue to carry those two burdens. I am sure he realizes the importance of those two portfolios. He, as Minister of Lands, is the biggest landlord in the State and, through the Agriculture Department, he has a tremendous responsibility for the progress of the State.

His other portfolios are by no means light ones, either. Even as capable as a Minister can be, he cannot be in every place at once, and no doubt the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Agriculture are required to be in different parts of the State simultaneously. Two Ministers are certainly needed so that these two portfolios can be separated. This is in line with what has become the traditional practice of one man being responsible for Lands and another responsible for Agriculture. The Opposition supports the Bill, and we are glad to see that the Government has come to realize that the appointment of an additional Minister is necessary, but what a pathetic way to do it! I wish that the Government would occasionally admit that it has made a mistake. I support the second reading.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): Honourable members are well aware that this is the third occasion on which a Bill to achieve this objective has been introduced in this place. It now looks as though the Bill will succeed, and I am pleased that this is so. On the last evening of the last session of the previous Parliament a Bill on this subject was still on the Notice Paper, having been there some time. At about 2 a.m., after having had the adjournment on the Bill for practically the whole session, I rose to speak on it. However, I think that members at that time were all in agreement that although it may have been the place to pursue this matter it was not the time, as it was the last few minutes of the Parliament. We all knew full well that the Government did not have sufficient supporters to form a constitutional majority, and the then Opposition had expressed its opposition to the Bill. Therefore, there was no point in making a powerful speech on the matter at that time. So there the matter rested.

The views of members on this side at this time are the same as they were when we unsuccessfully moved in this direction twice during the previous Parliament. I believe that those who have had experience in Parliament appreciate the heavy duties that devolve on all Ministers. I believe the members of the present Government now agree with this even if, perhaps, they did not agree before. Very often people outside Parliament regard the life of a member of Parliament or of a Cabinet Minister as being wrapped up in glamour. Seeing that we have journeys to other States to attend conferences and so on, they have the impression that it is great fun without, perhaps, much work attached to it.

Mr. Hughes: They are very much mistaken.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I could not agree more. Occasionally, of course, one is honoured and perhaps a little proud to be a Minister of the Crown. However, the duties, concerns and worries of the office often lie heavily upon one. Of course, there is some sense of achievement. Although I found the work of a Cabinet Minister extremely onerous and sometimes a little prejudicial to my general health and well-being, I also had a sense of accomplishment when I observed the way the State was growing, the progress being made, and the activities of Government departments which contributed so substantially towards that progress. There was a sense of satisfaction in feeling that one had had a hand in framing and guiding these important and significant enterprises. The sense of achievement that comes to any genuine person is a material compensation for the work and worry involved in the office.

When this matter was previously before the House I asked people in my office to take out some statistics, which I intended to use to illustrate to the House just what the duties of a Minister were. I shall recapitulate a few of those facts. The important dockets registered into and out of the office numbered no fewer than 16,000 a year. They were the significant dockets and, of course, there were thousands of contract documents, for example, all of which had to be processed in the office and signed by the Minister, and these were not included in the figure. Thousands of loose sheets of papers and memoranda passing between Ministers and members of Parliament also had to be dealt with. In addition, there was the work of Cabinet which was computed to amount to not less than 5,000 Cabinet decisions a year on separate matters covering business negotiations, policy decisions, and decisions on legislative matters. Executive Council had 50 to 60 meetings each year. Also, there was the work in Parliament during the time the House was sitting, answering questions, steering Bills through the House, organizing the business of the House and ensuring that a Minister was always present on the front bench. Then there was the general administrative work of a Minister which was, to put it modestly, enormous.

Of course, it is not just a question of picking up a docket and signing it, although this applies in routine matters. As one's experience lengthens so one begins to appreciate the background of particular dockets, and it does not take a long time then to come to a decision and pass on the docket. However, there are

hundreds and, perhaps, thousands of curly ones that require study and a good deal of judgment and homework before a decision can be made. Many require hours of consideration and consultation with officers, colleagues, people in the departments and people outside. Therefore, the administrative work of a Minister is extensive. Finding it impossible to cope with the work in anything like ordinary working hours, I had to be in the office early in the morning and to go back again after dinner at night two or three times each week when the sittings of the House permitted that to be done.

I do not want to labour that matter, because there have been Ministers of the Crown since time immemorial and every one of them has experienced this problem, so no-one, present or past, is necessarily a hero because he lived through that sort of experience. However, it is a fact that as the scope and sphere of Government activity in the community grows, so must necessarily the work of a Minister grow with it. One has only to review the fields of Government activity now and compare them with the fields in which Governments operated a decade or a quarter of a century ago to realize just how much more is expected of a Government in these days than was required of it at the turn of the century.

May I mention, for example, just the one matter of housing. During my earlier years in this place, about 15 years ago, the housing of the people generally was then only really beginning to become a Government responsibility. In pre-war days it had always been regarded as being the private individual's responsibility to find a home for himself, to find the finance to build it, and generally to make his own provision. I know that there were Acts to assist, but the activity of Government in housing is an illustration of the growth of Government activity in other spheres, and I think it is an example of the additional calls made upon Governments on behalf of the people generally. Therefore, it necessarily follows that, if Parliament is expected to take a greater interest, Governments must take a greater interest and responsibility, and that devolves on Cabinet as individuals and as a whole. It is some years now since an alteration was made to the size of Cabinet in this State, and I believe (as I believed it two years ago) that it is high time we afforded some relief and provided some additional strength in the Ministry in order to cope with the increased responsibilities.

I support this Bill with a little bit of grim humour, in so far as it was ardently desired by the previous Government but was not

acceptable at that time to the then Opposition. I am not sore about this, but it is rather interesting that within six months of the arrival of a new Government the duties and responsibilities of Cabinet have been seen by a new group of people in another light, and they are now asking us to do (as we are prepared to do) something which they in their time were not prepared for us to do. The reason given at that time was that they desired changes to be made in the Constitution of the House, and, until that was done, they were not prepared to agree to more Ministers being appointed. I could not agree with that opinion, but nevertheless that opinion prevailed. I do not see that the activities of Government have grown so rapidly in the last six months as to produce any marked change in the situation from the point of view of the responsibilities of the Ministers. In fact, if I wanted to be political in this matter I might say that it appeared to me that perhaps there was rather less activity on some fronts now than there had been previously. However, this is not intended to be a political speech, so I will not develop that idea; but I could develop it if anybody chided me into doing so.

Mr. Clark: We're not going to.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I thought the member for Gawler was anxious to say something. I accept what he has said as an indication, perhaps, that he is a little unwilling to compel me to develop this theme. However, I do not intend to do so. I agree with what the Leader has said regarding the separation of the offices of the Minister of Lands and the Minister of Agriculture. I was one who in the Address in Reply debate this session criticized the composition of the Ministry, and I was taken to task by some members opposite for so doing. I said that whereas in the previous Cabinet there were about seven farmers (or people with a close association with the land) out of eight, there were at present none. Perhaps I was a bit hard in saying that, and I was certainly criticized for saying it. However, I did consider that the Hon. Mr. Bywaters, who was made Minister of Lands and Minister of Agriculture and associated portfolios, had been given a task which was (I thought at the time) probably beyond his capacity to perform. I believed that it was a job that was more than could be expected of any one person, and I think the Minister realized, soon after he assumed his responsibilities, that there was some truth in my remarks. I take this opportunity of saying that I believe he has carried out the functions of his office extremely

well. I have said this to him privately and I take the opportunity of saying it to him publicly. I believe he has grappled with a gigantic task in a way that has done him credit.

However, that does not mean that I am now any less concerned that the two portfolios have been amalgamated than I was then, and I think the Minister himself, despite the work that he has done, will agree that there are activities within his departments to which he would like to give much more time than he is at present able to give them. I believe that, particularly in the Agriculture Department, where so much is done and should be done to keep agriculture up with the times and to develop the scientific and promotional activities of his department in a way that will reach every farmer in the best and most effective way, these times are with us now perhaps more than they have ever been before.

Despite the notable achievements of the Agriculture Department, the practical requirement expected of this department is probably greater now than it ever was. The extension services (which are an obvious corollary and end product of laboratory and back-room research) are of such vital importance that I believe the Minister should be able to have more time than he can possibly have at the moment to have a good look at these things, to encourage his officers, to stimulate them, and to sit down with them and devise ways and means of expanding this important activity.

I support the amendment of the Leader. I do not know the intention of Cabinet members in this matter, and it may be that in any case, with or without the amendment, they intend to do what the amendment provides. I repeat that we regard this matter as being of great importance. With those few remarks on a matter which probably deserves more discussion from the House than we are giving it today, I support the second reading and also the amendment.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I support the Bill, which affects me personally. I do not object to the Leader's amendment nor do I think the Government will object, but I consider there is no need for it as it has already been stated that the new Minister will take the portfolio of Minister of Lands. The Premier and I have said this, and the matter has been discussed in Cabinet, so there is no doubt that, provided the Bill is passed, the two portfolios will be separated with a Minister of Agriculture and a Minister of Lands. I thank the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) for his kindly references

to me, and I know that he is sincere because he has told me the same thing privately, as have other members opposite. The Labor Government considers as important the man on the land and also these two departments. I defy anyone to contradict that statement, as in the short time the Government has been in office, it has shown consideration for both departments. Without boasting, I say that neither department has suffered during this time and no work has been shelved because of the present situation.

The Premier has been criticized, but when the portfolios were allocated changes were made under the new Government. That is not new; it happens because of different ideas with a change of Government. The Leader referred to the Ministries of Housing and Transport, but these changes have been widely acclaimed by people outside the House. It was necessary for this to be done, but it did create problems. When the allocation of portfolios was made and I received, rather unexpectedly, the portfolios of Lands and Agriculture, the Premier told me that he did not intend that the situation would remain as it was. He said that he realized we needed another Minister, and at the right time this would be done if the necessary Bill were passed. He has now introduced it. The last Labor Government went out of office in 1933, but members today spoke about the increase in work that has taken place in recent years. Surely in this time there has been a change of thinking with regard to these important departments, and the Government never intended the present situation to remain. The member for Alexandra (Hon. D. N. Brookman) said that this was a junior Ministry in the Cabinet, but I deny that, as would every member on this side.

Every Minister is of equal importance in the Cabinet: the Premier plays the leading role but all other Ministers have no feeling of being higher or lower than the others. I emphasize that these two departments have not been placed at the bottom of the priority list. In the Labor Party there is no seniority of Ministers and the same significance of all Ministers is considered: there are no senior or junior Ministers. The Ministers in another place and in this House have a job to do and they try to do it to the best of their ability. It is unfair criticism by the member for Alexandra to suggest otherwise. When a Constitution Bill for the ninth Minister was last before the House we, as members of the Opposition, opposed the measure. Giving valid reasons for that stand, we believed that

there should be more members in the House. We still believe that: we have introduced a Bill to increase the number. However, because of circumstances beyond our control, that Bill cannot be proceeded with because we do not have a constitutional majority. We are consistent in saying there should be more Ministers. It has often been suggested that there should be more than nine, but the reasons given for the extra Minister were valid and would stand up to any argument.

Since I have had the honour of controlling the two departments, I have treasured and valued the co-operation of the officers of both departments. I have received nothing but consideration and co-operation from every member of the staff of the Agriculture and Lands Departments. To a great extent this has enabled me to fulfil the important functions required of me. This Government never intended to make the present position permanent. It considered that at the first opportunity it should divide the portfolios, if both Houses would accept a Bill. While I have represented these departments I have tried to give much time to both and to visit people as much as possible. I have travelled extensively during my term of office. Soon after becoming a Minister I visited the Far North to consider problems, and returned for further talks with the people in that area. I have attended many functions in the districts of various members, and I appreciate the co-operation of members opposite when I have visited their districts. It will always be my intention to give them every consideration and to ensure that they participate in any official visits I undertake. This important matter is far above the small-mindedness of some people who choose to play politics. A job has to be done, and I aim to do it. I have found my visits to various parts of the State, as well as to other States, and my attendances at various conferences (in conjunction with officers of the Agriculture and Lands Departments) most interesting and informative. I realize that much has to be learned in this work, but at no time has the work suffered because of the present situation. In view of the time, Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2).

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 5.3 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 19, at 2 p.m.