HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 20, 1965.

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

QUESTIONS

RESEARCH GRANTS.

Mr. HUDSON: In this morning's *Advertiser* appeared a report headed "Research Grants in Doubt", which stated:

All 70 members of the Adelaide and Bedford Park University staffs nominated yesterday for special Federal-State research grants worth £297,000 may not receive them. The State Government says it cannot afford to match the full proposed Commonwealth grant of £148,500 on a pound-for-pound basis.

Will the Minister of Education amplify that report and give further details to honourable members in relation to this matter?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The honourable member was kind enough to inform me that he would ask this question, and I have much information on the matter that I think will be interesting to honourable members. First, £5,000,000 was to be made available by the Australian Universities Commission, which recommended £5,000,000 for research in the triennium, 1964-66. Of this £5,000,000, a sum of £3,000,000 was first made available and South Australia's allocation was £370,000, half of which was to be provided by the Commonwealth and half by the State. The State agreed to match this particular grant—it undertook to pay half of the £370,000. A sum of £330,000 of that amount was for the University of Adelaide, and £40,000 was for the Bedford Park division. Then the Premier received a letter from the Prime Minister dated September 20, 1965, in which the Prime Minister indicated the likelihood that the Australian Research Grants Committee would recommend an allocation of £300,000 for research projects at South Australian universities in that triennium.

On September 28, the Premier informed the Prime Minister that, in framing its Budget for 1965-66 and in looking ahead to 1966-67, the Government had anticipated recommendations of about 11 per cent of available research grants for South Australian universities. This was in accord with the formula that had been applied to the allocation out of the first £3,000,000, which was on the basis, generally speaking, of being in proportion to the number of post-graduate students at each university. The proportion of these post-graduate students in South Australia is 10¾ per cent. Our population is barely 9½ per cent of that of all the States. However, the State undertook to meet 11 per cent in its Budget Estimates of the second allocation but, as the £300,000 was far in excess of that 11 per cent, the Premier wrote to the Prime Minister as follows:

My Government desires to give all practicable assistance to universities but, bearing in mind other urgent demands and the fact that we have had to budget currently for a deficit of £1,500,000, we would see great difficulty in finding additional funds for any purpose. At this stage then, I feel compelled to say that, while the Government appreciates your tribute to South Australian universities in offering such a favourable allocation, we would not be prepared to provide funds to the extent that you suggest unless a review of the projects proposed showed a particularly urgent requirement.

In this letter the Premier indicated that we were prepared to go to the full extent of meeting half of £550,000 from the total of £5,000,000. However, despite that, the Premier then received a letter from the Prime Minister dated October 8, stating that, as a result of the investigation by a committee under the chairmanship of Professor Robertson, which had to investigate individual research projects, this committee had recommended £296,000 as South Australia's allocation, from the amount of £2,000,000. In fact, it is over £297,000.

Before this matter had been properly considered by the State Cabinet (this letter was, of course, dated October 8), the details of the allocation to individual projects were handed out by Canberra to a South Australian daily newspaper and were published in the *Advertiser* of either yesterday or the day before. The Prime Minister had not been advised whether we could meet the extra commitment from this State, a commitment that would mean another £60,000 on top of the £90,000 that we had budgeted for in regard to this second part of the allocation out of the £2,000,000.

I strongly resent, as Minister of Education, being placed in the position of having a handout from Canberra to say that certain amounts will be made available for projects when the Government has had no opportunity of deciding whether the money can be made available and particularly as the Prime Minister had been advised in the terms of the letter dated September 28. The fact is that this money cannot be provided unless some cut is made in our Estimates. We shall do the best we can.

I think the whole method of allocation of Commonwealth grants for research work in this manner is most unsatisfactory. The list of projects was sent on to us from the Prime Minister, and the titles of those projects, for the most part, are quite incomprehensible to the ordinary layman. Even if they were in plain layman's language, I doubt whether we should be able to determine, with the information at our disposal, whether they were of urgent priority or not. As a matter of fact, this research work is a matter of national importance in its benefit and I think we should protest strongly against a procedure that calls for such unreasonably high contributions from this State towards research of this nature. Let me point out that the money that has now been allocated to South Australia represents 13½ per cent of the all-round total, and of the last apportionment it represents 16¼ per cent of the total money made available by the Commonwealth. It simply means that the State is put in a most embarrassing and impossible position as a result of this particular approach to Commonwealth allocations of this sort of grant.

EUDUNDA RAIL SERVICE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I understand the Premier is now able to give me some information regarding a new type of passenger rail carriage for the Eudunda-Adelaide service.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Chief Mechanical Engineer of the Railways Department has considered a number of suggestions concerning the design of the proposed new passenger cars for use on the country service for short hauls. However, the final details have not yet been determined. Diagrams have been prepared showing a car comparable with the suburban type car but with the addition of a large central baggage compartment, adequate toilet facilities, and a type of seating for middle distance country use. Consideration is being given to the heating of the cars for winter conditions. This can be accomplished at a reasonable cost by using cooling water from the engines. In general, the proposed cars will be substantially superior in riding comfort to the model 75 railcars at present used for medium distance country passenger services.

MOUNT TORRENS SCHOOL.

Mrs. BYRNE: Can the Minister of Education say whether plans and specifications for the fencing of the Mount Torrens Primary School property and the grading of the oval have been completed, and when it is expected tenders will be called?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have now been advised by the Public Buildings Department that plans and specifications in connection with the fencing of the Mount Torrens school property and the grading of the oval area will be completed shortly and that it is expected tenders will be called within the next two weeks.

BURRA COPPER FIELD.

Mr. QUIRKE: Some time ago I asked a question concerning the investigation of the old Burra copper mine and particularly of the new discoveries of ore there which I understand are extensive, although the ore is not of a very high grade. Can the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Mines, make a statement on this matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: My colleague, the Minister of Mines, reports:

The Mines Department had been carrying out extensive geological, geophysical and geochemical surveys of the Burra district over the past several years. This work, coupled with a drilling programme, had established substantial "leavings" of oxidized copper in and north of the old open cut at Burra. The tonnage involved was considered to exceed 1,000,000 tons of low-grade oxidized copper, and trial metallurgical work by the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories on recovery of copper from parcels of this material had been encouraging. The interest of major mineral exploration companies was now being invited to the area, with the expectation that if further investigatory work by the selected company confirmed Mines Department findings, an industry would be established at Burra to recover copper. This operation, if set up, would involve open cut mining, requiring the removal of overburden and oxidized copper to at least 100ft. below the present water level in the old open cut, followed by acid leaching of the ore and recovery of copper concentrate in a treatment plant on site. More than 50 men could be employed on the project, which could last five to 10 years, depending on the scale of operations. In addition to the shallow ore "leavings", several targets for deeper drilling had been suggested by the Mines Department work, and the company selected to carry on the project would be required to undertake a vigorous and substantial exploration programme for deeper seated ore in the Burra area. If this exploration achieved successful results, a major mining operation could develop.

WEST BEACH SANDHILLS.

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Premier a reply to my question of October 14 regarding development in the area adjacent to the West Beach caravan park?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I have a letter, which states:

The West Beach Recreation Reserve Trust has almost completed the removal of the eastern sandhill in the area between Military Road and the sea, but it is proposed to leave the western sandhill more or less as it is. Final plans have not yet been completed for the development of this portion of the trust's land, but it is envisaged that there will be some further extension to the caravan park. Extensive car parking facilities will be made available. A kiosk, ablution and toilet blocks and change rooms will be built approximately midway between West Beach and Glenelg. It is likely that these structures will be on top of the existing western sandhills. Consideration will also be given to a holiday village concerning which negotiations are still in progress.

WALLOWAY BASIN.

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Minister of Education, representing the Minister of Mines, a reply to my question regarding the Walloway Basin, near Orroroo?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: My colleague, the Minister of Mines, reports that the Department of Mines undertook a preliminary survey of the Walloway Basin during 1964, and prepared a programme of test drilling. This programme is scheduled for action within the next two months. The problem in the Walloway Basin is the presence of very fine sand, which has hitherto proved impossible to screen. However, included in the proposed investigation is the use of a new type of screen developed on behalf of the department by the Australian Mineral Development Laboratories. Cabinet has approved an expenditure of £2,600 on the initial test work. The work on the Walloway Basin will qualify for subsidy under the Commonwealth Government State Grants (Water Resources) Act.

KULPARA TANK.

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question seeking his co-operation in the removal of a disused Engineering and Water Supply Department tank at Kulpara, at the top of the Hummocks?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief informs me that this tank was used for balancing purposes in respect of the water supply to Kulpara but, as a result of the completion of the new Warren trunk main, it is no longer required. Following the recent mishap to the tank, an inspection has shown that it now has only salvage value and, to obviate expense in dismantling it, offers are being obtained from local farmers and interested persons. It is hoped that a satisfactory offer can be accepted to enable early removal of the tank. In the meantime, the tank has been secured so as to prevent further movement.

PAPER PULP INDUSTRY.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Premier a reply to my question regarding the establishment of a paper pulp industry in the South-East, with particular reference to whether the recent development in Tasmania will jeopardize the negotiations that have been going on for some time?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The report mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition refers to a broadcast news item in connection with the development of a paper mill at Wesley Vale in Tasmania by Associated Pulp and Paper Mills Limited. This company is prominent in the field of production of fine papers, printing papers and writing papers, and is, I think, the only such producer in Australia. The project now contemplated is a paper mill that will initially use imported pulp and it is part of an integrated pulp and paper project that has been planned by this company for some years. This installation is not expected to affect any present or proposed plans for the expansion of the pulp industry in South Australia.

FESTIVAL OF MUSIC.

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent suggestion of televising the schools' Festival of Music?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: The President of the Public Schools' Music Society (Mr. Pearson, Master of Method at Burnside Demonstration School) wrote to all television stations on September 21 asking whether they would be interested in televising one of the concerts in the Adelaide Town Hall. No reply was received from Channels 7, 9 and 10. The Australian Broadcasting Commission replied, and showed an interest by filming portions of a rehearsal and showing these shots as part of its news-cast. One difficulty in televising a whole concert would be that the television station would require much space, and this would limit the audience for that particular concert.

The executive of the Public Schools' Music Society would co-operate in any way possible if one of the four television stations would be willing to televise the whole of one concert, so that country viewers could have the opportunity of seeing and hearing the children in action. I hope the management of the stations will re-consider this question so that this may be done. As members will see from the chairman's comment, the television stations, excluding

ABS channel 2, did not show any enthusiasm for the project. It should be mentioned that an increasing number of music festivals is being held in country areas, with from six to 12 schools participating. This year, festivals have been held at Whyalla, Barmera, Loxton, Victor Harbour, Crafers, Morphett Vale, Salisbury-Elizabeth, and the Barossa Valley.

SERVICE PAY.

Mr. COUMBE: During the debate on service pay earlier this session it was suggested that, because of its introduction, the South Australian Railways would be able to retain labour and step up recruiting. Will the Premier obtain a report on the effect of the introduction of service pay on the retention of staff and on the recruiting of additional staff?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

FOSTER CLARK (S.A.) LIMITED.

Mr. CURREN: Has the Premier an answer to my question of October 13 about the likelihood of future payments from Foster Clark (S.A.) Limited for fruit supplied in the 1962 season?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Realization of the assets of this company will fall far short of the amount owed to secured creditors. There is, therefore, no possibility of further payments to unsecured creditors.

KARKOO-KYANCUTTA ROAD.

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Roads when the road from Karkoo to Lock and from Lock to Kyancutta will be sealed? An excellent job has been done in preparing this road for sealing, and with the heavy traffic on the road, which will increase because of this year's heavy crop, considerable damage will be done to the preparatory work if the road is not sealed as soon as possible.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I will get this information.

GOODWOOD TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL.

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the completion of an art room at the Goodwood Boys Technical High School?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director, Public Buildings Department, states that the new art room now under construction at this school is expected to be completed towards the end of next month. Carpenters are currently finishing off their portion of the work. Painting will then be carried out and linoleum laid to complete the room.

WOLSELEY STATION.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Premier a reply to my question of September 29 about the breaking of trains at the Wolseley station to enable children to cross from one side of the station yard to the other when moving between the town and the school?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Railways Superintendent at Murray Bridge, together with the Assistant Superintendent (Transportation), visited Wolseley on October 4 and made observations of the movement of schoolchildren between the school and that part of the township which is situated on the northern side of the railway. These officers had lengthy discussions with the station master, a signalman, the President of the Wolseley School Committee, a councillor of the District Council of Tatiara, the teacher in charge of the Wolseley school, and the postmistress, who has been a local resident for many years. As a result of their investigation, the following facts were established: No new or unusual recent circumstance has intruded. The problem is the same now as it has been for 30 or 40 years—that is, there is occasional blocking of the level crossing at the Bordertown end of the yard by a stationary train. There are 56 children enrolled at the school, about 50 per cent of whom it is claimed live on the northern side of the railway. Children do not pass through the railway yard when going to and from school; they travel by way of the level crossing at the Bordertown end of the yard, and they are constantly warned against doing otherwise by the schoolmaster.

Blocking of the level crossing by stationary trains during the periods when children pass to and fro occurs only infrequently. Such occasions occur when a down train longer than 66 vehicles in length is admitted to the main line and stops at the signal protecting the scissors crossover at the Serviceton end of the yard. In this case the rear of the train would be over the level crossing at the Bordertown end. The train most likely to be involved is No. 87 goods, which during the busier time of the year may arrive at Wolseley during the school luncheon period, when, it is understood, many children go to the street on the northern side of the railway boundary to buy their lunches. There could be other infrequent occasions when No. 161 goods was at Wolseley when children were leaving the school in the afternoon, but this would happen infrequently. All up trains are stopped with the locomotive short of the level crossing. Although this

ensures that the level crossing at the Bordertown end is kept clear, it means that trains of over 110 vehicles in length will foul the level crossing at the Serviceton end adjacent to the railway cottages. However, the persons interviewed agreed that this was of no consequence whatsoever. With resect to the incident referred to, when it was stated that a guard told children to crawl beneath a train, Mr. Merrett and Mr. Makin said that the incident occurred in about November last. They were unable to be more specific about the matter, but Mr. Merrett also said the school committee had not acted at the time, and that it had been tardy in bringing the matter forward, even at the present time. Neither gentleman could refer to any specific instance (since the occasion in November last) of children crawling under trains, but Mr. Merrett had instructed the schoolmaster to keep a record of all occasions when the passage of children was blocked by the presence of a stationary train over the level crossing.

Mr. Merrett stated that, at the time of the incident in November last, he believed that trains were blocking the crossing in the passage of children about twice a week, although this had not occurred recently, and, in fact, no other instances could be cited. When interviewed, Mr. Carey said that he had not kept a record of the occasions when the crossing was blocked by a stationary train, and it was also learned that the Murray Bridge Superintendent considered keeping such a record was not warranted. He apparently had not heard of a single instance when children were late for school as a result of any difficulty encountered at the crossing, since the beginning of the present school year. The stationmaster is adamant that, with the exception of isolated occasions prior to November last, trains have not been permitted to remain stationary over the level crossing at the Bordertown end of the yard. He has been instructed that trains must not be permitted to stand at that point during the times when children are moving across it. Messrs. Makin, Merrett and Carey agree that if trains were split, in order to ensure that the level crossing was clear during the times referred to by the honourable member, it would meet the school committee's requirements, and that no further problem should arise. It may be advisable for the honourable member to obtain the correct information before he raises a matter on the next occasion.

SOUTH AFRICAN DAISY.

Mrs. STEELE: During this session I have asked questions of the Minister of Agriculture regarding the eradication of South African daisy where it is particularly prevalent adjacent to the Mount Barker Road, on land under the control of various Government departments, and where the terrain is difficult to treat in the usual way. I understand the Agriculture Department is now contemplating tackling this problem with a new and unusual method. Will the Minister explain this method?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes. The honourable member rightly stated that she had brought this matter to my notice both by letter and by way of questions asked in the House earlier in the session. The District Council of Stirling is also concerned about the spread of South African daisy, and the Agriculture Department is most concerned about the prevalence of the weed on Government-owned lands. The honourable member correctly referred to this weed being in inaccessible places. Indeed, some of those places are precipitous, and eradication of the weed has created a real problem. Recently, as a result of negotiations between the Tourist Bureau, National Park Commissioners and the Agriculture Department, it was decided to tackle the problem and to ascertain whether anything could be done to comply with the wishes of not only the councils concerned but also private landholders who are worried about the spread of South African daisy. It has now been found that this work can be done by means of a helicopter, and on Friday of this week spraying will be done from a helicopter for this purpose. As far as my department is concerned, this is a completely new method for the spraying of noxious weeds. I can assure the people concerned that the herbicides to be used in the spraying will be non-toxic, and little chance exists of any damage being caused to native flora. The technique to be used will enable the herbicides to be delivered accurately on to the South African daisy, which has gained a serious hold in the Adelaide Hills and threatens pasture land generally in South Australia. No doubt this method of spraying will be a good innovation for the State. I am sure that district councils and private owners in the vicinity will greatly appreciate the department's work in the eradication of South African daisy. Undoubtedly this new technique will create much interest throughout South Australia.

PENOLA PRIMARY SCHOOL.

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of October 14 regarding additions and repairs at the Penola Primary School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I have been informed by the Director of the Public Buildings Department that since September, 1964, tenders have been called on five occasions in an endeavour to obtain a satisfactory price for additions and repairs at the Penola Primary School. Recently, in view of the unsatisfactory tender position, the matter was referred to the Education Department for assessment of the urgency of the work in relation to a price received on the latest tender called, and, following a request from the department, arrangements are now being made to negotiate a price.

ROAD SURVEY.

Mr. McANANEY: About 200 members of the Strathalbyn Fishing and Game Club understand that an aerial photograph has been taken of roads and reserves along the Murray River between Goolwa and Mannum, and they have the impression that this has been done with a view to closing some of the roads and reserves. Can the Minister of Agriculture give a report to allay the fears of these people?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I will get a full report for the honourable member.

MALLEE WHIPBIRD.

Mr. FERGUSON: I read with much interest an article in this morning's *Advertiser* relating to the discovery of a rare native bird called the mallee whipbird. The discovery was made near Pondalowie Bay on southern Yorke Peninsula. Mr. H. T. Condon (Curator of Birds at the South Australian Museum) confirmed the identity of this bird. Until now the mallee whipbird has been regarded as extinct in South Australia and Victoria. Mr. F. R. H. Chapman (President of the South Australian Ornithological Association) said that the birds appeared to be confined to an unspoiled, natural area of about two or three square miles near the coast, and that they seemed to be fairly numerous. Mr. Chapman also said he expected that the discovery of the bird would mean that the area would become a wild life reserve with little delay. The area in which this discovery was made contains some of the best natural flora of the rural areas in this State. Can the Minister of Agriculture say whether this discovery could expedite the declaration of an area on southern Yorke Peninsula as a fauna and flora reserve?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I, like the honourable member, was pleased to hear of the discovery of the mallee whipbird. It is pleasing to know that, although it was believed that this species was extinct, apparently it is now thriving in this location. Too many of our native birds have been allowed to go out of existence by the spoiling of the natural habitat. I am sure everybody will applaud the fact that this area has been kept in its natural state so that the birds can live and even increase in numbers. So I join with the honourable member in this sentiment. I shall make every effort to see that this area is declared a reserve.

STRIKE.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question arises from what I now understand to be a settlement of the strike by the employees of the Tramways Trust. I read with interest an announcement made by the Premier towards the end of our sitting last night that, as a result of a conference in his room between himself, the Minister of Transport and the Chairman of the Tramways Trust, certain terms had been worked out. This surprised me, as earlier in the day the Minister of Works had said that the Government did not intend to intervene in this matter—

Mr. McKee: The Premier didn't say that at all; he was not here.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —as he hoped there would be a settlement soon.

Mr. Corcoran: That is quite in order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Works said that the Government did not propose to intervene. According to *Hansard,* the Minister said:

The Government believes that it should not intervene at this moment.

Mr. Corcoran: That is so.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I see that the terms of the settlement have been disclosed in the "Stop press" of the edition of the *News* that I have, and they are as follows:

The terms for settlement of the M.T.T. strike were announced at a meeting of tramways employees at Hackney Hall today. Mr. L. H. Johns, secretary of the Trades and Labor Council, told about 800 M.T.T. workers that Mr. C. W. Harrison would not work with the trust. "If he reports for work, he will not be taken on. The Arbitration Commission will hear the case sometime in the future and thoroughly investigate all facets of the current problems." Mr. Johns moved the resolution, "That this meeting of tramways employees, in the public interest and appreciation of the efforts of the Premier and Transport Minister, accept the formula recommended by them to resolve this dispute."

As, apparently, these terms were agreed upon or suggested by the Premier and the Minister of Transport, first, can the Premier say whether he is against people over 65 years of age being employed, as a general rule; and, secondly, does he consider that nobody over the age of 65 should take or hold a position of employment?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I think the lengthy preamble to these questions calls for some correction. So that there shall be no misundertanding, let me stress that the policy of this Government has been conciliation and arbitration. The conference held in my room last night lasted for a considerable time. I made a short announcement in the House towards the end of the sitting, when the member for Mitcham was absent, probably catching a train, before the House adjourned, to get to Eden Hills, although I understand honourable members are supposed to be readily available in case a vote is taken in the House, as was the case last night. The conference was convened because of certain information that had been conveyed to the Minister of Labour and Industry (who is also the Minister of Transport), who reported to me that a discussion had been held with a conciliator from another State in connection with this dispute. As the conference had proceeded for several hours and no conciliation offer was made, I considered that in the public interest it was time some conciliation was recommended.

After the Chairman of the Municipal Tramways Trust arrived at the House, a discussion took place. I do not have a copy of the press release before me, but I recall that the Chairman left on the firm understanding that the person concerned (this can be checked for accuracy, because what I am about to say may not be quite the position) was in receipt of a long service leave payment, and that as soon as his services had been terminated, by reason of age, and certain payments had been made he was to be engaged as a conductor. The agreement arrived at was that the person concerned would be placed on leave. It was expected that the conciliation commissioner would proceed to Adelaide from Brisbane on Friday of this week or on Monday next at the latest, and that he would then have before him the question of the settlement of the dispute between the M.T.T. and the union concerned regarding the question of engagement of men beyond the age of 65 years. I am pleased to know of the resumption of work. I think the latter part of the question was addressed to me in rather a personal way, and I have no reply to give to it.

AGINCOURT BORE SCHOOL.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT: Is the Minister of Education able to give me any further information following the long discussion that took place at the deputation in connection with the commencing date of the building of the Agincourt Bore Area School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I regret I cannot give the honourable member any more information except to say that instructions have been given for the drawings to be proceeded with as quickly as possible. Certain letters appeared in the press suggesting that this Government was not honouring the promise of the previous Government that the Agincourt Bore Area School would be commenced before the Paruna Area School. Let me say categorically, Mr. Speaker, that when the member for Ridley introduced the deputation to me on this question I made it plain to the deputation that the only reason for the delay in starting the Agincourt Bore school was that when I came into office the honourable member in the Legislative Council who represents that area told me that the water at the point where that school was to be placed was of no use at all for school purposes.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: The information was incorrect, too, wasn't it?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: That information proved to be incorrect but, as Minister of Education, I had to take notice of it and I was not going to approve of a school being proceeded with until I was certain that the water was satisfactory. Because of the investigations that had to be made to determine whether the water was satisfactory, delay occurred in regard to the construction of the school. The Paruna Area School work was proceeded with and, as a consequence, that school will be opened before the Agincourt Bore school. The reason for that is entirely the information given to me by a member of the Opposition regarding the quality of the water supply.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Minister referred to a report he received from a member of the Opposition regarding the supply of water to the Agincourt Bore school. Can the Minister say whether the Mines Department has not immediately available the results of tests of all bores put down in the State and would not that information have been available to him immediately if he desired it?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: In reply to that question, I can only say that, on receipt of the information to which I have referred, I caused all the necessary inquiries to be made immediately and the departments responsible carried out what they considered were the proper inquiries to establish whether the water was or was not satisfactory.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Will the Minister bring down the docket so that honourable members may peruse it?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I see no reason to do so. I am not in the habit of giving the Leader false information, and I think he can accept my word on this matter. In fact, the member in question was present at the deputation, which was introduced by the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott), and the deputation and the honourable member concerned know all about it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Information about the quality of water in the bore would normally be available to a Minister by telephone within 10 minutes. Will the Minister ascertain how long it actually took his colleague to ascertain whether the quality of the water was suitable?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall see whether I can get the information for the Leader.

PORT WAKEFIELD WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question regarding the water supply to an area of land south of Port Wakefield?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: With a view to improving the water supply to an area of land south of Port Wakefield, I am pleased to advise that, only recently, I approved an amount of £8,000 for this purpose. The work involves the re-laying of 20,000ft. of old 2in. pipes with a new 3in. main and will connect with the Warren system at Port Wakefield. The Director and Engineer-in-Chief advises me that work on the project commenced on September 1 this year and should be completed by the end of next month, when the supply to the area will be greatly improved.

DOVER GARDENS SCHOOL.

Mr. HUDSON: Can the Minister of Works inform me whether expenditure for the development of the hockey oval at the Dover Gardens Girls Technical High School has been approved?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Yes, approval of the expenditure of about £900 has been given for the top-soiling of the hockey oval in the Dover Gardens school grounds.

MIDDLE RIVER RESERVOIR.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: During the debate on the Estimates, I mentioned the construction of the Middle River reservoir on Kangaroo Island. Can the Minister of Works inform me when that work will be commenced, whether it will be done by contract or by Government workers, and whether local labour will be employed?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Following a favourable recommendation by the Public Works Committee and Cabinet approval, the dam on Middle River will be built departmentally, using day labour. The Director and Engineer-in-Chief has stated that preliminary work will be commenced during this financial year and as much local labour as possible will be engaged on the construction work.

PORT PIRIE SCHOOL.

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Works say whether approval has been given for the provision of heating facilities at the Port Pirie Primary School?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Approval was given recently for over £2,000 to be spent on the installation of gas heaters in 22 classrooms at the Port Pirie Primary School.

CADELL TRAINING CENTRE.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: On September 28 I asked a question about the public relations activities of the Cadell Training Centre, on which I commented. I said that they had made a favourable impression at the Eudunda show. Subsequently, as the Premier knows, another good impression was made at the Kapunda show. Can the Premier say whether this exhibiting work will be increased and expanded in the future?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I agree with what the honourable member says, and that what I saw at the Kapunda show was an outstanding achievement. It is the intention of the department gradually to extend the activities of the Cadell Training Centre to display at other agricultural shows. As the honourable member said, the centre exhibited at the Kapunda show. Next year it is intended to display at Loxton and Saddleworth, ultimately working up to the Royal Adelaide show standard. The Adelaide Gaol regularly exhibits at the Royal Adelaide show and has won some prizes. The department entered an exhibit in the Royal Exhibition in 1963 and won a silver medal. Both staff and prisoners are keenly interested in this phase of the work and do an excellent job preparing the exhibits.

UPPER HERMITAGE WATER SUPPLY.

Mrs. BYRNE: Several families living at Range Road North, Upper Hermitage, require a water supply, and one family applied to the Engineering and Water Supply Department on August 12, 1960, to have their property connected. To connect these houses to the water supply, it would be necessary to extend the supply from its present terminal at the Upper Hermitage tennis courts, a distance of about half a mile. I was informed by correspondence earlier this year that this matter was being investigated. Can the Minister of Works inform me of the result of these investigations, and of the department's intentions in this matter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I will do my utmost to get a prompt reply for the honourable member.

DENTAL HEALTH.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In this morning's *Advertiser* on page 7 appears a report headed "Aid Urged on Dental Plan", which reads in part:

Support by the State Government of a public education campaign on preventive dentistry was called for yesterday by the chairman of the dental health education committee of the Australian Dental Association's South Australian branch (Mr. R. H. Wallman). It was not generally realized that school dentists and the nurses trained in the next few years would not be able to keep up with the need for their services.

I think I heard on the wireless another reference to his comment that two-thirds of the people of South Australia could be regarded as dental cripples. The report continues:

Mr. Wallman said the campaign should embody public education in all aspects of preventive oral hygiene, including correct dietary habits, care of the teeth and gums, fluoridation of water supplies, and the training of more dentists.

Will the Premier, as Leader of the Government, say whether the Government intends to support the plan for which Mr. Wallman calls in his statement?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I will endeavour to obtain some information on this matter as soon as possible.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HUGHES: Some weeks ago the Minister of Works released a statement about what is known as the "new look" in the Public Buildings Department. I understand that the State will be divided into districts, with an officer of the department in each, and that the work of the department will be channelled through this officer. I understand that the change will enable a better service to be given. Can the Minister say whether the department intends to proceed with this excellent suggestion and, if it does, when the change is expected to take place? Does the department intend to have an officer stationed at Kadina?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member was good enough to indicate that he would ask this question, and I obtained a reply. The planned decentralization of the department's maintenance activities in turn forms an important part of the overall reorganization of the department. Action is proceeding on the establishment of district building offices and sub-depots in defined districts in the country and metropolitan area. In the country, approval has been given to establish new depots or sub-depots and to appoint resident officers at Naracoorte, Nuriootpa, Kadina, Murray Bridge and Berri. The department already has depots and resident officers at Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Mount Gambier. At present these officers are responsible for only part of the normal maintenance of Government buildings in their district, the balance being handled by officers stationed in Adelaide.

The reorganization involves a new definition of resident officers' duties and responsibilities to the effect that they will become responsible for all phases of maintenance and minor works in the district. Approval has been given for the creation of new offices of District Building Officer and applications have recently closed for the first of this type of position in the metropolitan area. Applications will progressively be invited for positions in country areas. Land has been obtained in the country towns indicated, and depot facilities will be provided as staff is appointed, and as funds become available. The complete change will occur progressively as staff, depots and sub-depots are established, and should be completed within two years.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I understood the Minister to say that the Public Buildings Department intended to appoint regional officers. This takes somewhat further a policy initiated last year. I believe that these regional officers will operate similarly to general regional engineers in the Engineering and Water Supply Department. If that is so, I presume that they will submit to the head of their department each year an estimate or requisition of expenditure for the year in respect of their areas. What authority

or autonomy will such officers have and will funds be allocated to them each year to enable them to carry on activities in their areas?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The honourable member has assumed correctly that these officers will submit their estimates for work for a year and then be given an allocation. However, they will be controlled. That is the position as I see it, but I think it would be wiser if I obtained a full report. As soon as it is ready I will make it available to the honourable member on his asking a further question.

LAMEROO AREA SCHOOL.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week concerning the rebuilding of the Lameroo Area School?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: As the honourable member is no doubt aware, a reserve for school purposes at Lameroo was gazetted in July, 1963. A schedule of the requirements for the new school has been prepared in the Education Department. Broadly, it is anticipated that the school will provide accommodation for 300 primary and 120 secondary children. Provision will be made for special rooms for infants activity, science, art, boys and girls crafts, typewriting, library and administration. As the proposed school is in the early stages of planning, and as the needs of Lameroo must be considered in relation to those of all other areas, some of which have rapidly expanding populations, it is not possible at this stage to set a target date for the erection of the building.

PUMPING COSTS.

Mrs. STEELE: Will the Minister of Works say what is the daily cost of pumping water, and what that cost is likely to be when pumping is in full swing later in the season, if, as seems inevitable, there is no further natural intake into the reservoirs in the meantime?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Engineering and Water Supply Department is at present pumping at full capacity in off-peak periods. I should not like to be held to this, but I understand the pumping cost to be a little over £1,000 each week day. The honourable member is, unfortunately, correct in suggesting that we shall have to increase pumping before long. Last year the water stored in the metropolitan reservoirs was 23,700,000,000 gallons, and at present it is 16,041,000,000 gallons. The latest figures indicate an intake to storage of 298,000,000 gallons, and consumption last week was 663,000,000 gallons. The evaporation loss was 61,000,000 gallons, making a total draw-off of 724,000,000 gallons. Regrettably, pumping will have to be increased to keep up the supply. However, I shall obtain the exact costs for the honourable member, and I shall notify her when they are to hand.

WESTBOURNE PARK WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Today a resident of Norseman Avenue, Westbourne Park, telephoned me and complained about poor water pressure in that street, saying that it had been bad for a long time. He told me that he believed the street still had only a 3in. main, which was originally laid in 1926, when there were only three houses in the street. The street is now the centre of a fully built-up area. However, he said that, on the other hand, in adjoining streets new 6in. mains had been laid. I undertook to raise the matter with the Minister of Works. Will he investigate it with a view to improving, by one means or another, the water pressure in Norseman Avenue?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be pleased to have an inquiry made, and I will inform the honourable member of the outcome. I trust that, if the position is as he stated, we shall be able to remedy it.

HOUSEKEEPER SERVICES.

Mr. NANKIVELL: During the Budget debate I drew attention to the importance of housekeeper services. The publication *Commonwealth Payments To and For the States* (1965-66), page 24, states:

In 1951 the Commonwealth offered financial assistance to the States up to a limit of £15,000 a year to encourage the development of housekeeper services conducted by approved organizations and to provide assistance to families in emergencies. The offer was made on the basis that the sum of £15,000 would be distributed amongst the States in proportion to their population, and that the States would not reduce their own expenditure on, or subsidy for, these services. The State of Queensland declined the Commonwealth offer and the Commonwealth itself has distributed that State's proportion of the sum of £15,000 to emergency housekeeper services in Queensland.—

and this is the important point—

South Australia has not yet availed itself of the Commonwealth offer.

Is the Minister of Social Welfare aware of this money being available? If he is, does he intend that his department shall avail itself of it?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The answer to the first question is "No". I am grateful to the honourable member for drawing

the matter to my attention; I will get after it as soon as possible.

RAILWAY TICKETS.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: During the debate on the Estimates a question was asked of the Treasurer about the Railways Department authorizing the Tourist Bureau to sell tickets on its behalf, and the Treasurer undertook to investigate the matter. Has he any information on it?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Interstate railway tickets are sold in this State at the following outside agencies: the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau; the Tasmanian Government Tourist Bureau; Thomas Cook & Son (those three agencies are accountable to the South Australian Railways); and the South Australian branches of the Victorian, Western Australian and Queensland Tourist Bureaux (these agencies are accountable to their respective State railways systems). Interstate railway tickets can also be purchased through any one of 31 travel agents in South Australia on a 5 per cent commission basis. Commission is not paid to Tourist Bureaux.

SEAT BELTS.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should advise His Excellency the Governor to make the proclamation pursuant to section 162a (3) of the Road Traffic Act specifying the date after which seat belts must be fitted in certain motor vehicles.

I suggest, with respect, that it is hardly necessary to labour the grim facts of death and injury caused by accidents on the roads throughout South Australia and the Commonwealth. Those facts are known, acknowledged and, alas, they are often (both by members of this House and, more particularly, by members of the public) simply accepted. One has only to open the daily newspaper on any day (but especially on a Monday, after the weekend, or on the day after a holiday) to see the carnage that is taking place in the community all the time. The sad truth is that the figures concerning road accidents, injuries and deaths are growing all the time. I believe all honourable members are sent a copy of the *Quarterly Abstract of South Australian Statistics*. On page 45 of the September, 1965, issue appears a table of road traffic accidents. I wish to quote the figures for 1962-63 and for 1963-64, and then to quote figures for 1964-65 that I have obtained by courtesy of the Police Commissioner. Unhappily, these figures show an upward trend. The accidents reported in 1962-63 in this State were 21,597. In the following year they were 22,912, and in the year just completed they had risen to 27,038.

The next column sets out accidents involving casualties, and the corresponding figures are: 6,343, then (I am glad to say) a slight drop to 6,284, and finally 7,563. The next column shows persons killed: 1962-63, 201; 1963-64, 236; and last year, 232. The column from which I desire finally to quote is headed "Persons injured", and it shows: 1962-63, 8,216; 1963-64, 8,300; and 1964-65, 9,777. Those statistics are sufficient, I suggest, to confirm my point.

Mr. Freebairn: They are frightening statistics.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and they confirm that the figures of accidents involving people injured and killed show an upward curve, which has not been arrested at all. The position is getting worse all the time, and the tragedy of it is that we are taking little, if any, significant action to stop it.

Having made that point, I hope it is not necessary to labour my next point—that the wearing of a seat belt reduces the risk of death or serious injury. The arguments in favour of the use of seat belts were set out fully during the debate in this place in 1963, and any member who wants to look at and ponder the arguments used then can do so. The *Hansard* report of the debate began at page 710 of the 1963-64 volume. Nothing that has happened since then has altered the views I expressed in that session. Indeed, general experience has confirmed what I said on that occasion. Simply to bring the matter up to date, if it is necessary to do so, I shall quote from a publication known as *Report*, put out by the Australian Road Safety Council. I quote from the issue dated March 31, 1965. The heading of the article on page 4 of that publication is "Seat belts cut casualties by as much as 80 per cent". The next heading is "One in four Australians an accident victim". Having canvassed those points, it goes on to say this:

The effectiveness of seat belts as protectors against death or serious injury in a road accident has been confirmed by research undertaken in many countries of the world. In every case the research has demonstrated that the risk of death or serious injury in an accident is reduced by as much as 80 per cent if an approved seat belt is worn. Research agencies which have proved this include Australia's Snowy Mountains Authority; the Cornell University Medical College, U.S.A.; the

British Road Research Laboratory; and investigations undertaken in Sweden. In many cases the research involved vehicles which had been wrecked beyond repair but from which the victims had emerged with minor or no injuries. More recently, the Government pathologist of Tasmania, Dr. Campbell Duncan, has given even further confirmation of the value of seat belts by stating that 48 per cent of all drivers killed in the past 10 years in Southern Tasmania would not have died had they been wearing seat belts, while 35 per cent of passengers killed would have lived and another 47 per cent might have been saved had they been wearing belts. Dr. Duncan said that head injuries had killed a great many of the victims and death would have been avoided had seat belts been worn.

It is not necessary to labour that point. In 1963, I remind you, Mr. Speaker, this House agreed to a Bill that would have made compulsory the fitting of seat belts for the driver and the front seat passenger in motor vehicles registered for the first time after December 31, 1964.

During the second reading debate on that Bill, many members on both sides of the House spoke in its favour, and I am happy to note that two of the members in the then Opposition who spoke in favour of the Bill are now Ministers in the present Government—the Minister of Works and the Minister of Agriculture and Lands. Some of the then Ministers, I must admit, were at the time a little lukewarm about it but, nevertheless, I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House, most of whom were members of the House at that time, that the second and third readings of the Bill were carried without a division being called for; and, apart from an unfortunate incident over a procedural matter, the only division was on an amendment by the then Leader of the Opposition to make the wearing as well as the fitting of seat belts compulsory. This is what the then Leader of the Opposition (the present Premier) said on that occasion, at page 1104 of the 1963-64 *Hansard* volume:

I move to insert the following new subsection:

(7a) A person shall not drive a motor vehicle to which this section applies on a road unless he and every passenger in that motor vehicle sitting in a seat for which a safety belt is fitted pursuant to this section wears such safety belt. Penalty—£5.

The first sentence of his explanation in support of that amendment was:

The closing remarks on second reading by the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) have clearly indicated that this Bill is a first step only towards what I wish to achieve.

That amendment was defeated on Party lines. In fact, the voting was 19-all, I remind the member for Enfield (Mr. Jennings). All the members of the then Opposition, the Australian Labor Party, voted in favour. I did not support the amendment and said that I felt strongly that seat belts should be provided for people should they want to use them, but that it would be going too far to have (and it would be impossible to enforce and difficult to police) the compulsory wearing of seat belts. The then members on the Government side voted against the amendment, leaving the casting vote to the Chairman, who voted against the amendment. The significance of what happened was that all but half of the members of the House in 1963 wanted to go even a step further than the Bill that I had introduced, and make not only the fitting but also the wearing of seat belts compulsory. The Bill left this Chamber unaltered after that amendment was defeated.

Mr. Freebairn: We are mainly concerned with the front seat passengers, aren't we?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: We are concerned only with the front seat passengers now. The Bill left this Chamber in the form in which it had been introduced. In another place, an amendment to delete the obligation to install belts was carried on the casting vote of the Chairman, and, therefore, the Bill just failed to pass both Houses in the form in which it was introduced. As a result of the amendment agreed to in that fashion in another place, there was a conference between managers of the two Houses, a compromise was reached, and the Bill as it finally became law (after the compromise was agreed to by both Houses) inserted a new section 162a (and it is in the Road Traffic Act now). Subsection (1) of that section provides that the section should apply to every motor vehicle which has seating accommodation for one or more persons sitting by the side of the driver, either on the same seat or on a separate seat, and which is registered for the first time after June 30, 1964. Subsection (2) provides that a person shall not drive a vehicle to which the section applies if in any respect the vehicle does not comply with the requirements of the section and the specifications prescribed by the board as to seat belts and anchorages for seat belts, on pain of a penalty of £25. Subsection (3) provides:

Every vehicle to which this section applies must be fitted with:

(*a*) an anchorage for a seat belt suitably placed for use by the driver;

(*b*) at least one other anchorage for a seat belt suitably placed for use by another person sitting on the same seat as the driver or on a separate seat by the side of the driver's seat; and

(*c*) a seat belt suitably placed for use by the driver and at least one other seat belt placed for use by another person sitting on the same seat as the driver or on a separate seat by the side of the driver's seat:

Provided that the requirements of paragraph (*c*) of this subsection shall not apply or take effect until after a date to be specified by the Governor by proclamation.

It is that last proviso, naturally enough, that gives rise to this motion. I do not think I need canvass the other subsections in any detail. Substantially, the Bill, which inserted that new section, provided that all new cars sold after June 30, 1964, must have anchorages for seat belts fitted for the driver and a passenger sitting next to him, that is, the front seat passenger (who occupies what is usually known as the suicide seat in a motor car). The provision for the compulsory installation of belts was to be covered by proclamation.

Unfortunately, no proclamation has been made. During the 1964 session I asked a number of questions of the then Premier about this matter, and he was always able (very politely, but nevertheless quite definitely) to put me off. During this present session, hoping that the new Government would be prepared to advise His Excellency to make the proclamation, I have asked a number of questions of the present Premier. The answer that he gave to the last of these questions, Mr. Speaker, was on June 22, when he said:

This matter is currently before Cabinet, and when a decision has been reached it will be made known.

As that was almost four months ago and we have not yet had a decision, I thought the time had come to introduce this motion. It stands to reason, I suggest, that if seat belts are fitted as standard equipment in motor cars a greater proportion of people driving cars will, in fact, wear them. That has been the experience (I can say this quite definitely to members) in those States in the United States of America where the compulsory fitting of belts has been introduced.

Mr. Freebairn: Isn't it law in Great Britain now, also?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, not yet. I think Great Britain has a proposal to make anchorages compulsory, just as we have it now. What is perhaps of greater significance is that the four biggest manufacturers of motor cars in the U.S.A. are now fitting belts to motor vehicles sold in that country as standard equipment. They are doing that in all cars.

Mr. Shannon: Some of the major British companies are now putting in anchorages as standard equipment.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is so. In America the belts are actually being fitted. There is no doubt that in this State in the last two years the installation of belts and the use of belts has grown; there has been an increasing public acceptance of them. However, even the most generous estimate still is that only about 25 per cent of vehicles are fitted with belts, and if we are to wait for the gradual voluntary fitting of belts we shall be waiting for a long time indeed. I have here a copy of a report (this is the latest one, that of October 1965) which illustrates that contention, for it states:

Whether seat belts save lives, are effective, or a waste of money, appears to depend on the individual motorist and the value he places on his life. Preliminary surveys on the fitting of seat belts during the past three years since they were introduced show that most motorists approve seat belts but the majority are too apathetic to fit them. Acceptance of this safety factor varies in each State and ranges from 14 per cent to 25 per cent. It seems incredible that in this age of split-second driving motorists generally take life so cheaply and seem to forget they owe it to themselves and their family to take essential precautions at all times. Last year nearly 3,000 people died on Australian roads, while about 75,000 were injured. The loss to the national economy has been estimated at £100,000,000, but the personal grief to individual families is incalculable. Seat belts themselves do not prevent accidents—the driver and a combination of factors are responsible—but the police believe seat belts would effect a big drop in road casualties, as high as 70 per cent of driver-passenger casualties in some cases. Some road safety authorities believe seat belts could save 15,000 drivers and passengers from death and serious injury in road accidents during the next 12 months.

I believe the time has come to advise His Excellency to make the proclamation pursuant to the section that I quoted. I believe that public opinion is ready for it. The Gallup polls (and there have been a number of them since 1959) show that a fluctuating number of people, but always over 60 per cent, favour the compulsory installation of belts. If we are not ready now to have this provision then I doubt whether we shall ever be ready for it, and with every day that passes lives are lost and injuries are sustained—lives that could be saved and injuries that could be prevented. Seat belts may not be the complete answer to the road traffic problem; indeed, they

are not. There may be drawbacks to the introduction of seat belts.

Mr. Freebairn: The only drawback is that the belts would have to be worn.

Mr. Shannon: They cannot be worn unless they are installed .

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not consider that there is any overriding reason for rejecting them altogether. At least, this is something that we know will substantially reduce the shocking toll on the roads and it is something to which this House agreed in 1963. Surely, the saving of lives and prevention of injuries far outweigh every argument to the contrary. Indeed, if only one life were saved in every 12 months, it would be worthwhile. However, we know that it will save many more lives and prevent many more injuries than that.

The passing of this motion will simply mean that all new cars registered for the first time after a date stated in the proclamation must have fitted to them a belt for the driver and a belt for the front-seat passenger. The motion does not refer to cars on the road at present; installation would be voluntary in the case of those vehicles. The passing of the motion will not mean that the belts must be worn, although we hope that they will be worn. I consider that, in view of experience in other countries, a large proportion would be worn.

However, the motion provides only for the compulsory installation of two belts in new cars registered after a certain date. As time went on, an increasing number of motor cars would have the belts fitted. Therefore, for the reasons I have given, I commend the motion to the consideration of honourable members and ask them for their overwhelming support, as was given to me in 1963.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I am pleased to second this motion and I congratulate the honourable member for Mitcham on his crusading zeal. I know that all that motivates the honourable member is his desire for a reduction in the enormous toll of human life that takes place on our roads today. The honourable member for Mitcham quoted statistics and I should like to quote what I consider are rather important and relevant figures from the *Commonwealth Year Book* for 1964. The number killed in each Australian State was calculated in relation to each 100,000 of the population.

I do not want to labour this and read all the figures to the House, but some of them are significant and I think they indicate the trend that we must expect in the future as traffic increases on our roads and as vehicle speeds increase. The figure for South Australia for 1962-63 was 20 persons killed for each 100,000 mean population. The highest death rates were in Victoria and Queensland, where the figure was 27. Tasmania had the lowest figure, 19. That is a small State and traffic density is not great. I suppose that traffic density is not great in South Australia so far, but the figures indicate the trend that we must expect as we get more traffic on our roads. At this stage, I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

OFF-COURSE BETTING.

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Casey:

That, in the opinion of this House, a Bill should be introduced by the Government this session to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators, similar to the scheme in operation in Victoria,

which Mr. Hughes had moved to amend by leaving out all words after the word "House" and inserting in lieu thereof the following words:

any Act passed to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators should not come into operation until it has been approved by the electors at a referendum,

and which Mr. Millhouse had also moved to amend by leaving out the words "this session" and by leaving out all the words after the word "totalizators" with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the words "so that this matter may be properly considered by Parliament".

(Continued from October 13. Page 2126.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I rise to support the motion as moved by the member for Frome and, in doing so, desire to make a few observations on it. First, I should like to refer to an argument advanced by the honourable member for Ridley last Wednesday that all honourable members should vote for this motion so as to enable a Bill to be introduced. The honourable member thought that that was the only way in which there could be proper discussion and that it was fundamental to democratic procedure. However, I do not agree with that point of view. I think that, as a result of the moving of this motion, we are able to discuss fully the issues involved and ultimately get the opinion of the House as a whole. Every honourable member has a right to his own particular view and a right to vote as he pleases on the matter.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: That is not possible without a Bill, is it?

Mr. HUDSON: If this motion is not passed, what will be the point in introducing a Bill that will waste the time of the Government and of the House as a whole? If an honourable member (it would not necessarily be a member of the Government Party; it might be an Opposition member) moved, for example, that the Wheat and Woolgrowers' Association be banned, I wonder whether the honourable member would take the same point of view and say that a Bill should be introduced?

The Hon. T. C. Stott: What you are overlooking is that a Bill on T.A.B. can be introduced only by a Minister.

Mr. HUDSON: This is a Bill that can be introduced that way, but if in the opinion of the House a majority of members are against the motion and the issue is fully discussed, what is the point in introducing a Bill and wasting the House's time?

The Hon. T. C. Stott: On another issue a private member introduces a Bill straight out.

Mr. HUDSON: If members disagree with the principle contained in it they vote against the second reading, and the details are not further considered.

The Hon. T. C. Stott: That is what I said.

Mr. HUDSON: The points about this motion have been fully canvassed for weeks. The member for Ridley cannot suggest that members should vote for the introduction of a Bill to enable further discussion of this issue if their views are against the motion. The result of the motion should be a guide to the Government as to whether it is worthwhile spending the time debating the matter further and introducing a Bill. In answer to the member for Ridley, all I am defending is the right of members to vote against this motion if they so desire. I intend to support the motion, but I do not agree with the argument of the member for Ridley. In supporting the motion, first, I contend that the current situation represents the essence of hypocrisy. We have a situation where it is legal to bet on a racecourse, but off the course it is illegal, and no effective attempt has been made in this State (or in other States prior to the introduction of off-course betting) to enforce the law relating to illegal starting price betting. As a result, S.P. betting flourishes; no contribution is made to Government revenue; and as starting prices are usually lower than the prices operating on the course or prices paid by the totalizator, the extra rake-off goes to S.P. bookmakers.

No contribution is made to the racing industry or to the community generally via contributions to Government revenue. This situation is wrong. If the community as a whole is not prepared to have regard to the illegality of off-course betting, it should be prepared to consider some means whereby betting off-course can be legalized and the ordinary citizen given the right to act in a legal fashion as he does should he go to a racecourse. Secondly, the introduction of a totalizator agency board system of betting does not necessarily imply an extention of the amount of gambling that would take place in South Australia. The form of the motion—that a Bill should be introduced for the Government to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators similar to the scheme in operation in Victoria—is most important in relation to this issue. I emphasize "similar to the scheme in operation in Victoria". I believe that if T.A.B. were introduced into South Australia in a manner similar to but not identical with that operating in Victoria, and if at the same time the illegal bookmakers were suppressed, we would have a situation where the amount of gambling on races would actually decline instead of increase.

In the Victorian system the punter cannot bet on credit nor can he play up his winnings. It is the ability to bet on credit with an S.P. bookmaker and the ability to play up winnings that cause large increases in the volume of gambling. Eliminate those things and the amount of gambling that takes place legally through a T.A.B. system may be less than that which takes place through the S.P. bookmaker. In Victoria, the Royal Commission estimated the amount of illegal S.P. betting at about £250,000,000 a year. This is a guess, and no-one has any satisfactory way of checking that estimate. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that since the introduction of T.A.B. in Victoria, S.P. bookmaking has taken a considerable knock, and consequently the amount of betting on the T.A.B. system has increased only to a total of £58,000,000. It could well be that in Victoria the total of betting following the introduction of T.A.B. has fallen rather than increased. If the same or a similar scheme were introduced in South Australia, not allowing credit or playing up of winnings, I believe there would be a similar result here. It is for those particular reasons that I oppose the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham.

Mr. Millhouse: Oh, no!

Mr. HUDSON: I believe it would be valuable to have the reference to the Victorian system. I am prepared to contemplate T.A.B. only if a system similar to that operating in Victoria is introduced, and I want the opinion of the House on that issue. I regard that opinion as being most valuable. By the amendment of the member for Mitcham, the words "this session" are to be left out. If the motion is carried it reflects the opinion of the House that a Bill for T.A.B. should be introduced this session, though whether it could be passed this session is another matter. If it were not possible to introduce it this session, I would regard the opinion of the House expressed in favour of the motion as carrying over with full effect into the next session, so that this amendment of the member for Mitcham is not particularly relevant.

Mr. Millhouse: You disappoint me.

Mr. HUDSON: I am sorry I do that. I think it is best to be courteous and tactful if one can be.

Mr. Clark: Even charitable.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. A further point is that illegal S.P. betting can be associated with serious malpractices. When an individual can get credit, it sometimes happens that the S.P. bookmaker employs stand-over men to enforce payment of debts. Furthermore, the lack of T.A.B. has meant some difficulty for the racing industry in this State. Although the industry has not been forced out of existence, it has not been encouraged in any way. Prize money for ordinary races has not been adequate, so that the ordinary trainer, owner and jockey have great difficulty in making ends meet. This situation encourages malpractices of one sort or another. I believe that if T.A.B. were introduced it would make some contribution to the racing industry and that, if a Bill for its establishment ensured that this contribution would benefit in particular the ordinary trainer, owner and jockey (the small man), it would become much easier for people associated with the racing industry to make a living legitimately without indulging in the malpractices that may occasionally arise. I am not suggesting that any significant percentage of those associated with the industry engages in malpractices; all I say is that the return from activities associated with racing is not such as to encourage the elimination of malpractices.

Several members have said the introduction of T.A.B. is a first step to the extension of all sorts of gambling facility throughout this State. Some have suggested that if we get T.A.B. it will not be long before betting agencies become like the old betting shops or before poker machines and other things are introduced; but I do not believe this argument is valid. I do not think the opinion of members, which at present would be almost unanimously against betting shops and poker machines, would be changed significantly by the introduction of T.A.B. Suggesting that because members vote for T.A.B. they will suddenly be converted to supporting all sorts of gambling is ridiculous; it underwrites entirely the responsible attitude they are capable of taking. I do not accept the argument that the introduction of T.A.B. will be a first step towards extending gambling.

Summarizing, I believe that T.A.B. will not necessarily extend gambling facilities but that it will dignify a situation that is now full of hypocrisy. It will give the ordinary citizen the right to bet legally, whereas at present he is betting illegally without there being any effective attempt by the law to prevent him. Also, T.A.B. will enable some assistance to be given to an industry which, if we are not prepared to wipe it out, we should allow to operate on a reasonable basis. Finally, I believe that T.A.B. will benefit the community as a whole through a greater contribution to Government revenue.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I oppose this motion, although I, like the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson), do not agree with the member for Ridley (Hon. T. C. Stott) that those who oppose the motion are denying Parliament the right to have a discussion. This motion has enabled members to discuss this matter fully. However, I cannot understand why a Government member has sought the opinion of this House. The Government claims that, as the people elected it, it has a mandate to govern. This is part of government, so why does the Government want the opinion of this House? I suspect that it is in a cleft stick and that if T.A.B. misfires it wants the Opposition to be mixed up in the matter. In other words, it is not prepared to do this of its own volition.

I do not agree that, if T.A.B. were to be introduced, it should be similar to the Victorian system. The previous Government introduced a proposal that I was willing to support, but I am not willing to support the Victorian system. Having regard to the limited material he had at his disposal, the mover of the motion put up a good case. He said:

Let me remind honourable members that racing is a sport. I have heard it referred to as the king of sports.

Perhaps it was the king of sports many years ago, but that is not so now. Nobody can tell me that it is a sport; it is a business, and a very big one. Andrew Tennant (Acting Chairman of the South Australian Off-course Totalizator Committee) has said:

Revenue: T.A.B. will provide additional Government revenue. As the Government has already announced plans for the building of new hospitals, this additional revenue could be specifically allotted to hospitals and general welfare expenditure.

There is no doubt about the statement that T.A.B. will provide additional Government revenue but, as far as we can ascertain, there is nothing to say that the proceeds will go towards hospitals and general welfare expenditure. Nobody has told me that.

Mr. Hughes: There will be very little for that.

Mr. HEASLIP: As far as I know, it will all go into general revenue. It is simply another revenue-producing scheme. Then, Mr. Tennant continues:

It is conservatively estimated that within three years of introduction T.A.B. will provide additional Government revenue in excess of £600,000. For the year ended June 30, 1964, the Victorian Government received £1,623,751, and the Queensland Government, £485,468, in commission from T.A.B. operations.

Various honourable members supporting this measure have said that T.A.B. will not encourage or increase betting.

Mr. Hughes: I'll say it will!

Mr. HEASLIP: What Mr. Tennant says is sufficient in itself to indicate that it will, because when the Victorian Government is receiving £1,500,000-odd from T.A.B. it can mean nothing else. When introducing this measure, the member for Frome presented a table of totalizator investments and bookmakers' turnover in Victoria from 1960-61 to 1964-65. He told us that in 1960 the total on-course totalizator investments were £13,855,634, and the off-course totalizator investments £1,442,638. In contrast, the total on-course totalizator investments four years later are up to £16,000,000, and the astounding part of it is that for 1964-65 the total off-course totalizator investments are £56,000,000.

Mr. McKee: Have you taken increased population into account?

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not know about that, but I do know that, since T.A.B. was introduced into Victoria, off-course betting investments have increased from £1,500,000 to about £56,000,000. Honourable members cannot argue about this, for it is a direct result of the functioning of T.A.B. Indeed, the member for Frome used those figures to illustrate how popular T.A.B. was. However, some people in supporting this measure try to tell us that T.A.B. does not encourage betting. Of course it does! Mr. Tennant's statement continues:

Racing and trotting industries:—

He calls it an industry; he does not call it a sport. He is frank about it.—

Income from T.A.B. operations will assist the racing and trotting industries. South Australian metropolitan and country clubs will receive income which will enable them to increase prize money and improve amenities.

The higher the prize money the more interest that will be taken, the more encouragement that will be given, and the more betting that will take place. The statement continues:

It will be giving South Australian clubs a reasonable chance to compete with the now more affluent T.A.B. States and, furthermore, the established breeding industry in this State can be maintained and improved.

I believe that competition is a good thing, but so does Mr. Tennant because he knows that competition will bring about more investment. Continuing, he states:

T.A.B. does not mean unbridled gambling. It is not an inducement to bet. It merely provides a facility for city and country people unable to attend meetings to place a bet legally.

I differ from Mr. Tennant on that score, too. T.A.B. will not only provide a facility for more betting: it will induce betting. Where a person walking along the street sees a lottery advertised for, say, 2s. 6d. or 5s. a ticket, he is tempted to buy one. T.A.B. will provide a similar temptation and, being only human, many people will use the facility.

Mr. Corcoran: What happens now to country people who do not have the facility?

Mr. HEASLIP: Under the Victorian system of T.A.B. they would not benefit. Country people will not be able to go along to a T.A.B. agency and use that facility. It is merely an amenity for the metropolitan area, and not for the country.

Mr. McKee: Victoria has agencies in the country.

Mr. HEASLIP: How many? Victoria is much more thickly populated than South Australia. It is all right for the honourable member to say that, because he lives in the city, but I am talking about the real country people, who will not benefit by the T.A.B. facilities provided in the city. The member for Frome, in introducing the measure, said:

I wonder what the people who play bridge and poker regularly for stakes would say if they were told that what they were doing was evil. In other words, he is implying that betting is evil, but I do not think that. If people want to bet let them use their own money; it is their families that will go without, because no punter wins. I do not care if a man is the best informed punter in the world—he will not win. Only the bookmakers and those that own the horses make money; the poor old punter loses all the time.

Mr. Corcoran: Punters are better informed every day.

Mr. HEASLIP: Unfortunately they are not sufficiently informed. Bookmakers still keep on riding around in Rolls Royces and punters keep on losing money. However, I do not agree that betting is evil. Rather I suggest that it is a pity that people bet and so deprive their families of the amenities that could be provided with the money lost. I believe that all punters lose money, but, if they feel they can afford to lose it, it is their own money. I could not understand the reasons given by the mover of the motion. He said:

In moving the motion I have stated my case why T.A.B. should be established in this State and why I think it would be in the best interests of our community. I have not spoken in favour of extensions to gambling facilities.

Who could imagine that the establishment of T.A.B. would not be an extension of gambling facilities? Of course it is—it must be. The honourable member continued:

On the contrary, I am very definitely (and I mean definitely) in favour of control of gambling.

The establishment of T.A.B. would not control gambling but make it more prevalent. It would not do away with S.P. bookmakers. I think it was the member for Glenelg who said that £250,000,000 was invested with S.P. bookmakers in Victoria. I believe he just plucked that figure out of the air. The member for Ridley said that £50,000,000 was invested with Victorian S.P. bookmakers. A big disparity exists between those two estimates. However, all estimates are merely guesses because nobody knows the amount invested with S.P. bookmakers.

Mr. Hughes: The only way to curb S.P. bookmakers is to lock them up for 10 years.

Mr. HEASLIP: I do not think the gaols would hold them all, and I would not like the State to have to pay the expense of keeping them in gaol. S.P. betting is rife all over the country. One can place a bet anywhere.

Mr. Ryan: How does the honourable member know that?

Mr. HEASLIP: I know because I have been invited to these places.

Mr. Ryan: Will the honourable member name a place where a bet can be made?

Mr. HEASLIP: I could do so, but I will not. The member for Ridley said that there is an urgent need for the establishment of T.A.B., but I could think of nothing less urgent. Many matters said to be urgent have been introduced this session: a Bill was introduced for a referendum on a lottery; a motion was introduced dealing with greyhound racing; and we have had this motion dealing with T.A.B. I can see nothing urgent in any of these matters. Far more urgent matters should be before the House. This motion is a waste of time and provides another opportunity for people to waste money. Like most other members, I have received petitions. I agree that not much notice should be taken of petitions, because I know how easily people sign them.

Mr. McKee: Are all the signatures you have in your hand from people in your district?

Mr. HEASLIP: Most of them are, and they are all against the motion. I have one petition in favour. Signatures have come to me from people in not only my district but also from people in Penola, Cowell and Lyndoch.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I shall be brief. I am not prepared to give a silent vote on this matter, and I say at the outset that I intend to suport the amendment foreshadowed by the member for Mitcham. I have stated publicly in my district my opposition to the establishment in South Australia of a system of T.A.B. similar to that operating in Victoria, as proposed by the member for Frome. If such a motion were carried I would then be tied down specifically to that type of system, and it would be provided for in a subsequent Bill to be brought before the House. I refuse to be so tied down on a Bill which I have not yet seen and which would establish a system similar to that operating in Victoria. I do not believe the Victorian system would be in the best interests of South Australia. Nor can I support the amendment moved by the member for Wallaroo, although I appreciate his point of view on this matter. I believe his amendment simply passes the buck on this important social question. As members of Parliament we have an obligation to make our own decisions on an important question such as this. We should not have to be passing the buck all the time. Surely, as members of

Parliament we are big enough to face up to this question, make up our own minds and take a decision on the matter, either in favour of or against T.A.B.

Mr. Hughes: Did you not say the other day that you were in favour of a referendum?

Mr. COUMBE: I am talking about T.A.B., not about any other Bill. In fact, I am precluded by Standing Orders from doing that. The member for Mitcham has foreshadowed an amendment providing specially for a Bill to be introduced in this House so that the whole matter of T.A.B. can be properly considered by Parliament and debated on its merits or demerits. If this amendment were carried, it would mean that the resulting Bill, being a money Bill, would have to be introduced by the Government and members could then debate its specific clauses and all the conditions appertaining to the control and operation of a T.A.B. system. The advantage of this is that members would then be able to vote as they wished on something that they knew would be specifically provided instead of on a completely blind provision, as provided for by this motion. Then, members would have an opportunity to express their views either in favour of or against T.A.B.; we could discuss a specific matter and so get the best possible system for South Australia. The view has been expressed both by members opposite and by members on this side that on social questions there should be a free vote. That has always been the view held by members on this side, that on social questions the voting should not be on Party lines but that members should be able to express their views and vote according to their consciences. The best way to achieve that is to introduce a specific Bill. Therefore, this motion should be defeated and the amendment of the member for Mitcham supported.

Late last year, after much discussion, a scheme was arrived at known as the 14-points scheme. It received some, though not unanimous, support, because some people opposed it. However, it had the tacit support of some of the churches, and that is important to remember because, if such a system is to be introduced in South Australia, it is desirable that it have at least a measure of support from as many sections of the community as possible. The 14-points scheme received some support mainly because of the provisions to safeguard abuses of it. The motion before us is retrograde and certainly not the best means of discussing this important social question. How important it is has been revealed by successive speakers, who have put forward various points of view from all over the country. That it is exercising the minds of members of the community is illustrated by the large number of petitions that have been presented and the thousands of signatures appearing on them. So this matter is well before the public today.

I support my friend's amendment, first because I believe it is a better way of handling this important matter; secondly, because I believe that the motion before us is not the best way of going about it; thirdly, because I object to the suggestion made by the member for Wallaroo (Mr. Hughes) of passing the buck, although I appreciate his sentiments; and, fourthly, because if this amendment is carried and a Bill is subsequently introduced it will provide this House with an opportunity for further discussion on this important topic.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I rise to join issue with my good colleague, the member for Torrens. His argument is not sound, as is apparent when we read the motion moved by the member for Frome. The member for Torrens wants a Bill introduced so that we can discuss it on its merits and amend it where necessary: in other words, so that we can discuss a concrete measure.

Mr. Clark: But we can do that with the motion.

Mr. SHANNON: I have not finished yet. It is obvious that any amendment to this motion will be an attempt by the House to (as the member for Torrens puts it) pass the buck. Perhaps I shall be a buck-passer—I am not too sure. I may be so classified in the final analysis, but I point out that, if this is such a thorny question (about which I have some doubt), I do know that there are certain people with a vested interest in the racing game who keenly desire to see something done about it. Vested interests only are promoting this matter. I say that with due respect to the member for Frome (Mr. Casey) and other members, who hold varying views on this matter, but I think it is fair to assume that the prompters are the people with an axe to grind, people closely connected with the racing game. There is a golden opportunity for the Government, if it wishes to test the popularity or otherwise of T.A.B., to make such a test without cost; it would not cost the Government a razoo. It is a simple matter of adding another question to the ballot-paper to be used for the referendum on a State lottery. The two questions could be resolved forthwith without further fuss or cost. If it is thought that the elector may be bemused because he is

asked two questions instead of one, I point out that a prominent leader of the Labor Party once asked 14 questions.

Mr. Clark: Do you remember the result?

Mr. SHANNON: Yes. I understand the 14 questions did not bemuse the electors; they were quite competent to say "No" to 14 questions, and I should think they would be just as capable of saying "No" to two questions. It does not appear to me that it would entail very great multiplication of the problems of the elector to have to make up his mind on two questions. I shall be brief on this matter, because I do not deny the honourable member the right to a vote. Whether or not his motion is carried, if the Government has sufficient confidence in the support this matter has in the electorate it can bring in a Bill. The motion is a pious one, and I have seen dozens of such motions carried in my time in Parliament. Most of those motions are carried but subsequently discarded, and that is a simple way to get out of problems. This question ultimately must be presented to Parliament in the form of a Bill if it is ever to become law. These sorts of motion do one thing of which I do not approve: they seek to test the feeling of members prior to the introduction of a Bill. I like the direct approach; I like to come out in the open and bring in what I want to bring in, to throw something before members and let them have a chew at it, without any ill feelings in the matter.

I repeat that I do not approve of motions such as this. In the circumstances, I shall have to vote, and I say now that I am going to vote for the member for Wallaroo's amendment, because it will not cost anything to test the feelings of the people, and I think that is probably a better approach than trying to test the feelings of members of Parliament, who are going to decide the issue finally anyway. If the Government wants to know what the people feel about this matter it has a golden opportunity to put it to them, and I consider it is the lesser of two evils. Therefore, I support the amendment moved by the member for Wallaroo in the hope that the House will see fit to give this matter an airing before any other action is taken. Actually, my own approach to these things is that I take the blame or the credit (whichever is due) for dealing with my own problems in my own way, without asking my electors for guidance.

Mr. Hudson: You realize it would not be possible at this stage to get this question put on the ballot-paper.

Mr. SHANNON: I suggest to the member for Glenelg that some delay in taking the ballot on the lottery would not be out of court entirely. I see the honourable member smiling, but he knows it is well within the realms of practical politics for that to be done. I do not think he would deny that it could be done quite simply. There is no constitutional bar to having the two matters referred at the same time by referendum, and if it delays for a week or two the taking of the referendum on a lottery I do not think it will be a nation-rocking matter. I do not think anything would finally result from a joint approach to the electors by way of referendum that would be harmful to the State. By this time members will know where I stand on the matter. Finally, I support the contention of the member for Torrens that it is desirable to have such matters as these presented in the form of legislation so that we can deal with them on their merits.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I do not wish to debate the issues particularly today, but because of the public interest in the question I consider that I should explain my attitude in this matter. We now have three questions on the Notice Paper: the original motion of the member for Frome, the amendment of the member for Wallaroo providing for a referendum, and the amendment of the member for Mitcham. As a private member, I object to having to do the Government's work for it, which is what we shall be doing if we approve of these measures today. During the voting I shall be parting company with a number of other members; I will not be voting with the same group of members all the time. I say here and now quite frankly that I am opposed to the original motion and to both the amendments.

I believe that there is some demand throughout the State for off-course betting, and I believe that there is a case for a person who is keen on betting to have an opportunity to lodge a bet without having to go to a racecourse, provided he resides some distance from the racecourse. The previous Government came to an agreement with the Off-Course Totalizator Committee to introduce legislation which, in my opinion, was extremely sensible. That legislation provided in the main for country people to have the opportunity to bet by means of the telephone, and of course that implied that they had to place credit with the agency before they could make a bet. Now, to my mind, that is important, because I believe that while the desire of a person to bet legally

(when now he does not have the opportunity but is keen to do so) is a perfectly legitimate one, on the other hand I do not approve of the type of T.A.B. that is being so freely talked about in this House—the system that has offices all over the place where people can go to bet. I think such a system would only encourage non-betting people to start betting, and I do not think that is a good thing.

I consider that those people who are bettors and who wish to continue betting should have some opportunity to lodge bets legally, but I do not think they should have the opportunity to bet in a system which will enable (and perhaps also encourage) those who are not now bettors to begin betting. I believe that is harmful, and that is why I dislike the system of T.A.B. which is operating in Victoria and which is now sought by the member for Frome. The second aspect of the motion is that I do not consider that we should be asked by a weak device to request the Government to bring in a Bill. When we were in government, a Bill was being prepared and we had guaranteed to introduce the measure. It was not necessary to pass motions to ask us to do that. If a Bill had been introduced, some honourable members would have opposed it and others would have supported it. We would not have tried to get them to commit themselves before they had seen the Bill, and the present Government should not have to have a motion carried so that it could say that the House asked for it and it was only doing what the House wanted.

Mr. Shannon: If the Government carried that principle right through it would not be so bad.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: We have been getting much about Labor principles lately and the more we talk about them, the more confused members become. In fact, we are beginning to wonder how to spell the word "principle" as it is applied to the Labor Party.

Mr. Jennings: Your "principal" is £.s.d.

Mr. Lawn: You do not know what principles are.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The amendment moved by the honourable member for Wallaroo states:

That in the opinion of this House any Act passed to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators should not come into operation until it has been approved by the electors at a referendum.

Although I agree with the honourable member in some respects, I do not agree with all the sentiments he has expressed in advancing his argument. I do not consider that we, as legislators, should delegate our authority by way of a referendum. In fact, I do not believe in referenda very much and, as has been said in other debates this session, if there is to be a referendum, it should be on a complete Bill so that every detail is before the people. However, the point here is that we are responsible for what we do and we should be prepared to take that responsibility and decide one way or the other. Much of my objection to the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham is that it still asks the Government to bring in a Bill and I do not want to do that. The Government is able to bring in what legislation it likes. Why hasn't it the stomach to bring in legislation without having this silly debate going on week after week in order to get the verdict of the House first? It is about time the Government realized that it has to be consistent in its approach. If it is consistent, it will introduce its own legislation without making such preparations as we see here. If the matter was not so complicated and if I thought an amendment would have any effect at all, I would have moved to amend the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham. I shall not do that, but shall state what I would have done. It would have read:

In the opinion of this House, if the Government wishes to bring in a Bill for T.A.B. . . .

I would then have added the member for Mitcham's amendment, that the Bill should be brought here for discussion. The important words in the amendment I contemplated were "if the Government wishes". We should not be asked to decide these matters for the Government. It has not been in office for long but it has left everybody confused regarding its approach to legislation. I oppose the motion and the amendments standing on the Notice Paper.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I have listened with much interest to the speeches made since I moved this motion several months ago.

Mr. Quirke: You haven't heard much!

Mr. CASEY: Contrary to what the honourable member for Burra has said, I was in the House 99 per cent of the time taken up by the debate. In fact, I did not have time to go out for a cigarette or a cup of tea when the debate was proceeding.

Mr. Freebairn: Did you do any lobbying?

Mr. CASEY: No, I did not. The amazing part about this debate is the variation in the attitudes of honourable members opposite. They

talk about honourable members on this side not being united! Some honourable members opposite think that a Bill should have been introduced so that the matter could be debated, while others do not think that the motion has been before the House long enough to enable full discussion. Again, others have said, "We have had time to discuss this. The sooner we take a vote on it, the better." That is the sort of thing that has been served up during this debate. However, I propose to refer to some of the points that have been made. This morning I looked up the meaning of "morals" in the dictionary and found that the word meant:

Relating to, dealing with, or capable of making the distinction between right and wrong in conduct.

I think all honourable members will agree that we should give the people outside the credit for being able to make up their own minds and decide between right and wrong. That is up to the individual. However, getting back to the matter of morals, those who have opposed T.A.B. on a moral issue say that to have a bet is morally wrong. I think that that is probably the mis-statement of the century and I do not agree with it in any way at all. I do not want to name the honourable members concerned, because we all know who they are and they have been quoted in the paper as being opposed to T.A.B.

Mr. Hughes: Stop looking at me.

Mr. CASEY: I was addressing the Chair, so I could not have been looking in any other direction. Those honourable members make no mention whatsoever of the advertisements in our daily newspapers, magazines, weeklies and monthlies that have a degrading effect on the moral standards of the community. No reference has been made to the books and the obscene literature that can be purchased at any book stand or from any bookseller.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: That was not up for debate.

Mr. CASEY: That does not matter.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Yes it does.

The SPEAKER: I remind the honourable member this matter was not up for debate and it therefore cannot be part of the reply.

Mr. CASEY: I was outlining the differences between betting, which is claimed to be morally wrong within the community, and other things which are, in my opinion, more morally wrong, but which have not been discussed. I listened with great interest to the Leader, and was amazed to find that he (with the knowledge that he claims to have) referred to the question of T.A.B. as a social question, and said that the Labor Party believed that social questions should be submitted to the people by way of referendum. He said this was included in the Labor Party's rule book, on which the member for Mitcham wasted 5s. I correct the Leader on this point.

Mr. Clark: There may be something in it that would do him good.

Mr. CASEY: The Leader said it was a waste of money to buy it, but I am sure that it is not. On page 47, under the heading "Social", the Leader will find no reference to the subject he mentioned. The only thing referred to in the rule book is the submission to a referendum of the question of a State lottery, in which referendum the Labor Party will take no part. I sincerely hope that the Leader will read the rule book held by the member for Mitcham, so that he will be more enlightened in future than he has been in the past.

Mr. Millhouse: I think you are trying to antagonize us.

Mr. CASEY: I know members want to vote on the motion, as it has been before the House for some time, and I know that it is a contentious issue. I am sure that the Leader was surprised to see so many differences of opinion within his own ranks, and that this surprised not only him but everyone else.

Mr. Quirke: There could be differences, but we still remain a Party.

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. CASEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the member for Onkaparinga when he said that matters should be dealt with directly in this House. Unfortunately, as a private member I am in the same position as he is, and cannot introduce a Bill on this matter because it deals with money. The honourable member knows that as well as I do. This is the only way I could introduce this matter to the House, and I consider it advisable to have a scheme such as this in South Australia. We are fortunate in having T.A.B. operating in Victoria, as it is a neighbouring State and most of the racing fraternity frequently interchanges between that State and South Australia. During the fortnight I was in Victoria and New South Wales, I made a complete study of the systems operating, and spent much longer than the members for Gouger and Light, who were there for only two days. I was able to obtain the latest information on T.A.B.

in Victoria, whereas those members were there when the scheme was in its infancy. Today it is progressing well, and has been accepted not only by racing people but by the general public of Victoria. The system introduced in this State need not be exactly the same as that operating in Victoria, but it should be on similar lines. South Australia may have topographical differences that will have much bearing on a T.A.B. system. I commend the motion to the House, and hope that it will be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member for Frome has moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, a Bill should be introduced by the Government this session to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators, similar to the scheme in operation in Victoria,

which Mr. Hughes had moved to amend by leaving out all words after the word "House" and inserting in lieu thereof the following words:

any Act passed to make provision for off-course betting on racecourse totalizators should not come into operation until it has been approved by the electors at a referendum,

and which Mr. Millhouse had also moved to amend by leaving out the words "this session" and by leaving out all the words after the word "totalizators" with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the words "so that this matter may be properly considered by Parliament". To safeguard the amendment of the member for Mitcham, I shall formally put, in the first instance, only so much of the member for Wallaroo's amendment as is unaffected by the second amendment. The question before the Chair, therefore, is:

That the words "a Bill should be introduced by the Government", proposed to be struck out, stand part of the motion.

The House divided on the question:

Ayes (23).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey (teller), Corcoran, Coumbe, Curren, Freebairn, Hall, Hudson, Hurst, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, McAnaney, McKee, Millhouse, Quirke, Rodda, and Ryan, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Stott and Walsh.

Noes (15).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Bywaters, Clark, Dunstan, Ferguson, Heaslip, Hughes (teller), Hutchens, Loveday, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Messrs. Shannon and Teusner.

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

The SPEAKER: There are 23 Ayes and 15 Noes; a majority of eight for the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

The House divided on the question "That the words 'this session', proposed to be struck out, stand part of the motion":

Ayes (24).—Messrs. Brookman, Broomhill, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey (teller), Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Quirke, Rodda, Ryan, Stott, and Walsh.

Noes (14).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Hall, Heaslip, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford, Mr. Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

The SPEAKER: There are 24 Ayes and 14 Noes; a majority of 10 for the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative. The member for Mitcham has moved to strike out all the words after "totalizators" (that is, the words "similar to the scheme in operation in Victoria") with a view to inserting other words.

The House divided on the question "That the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the motion":

Ayes (23).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Bywaters, Casey (teller), Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst, Hutchens, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Quirke, Rodda, Ryan, Stott, and Walsh.

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

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

The SPEAKER: There are 23 Ayes and 15 Noes, a majority of eight for the Ayes. The question therefore passes in the affirmative.

The House divided on Mr. Casey's motion:

Ayes (21).—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey (teller), Clark, Corcoran, Curren, Hall, Hudson, Hurst, Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McAnaney, McKee, Quirke, Rodda, Ryan, Stott, and Walsh.

Noes (16).—Messrs. Bockelberg, Brookman, Bywaters, Coumbe, Ferguson, Freebairn, Heaslip, Hughes, Hutchens, Millhouse, Nankivell, and Pearson, Sir Thomas Playford (teller), Mr. Shannon, Mrs. Steele, and Mr. Teusner.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

ABORIGINAL AND HISTORIC RELICS PRESERVATION BILL.

Second reading.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is designed to replace the Bill passed through the House last year for the purpose of preserving Aboriginal cave drawings, rock carvings and many artefacts and skeletal remains which have, in recent years, been subject to grave vandalism and which are in danger of complete loss through accident, carelessness and through sale overseas. The previous Bill failed to pass through another place last year because it set up an authority beyond the control of Parliament and beyond even Ministerial control, although that authority was vested with power of prosecution, purchase and authorized to purchase relics by expenditure of public funds. This Bill has been approved and recommended by the expert committee set up by the previous Government, and it properly places the administration of the Act in the hands of a Minister who is to be advised by an expert honorary committee. The controlling authority is now the Museum Department, the head of which becomes the protector of these objects of historical and anthropological interest.

The Bill has also been extended to include remains of the early white man's history in Australia (resulting from visits to these shores before settlement) contained in wrecks within the three-mile limit, believed to exist in the Australian Bight, and arising from the early settlement and exploration of the State, and includes, as well, objects of Aboriginal origin. However, it specifically excludes any object made for sale by an Aboriginal, whether living or dead, and it specifically avoids interference with or restriction of living Aborigines in the religious usage or enjoyment of any remains. There are also appropriate sections providing the necessary powers to preserve or to purchase areas and, where necessary, to restrict public access. There are also powers, where relics are found on private land, enabling the Crown to join with the landowner for the purpose of protecting such areas whenever expedient. Where relics exist on land required for development by the State power is provided for the removal of these objects of interest and for their preservation where this can be done without their being destroyed.

Severe penalties are also laid down for wanton destruction of historic remains and the duty is laid on every person finding for the first time hitherto unknown remains to report to the Crown through members of the Police Force, who, for this purpose, are given powers as inspectors, or to report directly to the museum. However, the Bill does not penalize private persons for searching for and preserving objects exposed by chance or erosion because, in the past, we have been indebted to such people for the preservation of many of the most valuable relics in the State, and unless such action is encouraged undoubtedly many of the artefacts remaining will be lost forever. The Bill also restricts trading in objects of historical or anthropological interest and, before any such objects may be sold, the Adelaide Museum must be given the first chance of retaining them. Such relics and objects can be sold only with the consent of the Museum. Only in this way can heavy losses resulting from export of such relics overseas be prevented.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (AUDIT).

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Act, 1934-1964. Read a first time.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is not, in any way, a contentious measure. It deals with audits of district council accounts. The position in South Australia is different from that in other States in that we have no supervision over the auditing of district council accounts, except that the Auditor-General may, from time to time, conduct an audit if he considers one necessary. As a matter of fact, the Auditor-General has only a limited staff, and although he attempts to visit each council at least every four or five years this is not always possible because his staff is inadequate. In South Australia, a council may appoint an auditor and pay him such fee as it determines. In many cases the fee paid by a council is so low that the council cannot effectively provide for an audit of its affairs. I have a list of councils and the fees they pay. For example, one council pays £10, another £15 15s., another £26 5s., and another £16 16s. At one stage, until the Auditor-General objected, some councils were considering calling for tenders from people to audit the affairs of a number of councils. The position in other

States is quite different. Where public moneys are involved it is necessary to ensure that the councils have the support of a properly audited balance-sheet each year.

Tasmania provides that all local government accounts be audited by the Auditor-General. In Victoria there appears to be a Local Government Department, set up in 1958, for the better administration of the laws relating to local government. There is a Municipal Auditors Board, which may grant certificates of competency to municipal auditors. The Governor in Council may appoint for each municipality some person holding a certificate of competency from the Municipal Auditors Board as auditor and may remove any person so appointed. The auditor for any municipality shall be paid out of municipal funds such remuneration as the Governor in Council may fix. So in Tasmania it is done by the Government but in Victoria the Governor in Council appoints the auditor and fixes a fee for him. In Queensland the accounts of certain local government authorities in different parts of the State are audited by Government auditors. In all other instances audits are carried out by registered local government auditors appointed by the Minister on the recommendation of the Auditor-General. The auditor is paid such remuneration as the Minister, on the recommendation of the Auditor-General, may fix. Auditors report to councils and to the Auditor-General. The Auditor-General has special powers in respect of council expenditure.

Again, honourable members will notice that there is some supervision over who is appointed as the council auditor and to see that sufficient money is paid to enable a proper audit to be provided. In Western Australia the Minister of Local Government appoints the Government auditors for certain shires, etc., and fixes the amount payable for the audit. Those auditors work, I think, under the local government authority. Certain municipalities have council auditors. Others can, subject to an order by the Governor, appoint their own auditors and fix their own fees. In practice, all shires and some municipalities have Government auditors with fees fixed by the Minister. In New South Wales auditors are appointed by councils from holders of audit certificates. Remuneration is fixed by the council provided that where he deems it necessary the Minister may fix the remuneration. So that honourable members will see, from what I have said, that in the other States there are almost uniform provisions that the amount of the audit fee is either fixed by the Audit Department itself or fixed by the Government, and that the auditor who undertakes work for the councils is also officially approved in addition to being appointed by the council. In South Australia we have an Auditors Board but there is no supervision over how many audits one auditor may do or over the fees that may be paid by a council to the auditor concerned. It is impossible for any auditor to undertake a proper audit of a council's affairs unless an adequate fee is provided for the purpose.

This short Bill contains only two provisions. I believe it is completely non-contentious. Every member here realizes the importance of a council's affairs being properly audited, in view of the involvement of large sums of public money provided by the Government through the Minister of Roads. The first provision is that no person shall be appointed auditor except with the approval of the Auditor-General. That means that the councils will still have the right to nominate their auditor but, before he can be appointed, he must be approved by the Auditor-General. Without going into the technicalities of the drafting (I can assure honourable members that these provisions are properly drafted), let me say that the second provision of the Bill amends subsection (1) of section 158 of the principal Act by inserting at the end thereof the following proviso:

Provided that the amount of any salary, allowances or commissions payable to the auditor shall be approved by the Auditor-General.

In other words, the only two amendments that this Bill makes to the Local Government Act are (1) that it requires that the Auditor-General shall approve of the person concerned, and (2) that he shall approve of the amount paid to him for the conduct of the audit. On the one hand, it would enable sufficient money to be provided for an efficient audit to be conducted and, on the other hand, if an auditor defaulted on the job, when the question of his appointment arose the Auditor-General would probably say, "I am very sorry but your work is not up to the standard required under the Act."

Mr. Lawn: We ought to have something like that for lawyers and doctors, too.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I know that sometimes it is perhaps foolish to shut the gate after the horse has bolted, but the fact remains that for many years in South Australia councils have not been well served by auditors. That may be an outside opinion but it is supported by what I have pointed out to be the almost universal position in other

States, which have taken much more interest in the auditing of councils' accounts than we have in South Australia. In other States, the Government supervises the fee paid to the auditor and who the auditors should be. I do not desire to take away from local government its function of appointing its auditors, but this supervision will be welcomed by local government. I have discussed it with two or three councils, which have assured me that they would welcome an amendment to the Act along these lines, because they believe it would assist them in administering it. As I have said, I do not think anything in this Bill could cause honourable members any problems.

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTRICITY.

Adjourned debate on the motion of the Hon. Sir Thomas Playford:

(For wording of motion, see page 717.)

(Continued from October 6. Page 1987.)

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): Although this motion has been before the House for some time, its delay has not been through any lack of importance attaching to it. I believe this motion is a most important one and that it should receive the very careful consideration of the House. It is a fact that the position South Australia has occupied over many years in respect of its capacity to supply electric energy to all its consumers is probably unique in Australia. There has never been a time, since the Electricity Trust was established as such, when we have not been able to supply all the power required by industry and by domestic and other consumers for the reason only that we lacked the generating capacity. I agree that there have been times when we have not been able to supply power, but that has been because we have lacked the fuel to fire the boilers to produce the energy required. Those matters at that time were beyond our control. However, because of those circumstances the then Premier (Sir Thomas Playford) took action to overcome even that problem, and I believe that it must go down in the records of this State that probably the wisest thing Sir Thomas did for South Australia (and he did many wise things for this State) was to pin his faith on the project at Leigh Creek and to push on with it regardless of criticism and doubt.

This has indeed proved the salvation, industrially and economically, of this State. I have made those comments because when the Leader introduced this motion he of course would not have referred to this aspect. Although the fact has been put on record in other ways, I want to put it on the record here that this is one of the greatest achievements South Australia has seen, in this generation at least. It has been the means whereby this State has had an abundant supply of cheap electrical energy which has ensured that our industries could go ahead, that we had something to offer to any new industry desiring to establish itself here, and that indeed we could, in the competitive field of attracting industry, outbid other competitors in other States. It is a fact, of course, that the position at Leigh Creek is balanced very nicely with the generating capacity at Port Augusta. At present the two stations at Port Augusta are likely to use during their economic life almost the known resources of the Leigh Creek field. This, of course, has been planned and carefully calculated, and I believe, therefore, that at this point in time we must look around for something to take the place of this resource when it eventually becomes worked out. The important thing to bear in mind is that it takes some time to develop new sources of energy and to equip new mechanical and engineering and generating capacity to utilize new resources.

It is an intricate problem, and it requires a great deal of money and a great deal of planning before that can be done. Therefore, about two and a half years ago (if my memory is correct) the Electricity Trust intimated to the Government of the day that it desired to commence the project at Torrens Island. This project appeared to be a gigantic one by the standards of the day, and indeed the generating units being installed there are double the size of any unit that we have at the present time in this State. However, the bigger the unit the more economical is the generating cost, and it only needs the consumption rate to rise sufficiently to justify a larger unit when immediately, of course, the authority concerned is encouraged to install it. The project at Torrens Island, as everybody knows, is equipped so that it may function with either oil or natural gas. I believe that with some adaptation it could also use good quality coal from another State. The important thing is that it is equipped to switch over to the use of other fuel. This has been done deliberately, of course, because at the time the units were ordered it was well known that there were possibilities of gas being discovered in South Australia, and that it would be prudent to make provision for its use if subsequent testing and exploration proved that there was

sufficient gas to justify the changeover. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to continue by remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[*Sitting suspended from* 5.59 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (MINISTERS).

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 2184.)

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I support the Bill, because it is similar to the one that was introduced by our Party when in Government. We intended to provide for another Minister to take some of the load from the front bench of the Government in this House. I must say I am sorry (and perhaps I am being a little cynical in saying that) that the Government has brought forward the measure when the number of members in this House is the same as it was when the Opposition refused to support our Bill.

The Premier, when introducing this legislation, referred to another Bill before the House to increase the number of members in this Parliament. On this ground he has apparently justified his changed view and the changed view of his Party on the necessity for the legislation we are discussing. This seems, however, a very inadequate reason for the changed attitude. The Bill to which the Premier has referred has not been passed, and he is on record as having said that no increase in the size of the Ministry should be allowed until the number of members in the House has been increased.

Mr. Jennings: There is a Bill on members' files for an increase in the size of the House.

Mr. HALL: We can introduce Bills for many reasons. We have seen some Bills passed and others defeated. The Premier, when he spoke against our Bill as Leader of the Opposition, gave reasons why an increase in the number of Ministers was not necessary. Not only did he relate his argument to the membership of the House but he also explained that the increase was not needed for the carrying on of the Administration. He gave as many reasons as he could think up for opposing our legislation, yet the conditions are the same now as they were then. There are still only 39 members in the House and we know that the impossible proposition for electoral redistribution submitted by the Government cannot be supported. This becomes clear when one has regard to the definition of "metropolitan area". Any honourable member who, because of his district, is concerned with the boundaries of this city must agree that the definition is ineffective.

Mr. Shannon: It is unrealistic.

Mr. HALL: It goes beyond being unrealistic: the Government's action is so unreal that it must be deliberate. For some unknown reason, it must be included to defeat the Bill. If that is the case, how can the Premier use the Bill for an increase in the size of the Ministry as an excuse by saying, in effect, that this House is soon to have increased membership, and, therefore, we can have an extra Minister? At the time our Bill was introduced, the then Opposition did not give us the extra Minister and perhaps one reason for that refusal was some political advantage they could see. At that time, the Opposition denied proper consideration of the business of the State. It denied the extra facility to help the State's progress and industrialization and it refused added consideration for country areas. It denied these things for selfish political purposes, yet this Bill is introduced with the same background. My Party is not one to oppose a measure for any slight political gain that may result from such opposition. The reasons we stated for the need for another Minister are the same, and, unlike Labor members, we are consistent in our stand.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I support the Bill, as it is essential that the number of Ministers be sufficient to deal efficiently and expeditiously with all Government business. For too long we have been somewhat niggardly about the number of Ministers, and an increase in the size of the Cabinet is overdue. We should examine what happened with respect to the number of Ministers in office since the introduction of responsible Government. The Constitution Act of 1855-56 provided for five Ministers when the State's population was 108,000. The Act was amended in 1873 when the State's population was 198,000, and there were then six Ministers. In 1901, when the population was 359,000, new legislation was introduced and the number of Ministers reduced to four. No doubt the reason for a reduction by two in the number of Ministers was that the Commonwealth of Australia came into being in 1901 when, under the Commonwealth Constitution Act, several functions were taken over by the Commonwealth Government, and no doubt this factor influenced the reduction in the size of the South Australian Ministry. In 1908, when the

population of the State was 386,000, the number of Ministers was increased from four to six.

Several attempts were made by legislation introduced after 1908 to increase the size of the Ministry. In 1919 a Bill was introduced providing for seven Ministers but, after passing the second reading, it did not pass the third reading. In 1924, another Bill was introduced providing for eight Ministers, of whom two were to be honorary. Although it passed in the House of Assembly it was rejected by the Legislative Council. In 1926 a Bill was introduced providing for an increase from six to seven Ministers, but although it passed in the House of Assembly it was rejected by the Legislative Council. In 1930 another attempt was made and a Bill was introduced providing for seven Ministers, one of whom was to be honorary but, although that Bill passed in the House of Assembly, it was rejected in another place.

The history of subsequent legislation is well known to most members. In 1953 the Playford Government introduced a Bill to increase the size of the Ministry from six to eight. At that time the population of South Australia was 752,000. I think it is well known that when that Bill was debated in this Chamber some members of the then Opposition advocated a greater increase in the size of the Ministry. Although the Bill provided for eight Ministers, some Opposition members suggested that there should be even 10 Ministers. In the second reading debate on that Bill in 1953, the member for Semaphore said:

If I had the power I would increase the number of Ministers to 10 so that the people would know that Ministers could give first-hand consideration to matters placed before them.

In the same debate the member for Hindmarsh (the present Minister of Works) said:

Like the member for Semaphore, I would support the appointment of even more Ministers.

He was supporting an increase to more than the eight provided for in the Bill. That Bill passed in this Chamber and in another place, and since then there have been eight Ministers—five in this Chamber and three in another place.

In 1963 and 1964 the then Government introduced legislation to provide for an increase to nine Ministers, but both Bills failed to pass in this Chamber, the 1963 Bill being defeated on the third reading on the casting vote of the Speaker, and the 1964 Bill not having a constitutional majority in support. As some members of the present Government said, when members of the Opposition in 1953, that the Ministry should be larger than eight, and even 10, it is surprising that in 1963 and 1964 they opposed legislation introduced to increase the size of the Ministry.

The Bill now before us, which provides for nine Ministers, merits support. I agree with other members that the very important major portfolios of Lands and Agriculture should be vested as major portfolios in two Ministers, and not in one Minister as at present. During the whole of my Parliamentary career these two portfolios have been vested in two Ministers. They have been considered very important, and even if a Minister were Mandrake he could not do justice to and perform the duties of both portfolios satisfactorily. I will therefore support the amendment to be moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

This State has developed considerably both industrially and agriculturally. Many State developmental projects have been initiated, particularly in the last 20 or 30 years, and no doubt in the future many more major developmental projects will be initiated, so an increase in the size of the Ministry is necessary so that the State can benefit to the fullest extent as a result of Government activity. The fact that every former Minister in this Chamber has said in this debate that it is necessary to increase the size of the Ministry is in itself a very sound argument for supporting this Bill. According to the population figures of most of the States, South Australia has the smallest Ministry. New South Wales has a Ministry of 16, Victoria 15, Queensland 13, Western Australia 10, Tasmania (which has the smallest population in the Commonwealth) nine, the Commonwealth 25, and South Australia eight. Bearing in mind that South Australia now has a population of over 1,000,000, and that when the 1953 Bill was passed the population was only about 752,000, I consider that the time is more than ripe for an increase in the size of our Ministry.

Mr. HEASLIP (Rocky River): I support the Bill.

Mr. *Jennings*: You have to be right sometimes.

Mr. HEASLIP: I think I am right all the time. I think I was right, too, when I spoke to a similar Bill previously. I think that nine Ministers are necessary. The previous Government introduced a Bill to increase the size of the Ministry but, because it did not have a

constitutional majority, and because the then Opposition opposed the measure, that Bill did not pass. In supporting the Labor Government on this measure, I am not changing my view. Agriculture and Lands are two important portfolios. I pay full tribute to the present Minister holding those offices. I think that Mr. Bywaters, as Minister of Agriculture and Lands, has done a good job, but it is beyond the power of any one man to do justice to both those portfolios. Previously, the Labor Party has always opposed the separating of those portfolios.

Mr. Jennings: That's rubbish.

Mr. HEASLIP: That is a fact. However, they are so important that I believe a separate Minister should be appointed to hold each portfolio. Although I support the second reading of the Bill, I reserve the right also to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition, which seeks to place these two portfolios under the control of two Ministers. South Australia's secondary industries have developed to an important stage, but primary production is still more important. We cannot have secondary industries without first having primary industry, and yet the present Government has seen fit to appoint one Minister to both the portfolios of Agriculture and Lands. It is not doing the right thing in this regard. Members opposite should remember that without primary producers and their exports we could not establish the credits overseas that are so essential to secondary industries.

Mr. Coumbe: What does the honourable member call primary industries?

Mr. HEASLIP: All production from the land. Primary industries come first, as the word "primary" indicates.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: What about steelworks?

Mr. HEASLIP: How could there be steelworks if there were not primary production? All the commodities for a steelworks come from the land. The steelworks now operating at Whyalla could not operate if it were not for the production from the land at Iron Baron and Iron Knob. The Government apparently believes that one Minister can cope with both Agriculture and Lands. When the previous Government introduced a Bill for a ninth Minister, the present Government (then in Opposition) opposed it. We did not have a constitutional majority and could not get it through without the assistance of Labor members. Now the Labor Government is introducing a Bill similar to that which we introduced when in office and which they opposed. It is a complete reversal of policy on the part of members opposite, who, when in Opposition, said, "We will not have a ninth Minister."

Contrary to the attitude of the Labor Opposition to the previous Government, we, as the present Opposition, support this Bill. At least we realize the need for a ninth Minister and the importance of agriculture to this State. When in Opposition, the present Government did not appreciate that. Let me quote what the present Premier said in his policy speech, when referring to certain constitutional legislation:

> This was opposed and will continue to be opposed by the Labor Party whenever it is submitted to Parliament. So also will any proposal to increase the Ministry to provide for six Ministers in the House of Assembly and three in the Legislative Council, until such time as there is a substantial increase in the number of members in the House of Assembly.

He went on to say:

> But if Sir Thomas desires to establish the office of Premier, this can and should be done by regulation.

These are not my views but those of the Labor Party as voiced by the Premier.

Mr. Lawn: You always have to rely on somebody else's views.

Mr. HEASLIP: If the honourable member wants to make a speech, let him get up and make it. The then Leader went on to say:

> The Labor Party has always been opposed to executive control, and our reasoning in this matter is that we must give greater opportunities for the voice of the people to be heard in Parliament rather than be subjected to Executive control by an extra Minister.

It will be seen that when he went out on the hustings asking for the support of the people he opposed the suggestion of a ninth Minister, yet now he has brought in a Bill to provide for that very thing. The Opposition is not going to oppose the Bill, because we have always believed an extra Minister was necessary. The present action is a complete reversal of Labor Party policy, and it gives me a little hope that the Government may reverse its policy on other things. For instance, this Government unconstitutionally denied the rights of the people at Appila to have a silo.

Mr. Ryan: What's that got to do with the ninth Minister?

Mr. HEASLIP: I repeat that the Government unconstitutionally refused a silo at Appila. Seeing that its reversal is so great that it now says that what was not right before is all right now, I believe that in the future we may have a silo at Appila. I only hope the present Government will reverse its opinion to the extent that the people of

Appila will be able to get something to which they are entitled. The Minister of Agriculture has said that the Government has every consideration for the man on the land. I am not taking any kudos from the Minister, for I believe that in the short time he has been in office he has done a really good job. However, it is beyond the capacity of any one man to carry out the dual tasks the Government is asking him to perform, and that is why I support the Leader's amendment. The two portfolios should be separated, for they are too big and too important for one man to administer. According to the Premier's policy speech the Government intends to increase railway receipts by £1,000,000. However, there is only one way that it can be done: the man on the land will have to pay it.

Mr. Curren: Rubbish! What about interstate freights?

Mr. HEASLIP: The people in the remote areas, including those the member for Chaffey represents, are going to pay it. They are about 150 miles from the metropolitan area. I tell the honourable member for Chaffey that, if the Government brings in legislation for the co-ordination of transport, the people in his district and in other areas remote from the city will have to pay. The country people will be taxed. The Minister of Agriculture said that due consideration would be given to the needs of the people in country areas, and they are the people whom I represent. If the people in the country are to receive justice, we must have two Ministers handling the portfolios that affect them. Who will pay the increased land tax? Again, it will be the country people.

The SPEAKER: I have given the honourable member some latitude and whilst I realize that the debate on the appointment of a ninth Minister can cover almost every portfolio, I suggest that he link his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP: I am referring to the remark made by the Minister of Agriculture and pointing out that the man on the land will not be getting due consideration if he has to meet increased costs such as increased rail freight charges. Of course, these charges will not be met by people in the city.

The SPEAKER: I ask the honourable member to link his remarks with the Bill.

Mr. HEASLIP: I agree that a ninth Minister is needed if country people are to be properly represented. I do not cast any reflection on the Minister of Agriculture, but it is not humanly possible for any one man to administer the portfolios of Lands and Agriculture in such a way that country people will be adequately represented. That is why I support the Bill for a ninth Minister. The Government has shown a complete reversal of opinion from when it was in Opposition, because then it twice opposed the appointment of a ninth Minister. We support the Government because we think it is necessary, realizing the responsibilities of all Ministers.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support the Bill, subject to my Leader's amendment. I do not join in the argument of city versus country, because we should all have regard for each other's opinions. I am a country member, but it behoves me to understand city problems: we are all Australians and should get on with the job. The Premier said he frankly admitted having opposed similar legislation last year, and gave as one reason his belief that Executive control should not be extended further without an increase in the number of members of Parliament. The only people who never change their minds are dead men and fools, and the Premier and other Government members are much alive and I know they are not fools. It has been said that when things are different they are not the same. An obvious need exists for an extra Minister, and my virtuous young friend the member for Light said that a case could be made out for a tenth Minister, with which I agree.

New as I am to Parliament, it is obvious to me that the eight Ministers are busy men and are showing signs of distress and strain, more especially the overloaded Minister of Agriculture and Lands, and even the young, virile Attorney-General. During my election campaign the Attorney-General was written up as being a virile young man, an athlete, and a weight-lifter, able to lift 600 lb. over his head with one hand. With men like this in Cabinet, it seemed that perhaps eight Ministers would be enough. However, there is a very good case for having a ninth Minister. The member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) gave some enlightening information about the duties of Ministers. As I spent eight years in the Lands Department, I know how onerous are the duties of a Minister. Because of this State's growth, obviously we should have an extra Minister to assist with the work of Cabinet. I will not link this matter with numbers in this House; we should assess the situation as it is. We want to assist the Government so that the present Ministry will have some relief in its arduous duties. I agree

with the member for Angas (Hon. B. H. Teusner) about the importance of the two portfolios, which the Government recognizes. The present Minister of Agriculture and Lands has given devoted attention to his duties under the two portfolios, but it is difficult for him to deal with all fields covered by them. For that reason, I will support the amendment to be moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): When speaking on another matter, I made my position on this Bill quite clear. I have never had any doubt about the necessity for a larger Ministerial panel to deal with the affairs of State. As the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) has said, we are continuing to grow. Nothing will stop our growth, which has brought about a multiplication of the duties of a Minister. Although I am not, am never likely to be and have never expected to be, a Minister, in private life I occupy a very important position that requires my daily attention to multifarious duties. I know how much time I must spend to give proper consideration to affairs that are part and parcel of those duties, which would have to be multiplied many times to compare with those of a Minister of the Crown. The signing of documents must be a time-absorbing business for a Minister, as it is in my case, yet my duties are moderate in comparison. I make it my duty to know what I am signing, as I am sure Ministers do. The mechanical function of administering a big department is in itself no small task. Although I am speaking in the presence of only one Minister at the moment, I do know that his is a major task. When I have had occasion to approach the Minister of Education I have seen how he has a grip on the department he is administering, as it is important that he should have. Indeed, it is vital for the welfare of the State that each Minister should know as much as possible about the affairs of the department he is administering. Now that the Government is in office its attitude has changed from the one it held when in Opposition.

When one is on the inside looking out (as the Government is at the moment) one has a wide perspective, but when one is on the outside looking in (as was the case when the Government was in Opposition) one has a restricted view of the State's affairs and of their implications. At the moment the Government is seeing things that it could not see when it was in Opposition. Indeed, I have some sympathy for it in this matter. This is not an appropriate subject in which to play politics. On the contrary, it is a subject in respect of which the welfare of the State must be considered. After all, it is in the interests of the welfare of the State that we, as members, are elected to this place. I know that the present Government is likely to separate the portfolios of Agriculture and Lands, and I shall be surprised if it does not do so. I agree with the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) who said that, in the foreseeable future, ours will be a primary-producing State. Our standard of living will be based on the productivity of the land. Our opportunities for the export of secondary products are negligible compared with those for providing foods to our near neighbours in South-East Asia, particularly.

By virtue of our assiduity, we are already securing valuable markets in Japan, an up and coming nation whose standards of living are rising. Consequently, the opportunity to supply foodstuffs to that country (which does not have the same opportunity to produce them as we have) is at our doorstep. These are matters that make Agriculture, particularly, an important portfolio. It should rank much higher than it has ever ranked in my 32 years' experience as a member of Parliament. I do not know why Agriculture has always been made the Cinderella, as it were, and has been ranked well down in the line of precedence of Ministers of the Crown. The department does more than any other in maintaining the standards that we enjoy in South Australia.

Mr. McKee: Primary industry has not suffered because of that.

Mr. SHANNON: I am not so sure.

Mr. McKee: Why were these changes not introduced when the previous Government was in power?

Mr. SHANNON: I have not attempted to avoid that question, and I have said that the position has applied since I was first elected to Parliament. I am not criticizing the present Government in this regard. It should have regard to the fitness of things and provide some seniority for the Agriculture Department, which is the major source of income for the Government. It is obvious that the Treasurer must lead the Cabinet because of the importance of finance. However, it is strange that service departments, which spend the money produced from the land, rank in front of the department that provides the money. If it is bold (as I hope it will be) the present Government has an opportunity to step up the status of the Agriculture Department. The Leader's amendment would make it obligatory

not only on this Government but on future Governments to split the portfolios of Lands and Agriculture between two Ministers at least.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: That is the present intention of the Government.

Mr. SHANNON: I have been told that, and I favour it. Although the Lands Department is important, it does not have the same impact on the economy of the State as does the Agriculture Department. The Leader's amendment is justified as it has merit.

Since my very good friend the Attorney-General has returned to the House, I should like to say a word or two about him. He has accepted an onerous administrative task. Whether or not it is too onerous for him I do not know, but I agree with what the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) said about him—his virility and his ability to withstand the blows and unkind cuts that come from his fellow man because he wants to do something. I am all for the man who wants to do something; I do not criticize him for that. Far be it from me to criticize any man who seeks to do something. The only man who attracts my criticism and contempt is he who sits down and says, "I will do nothing; I cannot be criticized if I do nothing." He who does nothing makes no mistakes but he who does things sometimes makes mistakes.

We are all fallible, the human race is fallible, but I give full marks to him who tries, to him who will pursue at least some line of policy and try to do something which, at least in his view, is for the benefit of mankind. It can be said, and rightly said, that the Attorney-General has perhaps gone into things too quickly. I do not want to be mean or unfair to him. He has a very wide field to cover, probably the widest field of any Minister from the point of view of necessary legislation, of which he has made a careful study. I give him full marks for that, but he may be overstepping his own ability to achieve all the things he wants to do in the briefest possible time.

My experience of life is this, and it applies not only to my public but also to my private life: that making haste slowly sometimes pays dividends. Second thoughts are sometimes profitable. I say to the Attorney-General with due regard to his own sense of responsibility, which I know he has, and in the kindliest spirit, that endeavouring to cure all the ills (some of which are, I admit, obvious) in the first session of his attainment of office may lead him into problems which he at the moment does not foresee but which will arise as a result of some of the things he is seeking to do. I make that charitable (I do not want to be uncharitable) criticism of the Attorney-General, if criticism it be. I hope he appreciates that I personally have much sympathy for him in the problems with which his departments are faced. He has been criticized. I do not know the full story of it nor shall I enter into the arguments about it, but I trust that the Attorney-General will be able to handle the problems arising as a result of not only his administration but also the previous administration, problems that he has inherited and are now on his plate.

One great problem is our Aborigines. It is not easy: in fact, it is a difficult and complex problem, which I think he would be the first to admit. I shall not criticize him on this issue because, after all, criticism as a rule is cheap and valueless. Unfortunately, the constructive proposals that we get from people who oppose our ideas are rare. I think it would be more charitable to the person carrying the burden for one to be constructive rather than critical and, if one has some helpful advice to offer, to offer it in a way that is really helpful. Everybody knows that pulling down is simple and that building up is hard.

As one who has had long experience in this Parliament, I must admit that I am a supporter of this proposal of the Government to appoint a ninth Minister. I am not going to be Party political or critical in any way about it. The fact that the Government of the day now appreciates the need for a ninth Minister is, to me, an excellent sign, and I take it as such. I support the Bill.

Mr. QUIRKE (Burra): I want to give a little gratuitous advice, and I hope honourable members opposite will accept it as genuine. The Government now wants another Minister, and I stress that the portfolios of Lands and Agriculture must be divided. I believe that is the Government's intention. When the Government divides those portfolios, Agriculture, as has been said by the member for Onkaparinga, must have a man who knows the position and who will undertake some reformative action in the department, because it needs it. Quite recently it has fallen down somewhat, although not through any fault of the Minister. An element of decay was setting in because many officers were being offered better advantages outside. However that problem is overcome, it has to be overcome or we shall have a depleted Agriculture Department. This department must be fully staffed, because in these days Agriculture is easily the most important of the portfolios in

the Government. I say that advisedly, because, notwithstanding the progress that has been made in secondary industry here, we are still dependent upon progressive agriculture and will remain so to a large extent until we have the export nidustries that we are urger every day over television to seek.

Practically all the other nations on the face of the earth are seeking the same sort of export industries, and we shall for a long, long time yet, if not for ever, be dependent upon the products of primary industry in order to meet our oversea balance of payments. It is a very important portfolio, and it must be built to the greatest possible strength and have more money allocated to it. I know there have been factors that have prevented this department from reaching the strength it should reach, and I hope they will be overcome. I do not care who overcomes them, for I will not be jealous of anybody who does it. What is absolutely necessary is that someone does it in the interests of the State, and whoever that person is he will be worthy of the generous thanks of the people of this State.

The Lands Department is another kettle of fish. As honourable members know, I was Minister of Lands. Also, like the member for Onkaparinga, I have built a successful business from small beginnings to a position of some importance in an industry, and I know what executive organization means. I know the work entailed in the Lands Department and, what is more, I know the work that is ahead of the person who gets that portfolio. It is not going to be easy work. The man who becomes Minister of Lands must be able to face up to a pretty strong-minded and rebellious group of people. I know that these people are seeking things, in many instances mistakenly but in many other instances justifiably. Their plea must be heard, and although the many problems cannot be solved by this Government alone they must be solved by the Government in conjunction with the Commonwealth Government. Whoever occupies the portfolio must be able to stand up to the hammering that he will receive. He must be strong enough to meet these people on their own battleground. If he does that, he will be respected, because the people are not unfair. They merely consider that they have been denied an element of justice and I know that, in many respects, this is so.

The man appointed to the portfolio must reduce the position to one where the disabilities of these people are recognized and he must be prepared to take strong remedial action. Apart from the Agriculture Department, there is no other department in which the personal attributes of the Minister can be applied to such advantage. I wish the occupant of the position well, whoever he is. His task will not be easy and although I am a member of the Opposition, if he thinks any knowledge I have will be of assistance to him, I assure him that I shall be happy to give it.

Matters such as this are not matters for one side of the House or the other; the important thing is to ensure the well being of the people of South Australia in every portfolio. We shall soon need a tenth Minister, and when that is necessary in the interests of the State, let us have one. We should not adopt the attitude taken by the present Government when in Opposition: that it would not agree to the appointment of an additional Minister unless the number of members was increased. If he numerical strength of the House ought to be increased, we have to go after those members and have another election. The people of the State must be considered, because they are the people that every Ministry works to sustain. I wholeheartedly support this measure and should like an assurance from the Government that there will be separate Ministers of Lands and Agriculture.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): I take this opportunity of complimenting the members for Burra and Onkaparinga on the way in which they imparted their knowledge to the House. I thank them for the advice they gave so generously and sincerely. In the years to come we shall be indebted to many honourable members who have given their opinions on this measure.

The Government of South Australia realizes the importance of the portfolios of Agriculture and Lands. We make no apologies that both portfolios were combined under the one Minister. I compliment the Minister of Agriculture and Lands, as I have done previously, on the way in which he has carried out his duties in these two difficult portfolios. One has to know the amount of work entailed to realize how difficult these portfolios can be. I had the pleasure of his company to the Far North some months ago when we travelled over 3,000 miles. That was only a part of his duties, as he had to return to administer the other side of his department. He has proved worthy of his high office, but the burden is too much for one man. I agree with the member for Onkaparinga that agriculture will become an even

more important factor with respect to our oversea payments. We rely on the sale of our wheat and wool to a marked degree, and have only to look back a few years and consider the depreciating price of wool to realize how these sales affect the economy of this country.

We should take a leaf out of the book of other countries, particularly the United States, and include an economic adviser on the staff of the Agriculture Department. His duty is to analyse all phases of the economics of agriculture and to advise the Minister. I hope the Minister remembers that point and acts on it later, as I think that such an appointment will be essential. There is much room for improvement, particularly in the South-East, which will be one of the great food granaries of this country because of its considerable potential. The Mid-North and Eyre Peninsula are both areas with latent potential. Before the Second World War Eyre Peninsula was only a place on the map, with a few sheep, and was generally a poor area. However, the studs have improved the quality of the sheep, and this proves that, with knowledge and proper management, these areas can carry more stock. I support the Bill.

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): I, too, support the Bill. When in office my Party introduced it twice, and I am pleased to see that the present Government has realized the importance of executive administration, because the welfare of the State depends on the administration of Government departments and the responsibility of Ministers in charge of those departments.

Mr. Millhouse: Perhaps they have recognized their mistakes.

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Premier, most of all, has clearly admitted that experience is a wonderful teacher, and has realized that not only was the previous Government correct in asking for an additional Minister but that because the Premier has increased the number of departments the need for an additional Minister has been increased. The present Minister of Lands and Agriculture has done a phenomenal job, but I think it will ultimately wear him down despite his so-called virility. His terrier-like activity throughout the State has certainly been good for public relations, and I have no doubt that he has been able to keep up with the documentary work of his departments, but I doubt whether he has been able to do much more. I stress, however, that both departments are very important to the State, and I make no bones about saying that, for I have a vested interest in both departments in respect of the district I represent, which has about 300,000 acres of Crown land, in regard to the development of which I am waiting for a Minister of Lands to evolve some system. Further development is also possible in other parts of the State.

There has always been much free talk in this House about the importance of agriculture and how easily we can sell our products overseas. If, however, we look at the untouched productive potential of those South-East Asian countries in which we expect to be able to sell our goods, we must think further about this, because almost all those countries have a tremendous potential to increase agricultural production, which is always the first step towards developing the necessary industry and thereby improving standards of living. Until those standards are increased we cannot expect these countries to buy our goods. Until now we have been able to sell to those markets because of our efficiency of production, which it is important for us to maintain. We can do this only if we have good advice and can get the type of development in the Agriculture Department that I mentioned during the Budget debate, when I suggested that the Minister should have a completely new look at his department to see that it was functioning as efficiently as it should according to modern standards.

I hope that the foreshadowed amendment will be carried because it will mean a separation of these two major portfolios. The Minister of Agriculture would then be able to consider the virtual absence of extension services in the Agriculture Department: there is a general but no troops at present. As this is an important aspect of the department's work, it should be looked into and further developed if advantage is to be taken of information already available from research.

As I missed the debate on the line in the Estimates dealing with the Roseworthy Agricultural College, I shall deal with this matter now. One of the problems facing agriculture is the shortage of trained academic personnel, and I say advisedly that I believe the present University faculty is not training people interested in practical agriculture: it is training scientists but not field personnel. I believe it is a function of the Minister of Agriculture, as Roseworthy Agricultural College is under the Minister's control, to investigate whether the current teaching course at Roseworthy is capable of providing his department with the type of personnel it requires

for extension work and for the development of his department. I will support the foreshadowed amendment because it will separate the two portfolios. If they are separated and the Minister of Agriculture has the responsibility of looking into these aspects of his department, the State will benefit.

The Hon. T. C. STOTT (Ridley): I have not had an opportunity since I was Speaker to indicate my views on this subject. This measure should have been passed three and a half years ago, when we would have had an extra Minister, without loading added responsibility on to the present Minister holding the portfolios of Agriculture, Lands and Irrigation. The amendment to the Constitution, sought by the Bill, is vitally necessary in the interests of the State, its rapid development, expansion in primary production and in other fields. The work of Ministers responsible for housing, development, etc., is heavy, and becomes even heavier when certain Ministers who are away on official duties have to delegate their work to other Ministers. All this work requires time and energy, and wears down the constitution even of Ministers who have held office in the past. It is difficult to stand up to such strain in the present political world.

South Australia is developing rapidly, and we must keep pace with this development by securing men with adequate administrative ability. The Bill is long overdue and I commend the Government for changing its views on this matter, because I think it has realized at long last that, with the acceptance of added authority and responsibility, an additional Minister is necessary. We can, of course, refer to the speeches of certain Government members when they were in Opposition, but I shall not waste the time of the House in that regard. That is water under the bridge, and it is a sign of progress that the Government has seen fit to introduce the Bill, which I support wholeheartedly.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): I am pleased that the Bill has been supported in such strength, and I assure the House that the Government will accept the Leader's amendment, if, as I hope it will, the Bill passes the second reading.

The SPEAKER: In compliance with Standing Order 294, I have counted the House, and there being present an absolute majority of the whole I put the question.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Amendment of principal Act, s. 65."

The Hon. D. N. Brookman, for the Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD, moved to insert the following paragraph:

(*c*) by inserting after the word "Assembly" in the said subsection (2) thereof the passage ": Provided that a Minister shall not bear the titles or fill the Ministerial offices of Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Lands at the same time".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with an amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The SPEAKER: In compliance with Standing Order No. 294, I have counted the House and there being present an absolute majority of the whole I put the question "That the Bill be now read a third time".

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think it should be recorded that the third reading is carried by an absolute majority. On previous occasions a division has always taken place when the Speaker has made that statement.

The SPEAKER: I counted the House on the second and third readings to establish that there was in the House an absolute majority of the whole and, if the motion is carried, that establishes the constitutional majority.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PRIVATE PARKING AREAS BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 3. Page 785.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill. It provides simply for the better control of land the owners of which have given the public access to that land. The owners then deserve the protection of the law to ensure that the privileges enjoyed are not abused. Most of the offensive behaviour that occurs on private land, in private access roads, and so on is connected with motor vehicles. This applies particularly in walkways where motor vehicles are sometimes parked in the wrong place, and this is a particularly objectionable and common offence. This Bill will strengthen the hand of the private owner against this sort of thing. It is comprehensive. I notice that it provides even against misconduct by roller skaters, so it would probably cover just about every imaginable emergency. I approve of that provision. There appears to be a small error in the drafting of the Bill but I do not think it warrants an

amendment: it can be corrected by the Clerk without formal amendment. Clause 9 reads:

Notwithstanding anything contained in any other Act or law, user for any period of time by the public of any private access road, private parking area or private pedestrian walkway shall not create any right over or right of passage in the private access road, private parking area, or private pedestrian walkway and no such user shall constitute or provide a ground for constituting the private access road, private parking area or private pedestrian walkway, a highway, street or road.

I think that "user" appearing in the second and sixth lines of the clause should be "use". As it stands at present, the clause makes no sense to me, although I may be a little behind the times from a legal point of view. I assume there is no need for a formal amendment but, if necessary, I shall be happy to move in that way. However, I may be wrong in this. Apart from that, I can see nothing wrong with the Bill. It is sound, and I support it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Effect of user by public of private access road, etc."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I see by the expression on the face of the Attorney-General, and I understand from some words I heard, that my impression regarding the word "user" is incorrect. It did not seem to me to be the correct word, and I take it that it is a term more common in legal language than in ordinary parlance. I thought it was an error, and that the word should have been "use". I have no objection to the clause.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Attorney-General): It is a term of art commonly known to lawyers meaning "usage", and it is quite proper in this clause.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (10 and 11) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ELECTRICITY (COUNTRY AREAS) SUBSIDY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 3. Page 787.)

Mr. NANKIVELL (Albert): This Act, which was introduced in 1962, contains certain financial provisions. Section 2 (1) states that from the surplus moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Account of the Treasurer for the financial year ended June 30, 1962, the Treasurer shall pay to the Electricity Trust of South Australia £500,000 for the purposes of the Act. That amount was, in fact, paid in 1962. By subsection (2), the Treasurer was authorized to pay to the trust during the five financial years commencing at the end of June, 1963, further sums out of the general revenue of the State up to a maximum of £100,000. Under this authority, £100,000 was paid in June, 1965, to the credit of the Electricity Trust's trust fund at the Treasury. That means that a total amount of £600,000 was made available up to June, 1965, for the purpose of subsidizing country electricity. The subsidies provided under the Act fell into two parts. Part I was payment to the trust to compensate it for any loss of revenue arising from tariff reductions in country areas and any amounts as directed by the Treasurer in respect of electricity undertakings taken over by the trust during that period.

The second part was payment of subsidies to approved country public electricity suppliers other than the trust for the benefit of their consumers. Section 3 provided that, commencing with the financial year ended June 30, 1963, the trust could credit to its own revenue such amounts as the Treasurer may direct on terms and conditions laid down by the Treasurer, but the aggregate credited was not to be in excess of £300,000, plus additional amounts in respect of country undertakings taken over by the trust in the five-year period ending June 30, 1967.

In 1962, the trust reduced the tariff of about 45,000 country consumers at an estimated overall loss during the five years of £800,000 and it was arranged that £500,000 of this amount would be met by the trust and £300,000 would be paid out of the trust account. Up to June 30, 1965, the trust had withdrawn only £219,000 from the trust fund. During 1965, the trust also paid to other electricity undertakings a total of £72,998 to cover discounts allowed to consumers, and the total withdrawn for this purpose at June 30, 1965, amounted to £156,000.

Therefore, the overall total withdrawn from the fund was £375,741, leaving a balance in the trust account of £224,259. This is the amount that the Crown Solicitor decided, I understand, was to be spent for the purpose of subsidizing country electricity and could not be used for other purposes. This support arose largely from the fact that the trust itself, on January 1, 1965, decided that it did not desire any further moneys from this trust account and waived an amount of £117,000 to which it would have been entitled between Janary 1, 1965, and June 30, 1967.

The purpose of this Bill is to enable the balance of £224,259 remaining in the trust account to be spent solely for the payment of

subsidies to country undertakings other than those now operated by the trust, and to enable a continuation of this subsidy beyond June 30, 1967, which was the termination date of the present Act. The present rate of subsidies was doubled as from January 1, 1965, thus subsidizing the undertakings that were already outside the Electricity Trust, and that was set out by the then Premier in the following statement in the *Advertiser* of December 31, 1964:

Electricity Power Tariffs Reduced.—Cheaper electrical power for larger industries in the metropolitan and country areas and tariff cuts to benefit 80,000 domestic country consumers were announced by the Premier last night. Domestic consumers in the country supplied by the Electricity Trust and on the single meter tariff would have charges reduced to the metropolitan level. This means a 10 per cent cut to the country consumers concerned.

Subsidy.—In those localities not connected with the trust network, the Government proposed to double the present subsidy to enable charges to be brought down and where the tariff could be adjusted in line with advice given by the trust, the doubled subsidy would be granted immediately. This should enable some 17 local suppliers to reduce their tariffs to within 10 per cent of the metropolitan level. The double subsidy, effective from January 1, 1965, resulted in an overall reduction in charges of about one-third, and affected about 6,700 consumers. At the same time, about 80,000 consumers received the benefit of the reduction in tariff that was brought about by the trust's own activities. Now it is intended to reduce the tariffs for private undertakings to which the subsidy was originally doubled, so as to reduce tariffs to within 10 per cent of the metropolitan area rate at an estimated cost of £170,000, an increase of £40,000 over the amount estimated to be necessary to double the subsidy. This could further increase, depending on whether usage increases and whether country undertakings are able to meet the increase in demand that could result as a consequence of the reduction in tariff. Under clause 4, the Government will be able to extend payment beyond the original five-year period. This will have to be by way of revenue appropriation until such time as the trust can take over subsidized undertakings. The present reimbursement to the undertakings and the discounts paid are set out in a table in the Auditor-General's Report. As it is a long table, I seek leave to have it incorporated in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

SCHEDULE OF SUBSIDIES PAID TO APPROVED COUNTRY SUPPLIERS (EXCLUDING ELECTRICITY TRUST).

Undertaking.	Discount Percentage at 30/6/65. Per cent.	Reimbursed 1964-65. £	Approximate Number of Consumers at 30/6/65.
Arno	50	841	86
Beachport	40	2,237	178
Bordertown	—	2,285*	—
Ceduna	40	4,888	441
Cleve	40	2,821	243
Cowell	40	2,243	213
Elliston	50	1,253	71
Frances	50	417	19
Hawker	40	1,247	94
Kimba	40	2,996	228
Kingscote	40	9,376	416
Kingston	40	4,772	437
Lock	50	784	49
Lucindale	40	2,548	175
Naracoorte	20	6,885	1,527
Penola	30	5,706	530
Peterborough	20	5,224	1,120
Yongala	20	114†	—
Robe	40	3,038	252
Streaky Bay	40	3,898	308
Tintinara	—	1,042‡	—
Wudinna	40	5,278	278
Yunta (Ding)	50	768	17
Yunta (Breeding)	50	691	17
Cook, Marree and Tarcoola	50	1,646	43
		£72,998	6,742

* 1963-64 claims.
† Included with Peterborough after October 19, 1964.
‡ To date of transfer to Electricity Trust.

Mr. NANKIVELL: From this table it can be seen that the reduction in tariffs to be made to these undertakings under the Bill will be considerable, and I have no doubt that the people concerned will appreciate the action taken in reducing tariffs, because at present they are currently paying 20 per cent to 50 per cent above tariffs in the metropolitan area. This is a good measure from the point of view of country people, and I support it.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill, and do not intend to delay its passage. The arrangements to which the Bill gives effect, were largely made by my Government, and, indeed, I understand that there has been no substantial departure, if any, from the terms of the charged tariffs announced at the beginning of this year, except in one respect. That is in connection with charges levied on Commonwealth undertakings. The Commonwealth Government has not raised this matter with me, but it came to my knowledge that Commonwealth instrumentalities had been placed on a different basis from other consumers, and that whilst other consumers have had a tariff adjustment the Commonwealth instrumentalities have not. In other words, the prices charged in different districts are weighted particularly against Commonwealth instrumentalities. If the Treasurer wants to refresh his memory, I refer him to his reply to a question at page 2049 of *Hansard* in which he said that it was a rule that the Commonwealth and the State did not benefit from each other's charges, or levy charges that would impose a disability. However, this matter does not come under that heading. If one adopted the attitude taken here one could say that a Commonwealth officer travelling on the railways in the course of his duties should be charged more than other passengers because this type of charge involves the Government in a loss. However, electricity used in this State by Commonwealth instrumentalities is for undertakings that benefit all South Australian citizens. One of these undertakings is a television service in the South-East. If we charge Commonwealth instrumentalities for electricity used in public utilities more than we charge our own citizens, we will be harming this State's reputation.

When the agreement was made the Electricity Trust did not say that it wanted to exclude Commonwealth instrumentalities from benefits. I said at the time that country tariffs would be reduced to within 10 per cent of metropolitan tariffs, but Commonwealth undertakings were not excluded. I ask the Treasurer to reconsider this matter because I think the principle is wrong and out of line with decisions made by other departments. For instance, the Commonwealth Government is not charged special rates for water even though it is pumped at a loss. I should like the Premier to examine this matter again and ascertain the sum involved. When the agreement between the Premier and the trust was originally made, no suggestion of excluding the Commonwealth Government was made. Therefore, the matter should be investigated from the point of view of the prestige that the State may lose if we raise special charges against the Commonwealth Government, which other people do not have to meet.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer): Whilst I accept what the Leader has said, I refer to the reply I gave to the question he asked on October 14, when I said:

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.

I think the Leader will recall that he referred to a specific project regarding an arrangement to supply electricity to television services in the South-East, and I believe he would acknowledge that there is no dispute about that, as far as this State is concerned. The trust is prepared to meet that situation. If any financial hardship is being imposed on the people concerned, I assure the House that I shall further investigate the matter and bring down a report, if I find that anything further can be done. In the meantime, I realize that the Leader does not desire to delay this

legislation, which, after all, will benefit many people.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PUBLIC SALARIES) BILL.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering the following resolution: That it is desirable to introduce a Bill for an Act to amend the Agent-General Act, 1901-1953, the Audit Act, 1921-1957, the Industrial Code, 1920-1963, the Public Service Arbitration Act, 1961-1964, the Police Regulation Act, 1952-1963, and the Public Service Act, 1936-1959, and for other purposes.

Motion carried.

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

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It provides for increases in the salaries of certain public officers whose salary is fixed by Statute. Recently, the Public Service Board recommended increases in salaries for heads of departments, and the present Bill is designed to provide comparable increases for the officers concerned. Under the provisions of the Bill the salaries of the Auditor-General and the Public Service Commissioner will be £5,800, of the President of the Industrial Court £5,650 (Deputy £4,620), of the Police Commissioner £5,400, and of the Public Service Arbitrator £5,100. A rather greater increase than average is being made in the salary of the Police Commissioner and it is believed that the extensive responsibilities of the Commissioner warrant this.

With regard to the Agent-General, the increase comparable with those granted to other senior officers would be about £450 sterling per annum. It has been the practice over the past 12 years to provide for the increases to be made wholly in the salary component of the payment to the Agent-General, while the representation allowance has remained without adjustment at £1,000 sterling per annum since 1953. This has been preferred by recent appointees who have been members of the Public Service, since it has had an advantageous effect upon long service leave and pension entitlements. However, the new appointee, who will take office on March 21, 1966, is not a member of the Public Service and, accordingly, because of taxation considerations he could reasonably expect attention to the representation allowance component. Accordingly, the amending provisions add £448 sterling to the salary of the present Agent-General, leaving the allowance unaltered for the remainder of his term of office. As from March 21, 1966, £420 of the £448 adjustment is proposed for the allowance, so that the salary component will be £4,080 sterling, or £28 higher than at present. Two other rearrangements are also proposed for the new Agent-General. It has been the practice for the Government to meet a portion of the income tax of the Agent-General based upon the additional tax attracted by the exchange difference between sterling and Australian pounds. This is already an outdated arrangement which will become even more outdated when Australian currency is converted to a decimal basis. The Government met about £365 in Australian currency of the Agent-General's tax in his latest assessment, or just a little more than £300 sterling. It is proposed to cancel this arrangement when the present Agent-General retires and replace it by an addition of £300 sterling to the representation allowance.

The second rearrangement relates to an allowance of £200 sterling paid by the Electricity Trust of South Australia to the present Agent-General. It would seem desirable that the whole of the Agent-General's salary and allowances should be paid by the Government, and accordingly it is proposed that this £200 sterling be added to the statutory allowance from the date of the new appointment, and the Electricity Trust's payment will thereafter be paid into general revenue. In summary, therefore, it is proposed for the present Agent-General in continuance of past arrangements that he receive in sterling £4,500 salary from the Government, £1,000 allowance from the Government, £200 allowance from the Electricity Trust, and some rebate of tax at State Government expense, which in the latest assessment was nearly £300. This is about £6,000 sterling in all. For the new Agent-General, the amount of £6,000 sterling (£4,080 salary plus £1,920 representation allowance) will be paid directly by the Government. All increases of salaries effected by the Bill are made retrospective to July 5, 1965, the date on which salary increases to heads of departments generally became effective. Mr. Speaker, I have here a schedule of figures relating to salaries fixed by Statute, and I ask permission to have those figures included in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

SALARIES FIXED BY STATUTE AS AT SEPTEMBER 30, 1965.

	South Australia.		N.S.W.	Vic.	Qsld.	W.A.	Tas.
	Present.	Proposed.					
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Chief Justice	7,000	Under review	9,250 + 400*	7,350 + 500*	7,500	7,000	7,000†
Puisne Judges	6,250	Under review	8,500 + 300*	6,700 + 350*	6,750	6,350 6,200	6,200†
Auditor-General	5,202	5,800	7,500 + 250*	5,700	5,349	5,194	4,827
Public Service Commissioner	5,202	5,800	9,000 + 600*	5,700	5,349	5,344	4,827
Agent-General—							
Salary	4,052 stg.	4,500 stg.	4,500 stg.	2,500 stg.	3,925 stg.	3,000 stg.	2,542 stg.
Allowance	1,000 stg.	1,000 stg.	4,000 stg.	4,100 stg.	2,250 stg.	2,000 stg.	2,800 stg.
Police Commissioner	4,852 + 55*	5,400 + 55*	7,000 + 200*	5,700 + 340*	4,862 + 180*	4,824	4,343
President Industrial Court	5,052	5,650	—	—	—	—	—
Deputy President Industrial Court	4,302	4,620	—	—	—	—	—
Public Service Arbitrator	4,852	5,100	—	—	—	—	4,805

* Allowance. † Act just passed.

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

INHERITANCE (FAMILY PROVISION) BILL.

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from July 1. Page 666.)

Mr. HALL (Gouger): In his second reading explanation of this Bill, the Attorney-General stated that it repealed and re-enacted the Testators' Family Maintenance Act, 1918-1943. The Minister said:

Clause 5 is an important provision which enlarges the classes of persons who may claim against the estate of a deceased person. The clause will enable the following persons, previously debarred, to make a claim: (*a*) a divorced husband (divorced wives may at present claim in Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia in certain circumstances): (*b*) a step-child (provided for at present in Queensland): (*c*) a legitimated child (provided for at present in Queensland): (*d*) a grandchild, including an adopted child of a child and a child or adopted child of an adopted child (New Zealand has a similar provision): (*e*) a parent (where the deceased was a legitimate child): and (*f*) where the deceased was illegitimate, his mother and a person adjudged by an affiliation order to be his father.

This is a considerable widening of the class of person who may claim on an estate and I think that claimants must have proof to justify any claim. In connection with a step-child, a person who marries someone who already has small children certainly should provide for those children. However, it could be that a person re-marrying may have grown-up children who have left home years earlier and who are not close to their mother or father. These children would be practically unknown to the other party to the marriage, and yet they could claim on the estate.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That does not mean to say that their claim would succeed.

Mr. HALL: No, but there is a provision in the old Act regarding maintenance in some cases and not in others, and this expression must mean something. If not, why is it included in respect of some categories? A distinction is drawn and I think it is fair that the provision should be included in this Bill. I do not go as far as the honourable member for Onkaparinga would go. I know that he has approached this matter in good faith but his amendments take the matter back beyond our present Act, and I see no reason for that. I do not think we should make it more difficult for the groups at present included in legislation to claim on a deceased person's estate. However, I consider that in widening the range, we should be careful not to enact legislation under which persons not related and possibly not close to the deceased can claim on the estate. One of the main alterations relates to clause 5(*b*), which states:

A person who has been divorced (whether before or after the commencement of this Act) by or from the deceased person.

The 1943 amending Act included a wife as a divorced person, and I realize that the Bill includes the husband, and I have no quarrel with that. The previous definition of "wife" stated:

"wife" includes a woman who has been divorced, whether before or after the passing of this Act, by or from her husband, if she is at the time of his death receiving or entitled to receive maintenance from him.

I should like to see that maintained. I understand that the amendment of the member for Onkaparinga covers that point. Clause 5(*g*) states:

A child of a spouse of the deceased person by any former marriage of such spouse.

I believe that the member for Onkaparinga is moving in the right direction to provide for dependence on the deceased person, and I have the same consideration for a child or a legally adopted child of any child or legally adopted child of the deceased person, as stated in clause 5(*h*). I do not know whether it should apply to all or any legally adopted children of the deceased person, as they could be in the same category as a blood child. I see no reason why dependence should be provided in respect of that one, but the further we get away the more we need to establish the degree of dependence. I believe it should certainly apply in respect of parents. Clause 5(*j*) states:

where the deceased person was an illegitimate child—(i) the mother of the deceased person; and (ii) a person adjudged by an affiliation order to be the father of the deceased person.

The above points interest me most of all in regard to this Bill. I agree with the amendment to be moved by the member for Flinders in clause 7 to reduce from 12 to six months the period in which a claim can be made on an estate. The administration of an estate might be so far advanced by the added six months in which a claim could be made, that great inconvenience could be caused, and if a person had not heard of the matter within that six months I think the relationship would be only a slight one in any case. It seems to me that the main purpose of this legislation is to widen these provisions, and I shall support the amendments when they are moved, provided they do

not take the position back further than it is under the present Act, pertaining in the main to these categories that are included in those that can claim on a deceased person's estate.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I have one or two amendments on the file that I shall move at the appropriate time. I am concerned mainly with clause 5 which, in the second reading explanation, the Attorney-General described as an important provision, enlarging the class of person who may claim against the estate of the deceased person. This clause will enable the following persons, previously debarred, to make claims: a divorced husband, a stepchild, a legitimated child, a grandchild (including an adopted child of a child, and a child or adopted child of an adopted child), a parent, and, where the deceased was illegitimate, his mother and a person adjudged by an affiliation order to be his father.

In widening the scope of this provision, I think the Bill goes too far unless certain safeguards are provided. I think there is every justification for the attitude that a person should be responsible for his own children and those he has legally adopted. Obviously his own children have a claim upon him, provided that they are not adults. I think there is a distinction as to the degree of the claim, and as to the claim itself. The adopted child ceases to have any attachment to or knowledge of his natural parents, so morally and legally he is a child of the deceased. However, to include grandchildren, unless they are dependent, is taking the matter a little far. I think including children of a divorced spouse by her first husband, who at the time of the deceased's death were not dependent upon him, is also taking the matter too far. Under this provision it is possible for children to have a claim on two different fathers, and I do not think this is proper. The measure also provides that a spouse has a claim on her divorced husband. Even though she may be a widow of the deceased she can legitimately claim from any or all of her former husbands. I do not think the Minister intends that.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Yes.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Then I cannot agree with the Minister, as I do not think there should be a premium on marrying several men.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: The claim depends on clause 6 (1) (*b*).

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: If the Minister agrees that the principle of dependence is included, I go along with him.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He is entitled to claim only if he is left without adequate provision.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: But that does not mean that he is a dependent of the deceased. It is not proper that a person who may have had nothing to do with the deceased during the latter part of his life should be able to come along as soon as he has died and, by virtue of the relationship, and nothing else, claim a part of the estate. I think we must adhere throughout the whole of the Bill to the principle of dependence upon the deceased at the time of his death; I think this is the only logical thing to do. I cannot see why we should go any farther than that. The Minister may have a reason, but I can see no reason if a person is not dependent and has had neither a financial nor a filial relationship with the deceased.

Mr. Shannon: Or a blood relationship!

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: That may be so. Overriding all these considerations is the fact that the Act previously left the matter very much in the hands of the court, but within limitations. The Minister proposes to remove some of the categories of people with claims. I am prepared to accept that there is some justice in this, provided that a relationship of dependence exists between the parties. The member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) and I have some amendments on the file, and in one or two cases they may overlap. We shall take them in the order in which they will be put to the Committee, and failing the acceptance of one we shall attempt to secure the acceptance of another. They are not contradictory in any way. I understand that the six months allowed for the lodging of a claim has been satisfactory in the past, and I see no justification for increasing that period to 12 months. After all, the winding up of an estate can often be time consuming, irritating, and a costly process. Many of us know cases where an estate has been left in the hands of a trustee or a trustee company, and by the time it has been finalized many of the assets have been absorbed in the administration of the estate, with precious little left for the beneficiaries. These problems should be removed rather than accentuated.

As I have said, if a person is in any way dependent on the deceased, or has either a financial or filial relationship with the deceased, he knows when the death occurs, and should immediately learn of the provisions of the will, if there is one. He generally knows

whether he has been included or excluded, or whether he has been included to an extent justified by his relationship to the deceased. That person has six months in which to ascertain the information and to lodge his claim. Extending the period to 12 months will create an additional delay in winding up the affairs of the estate. I know that the Minister may say that the trustees can proceed to administer the estate, and that if a subsequent claim comes before the court the trustees are not liable for the administration at that stage. However, the Minister must provide that any subsequent claim that the court awards relates to the total value of the estate, and must be met out of a recoupment by the beneficiaries.

Mr. Shannon: It is difficult to get it back once at has been passed out.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It may be difficult, and it can be disturbing. Suppose, for example, that a claimant came up with a substantial claim. What would be the position if the beneficiaries had utilized the proceeds of the estate in order to set up a business, or for some other perfectly legitimate cause? They may not be in a position to make a refund. I know that the present legislation provides something along those lines. I do not want to widen the difficulties.

I know that in these matters in the past discretion has been left largely to the courts. It is claimed that this has worked well, and I do not know of any particular case where it has not worked fairly well. However, it is this Parliament's function not simply to say to the court that it should fix things according to its discretion: it is Parliament's function to lay down the rules under which the court can work. If Parliament has any function at all in passing laws its function is to provide the rules on which the courts shall operate. I am not suggesting that the courts have not done equitably in these matters, but I believe it is our responsibility to lay down rules. We do this in every other sphere of legislation, and the courts interpret the laws we pass; we should do the same here.

I do not object to the second reading of the Bill generally, but I consider it has widened the legislation to an unjustifiable degree. I believe we should consider the suggested amendments. I hope the Attorney-General will consider them because I am quite sure that if they are not considered and given effect to repercussions in the administration of estates will result. If we want to avoid friction within family circles and in the winding up of estates (and this has always been a rather touchy business) we should prescribe what should be done, and exclude people from having a subsequent claim on an estate. I am not referring to a claim that the deceased person may have been prepared to recognize. I do not object to a deceased person's having made a provision in his will, but it should not be possible for someone to attack an estate 12 months afterwards on a basis that is not strictly a basis of dependence.

Mr. SHANNON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 10.14 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, October 21, at 2 p.m.