HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 24, 1967

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

PETROLEUM (SUBMERGED LANDS) BILL

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

DISTINGUISHED VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery a visiting delegation from the United Kingdom Branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, comprised of the following members: The Rt. Hon. Lord Stow Hill, Q.C. (leader of the delegation), the Rt. Hon. John Boyd-Carpenter, M.P., Sir Donald Kaberry, Bt., T.D., M.P., and Messrs. Bert Hazell, C.B.E., J.P., M.P., and Ernest Armstrong, M.P. On behalf of the House of Assembly, I warmly welcome our fellow Parliamentarians from the United Kingdom, and I am sure that it is the unanimous wish of honourable members that representatives of our distinguished visitors be given seats on the floor of the House. Accordingly, I ask the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to introduce the Rt. Hon. Lord Stow Hill and the Rt. Hon. John Boyd-Carpenter.

The honourable gentlemen were escorted by the Hon. D. A. Dunstan and Mr. Hall to seats on the floor of the House.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: PARLIAMENTARY SALARIES TRIBUNAL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Since a public statement about the proceedings before the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal was released by the Chairman of the tribunal and some exchanges occurred in this House concerning it I have had correspondence with the Chairman and conversation with the Chief Justice, but these have not resolved some real differences that have occurred. However, in view of what I said in this House at that time, I consider that certain of the facts have been clarified, but that I am duty bound to make it clear that Mr. Justice Travers did not approach, but was approached by, the reporter to whom he made the statement, and that I accept that his only motive in making the statement was his belief that, as the tribunal was a public one, he had no right to refuse information concerning its proceedings.

QUESTIONS

MURRAY RIVER SALINITY

Mr. HALL: My question concerns the serious salinity and its effects in the Murray River waters. I have received a report from a gentleman who is conversant with the problems of the Murray River and the present problems of salinity, and this report, coupled with the report in this morning's *Advertiser*, prompts me to ask the question. I quote from the report appearing in this morning's *Advertiser*, giving the respective readings of salinity in parts a million at various places on the Murray River, as follows:

Lock 9, 170 parts of sodium chloride a million; Lock 5, 255; Berri, 330; Loxton, 370; Cobdogla, 375; Waikerie, 420; Mannum, not available; Murray Bridge, 490; Jervois, 420.

The report I have received indicates that the approximate safe limit for overhead sprinkler irrigation of citrus trees is 170 parts a million, and states:

The effect of using saline irrigation water is cumulative and leads eventually to premature defoliation with a reduction in crop (40 per cent in 1967-68), with loss of quality as a result of the reduced crop. Citrus trees in the Upper Murray have had a very heavy flowering this year, but leaf fall ranging from light to very heavy is now being reported from all districts. If we have to continue to irrigate with water well above the safety level then the outlook for the 1968-69 crop is not good, and the uptake of salt by young leaves this season could cause the same problem next year, even if water quality improves later.

The major citrus-growing areas are apparently receiving water of a salinity level well above that considered to be safe. The effect of using such water is cumulative and leads to premature defoliation. The safe level will not be achieved until high saline inflows are diverted from the river. It is stated that at present the Engineering and Water Supply Department is conducting a saline survey upstream from Waikerie. The writer, indicating that in his opinion the survey should be made from Lake Victoria downstream, continues:

It is suggested that, in view of the published figures, they would be better employed in working downstream from Lake Victoria, with immediate attention being given to points of major salt inflow. This would give the quickest possible relief to all places downstream.

One known source of pollution is in the Rufus Creek, which takes water from Lake Victoria to the river. Salt water seeps in all along this creek but at one point a small creek flows in with water at 14,300 p.p.m.

A small sandbag dam, temporary pump and some piping laid on the surface could divert this stream in a matter of days. Similarly—

The SPEAKER: Order! Can the Leader assure me that this statement is necessary to explain his question? It is an unusually long one.

Mr. HALL: It is, Sir, but I crave your indulgence and that of the House to explain this matter fully, as I believe it is of urgency and vital importance not only to river residents but also to city residents who are supplied with this water. The report continues:

Similarly, Salt Creek at Renmark collects "natural seepage", plus some channel overflow, and discharges at Settler Bend at 1,400 p.p.m. By keeping channel overflow to a minimum the flow could be greatly reduced, and this smaller but now very salty water could be pumped for temporary storage in Disher Creek evaporation basin.

So that the Minister of Works may have a full explanation, I shall be happy to give him the complete report. First, will the Minister take immediate action to relieve the saline inflows, two examples of which I have just given and several other examples of which I shall give him subsequently? Secondly, will the Minister appoint a committee with the object of combating the saline inflow to the river from evaporation basins and of investigating the siting of any further evaporation basins that may be necessary to remove drainage waters from irrigation areas?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall be happy to make all possible investigations into this matter. However, I think the statement referred to by the Leader is grossly exaggerated: my department has been continually watching the position, and it will continue to do so. Although I doubt whether it is necessary to appoint a special committee to consider this matter, I am nevertheless prepared to have the Leader's suggestion fully investigated. As the Leader appreciates, it will take some time to investigate fully this long and complex question and, should a reply not be available before the House rises, I shall let him have a detailed reply in writing when it is to hand.

Mr. CURREN: Salinity readings taken at various points along the Murray River are now made available to the *Advertiser,* which publishes them three times a week on the day after the readings have been taken. Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether these figures cannot be made available to the *Murray Pioneer* and to the two radio stations that service the Upper Murray districts on the days on which readings are taken?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: These figures are published in the country edition of the *Advertiser,* which has been gracious enough to make them available for the convenience of the people concerned. Although I should not like to guarantee that the figures could be made available to anyone else before the *Advertiser* had a chance to publish them, I will see whether they can be made available to the broadcasting stations for publication after they have appeared in the *Advertiser.*

WATER PUMPING

Mr. HUDSON: Last night on ADS Channel 7 the Leader of the Opposition said, when questioned about Adelaide's water supply, that the Government had not started pumping sufficiently early and that, if he had been Premier of the State, pumping would have started earlier this year. In this morning's *Advertiser* the Leader is reported as saying that, because there had been no cessation of pumping, the Government had a guilty conscience in not starting pumping with all pumps earlier. In view of these statements made by the Leader, can the Minister of Works give figures for the total pumping from January 1 to the present date for the four busiest years (that is, the four years in which the heaviest pumping took place) which, I understand, were 1959, 1962, 1966 and 1967? Can the Minister also say what quantity was pumped from April 1 last to the present time and the quantity of water pumped through the Mannum-Adelaide main from June 1 to the present? If these figures show that the quantity pumped this year has been a record and exceeds significantly the quantity pumped in any other year, will the Minister take up with the—

The SPEAKER: Order! I must rule the question out of order, as a question on the same subject appears on the Notice Paper.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Millhouse: You've been ruled out of order.

Mr. HUDSON: —can I confine my question to the quantity of water pumped from June this year?

The SPEAKER: Order! Although I cannot allow the question, I will see the honourable member later for another question.

Later:

Mr. HUDSON: I understand that the four busiest years for the pumping of water through the Mannum-Adelaide main have been 1959, 1962, 1966 and 1967. Can the Minister of

Works indicate the total quantity of water pumped through the Mannum-Adelaide main between June 1 and October 24 in each of those years, and from April 1 in each of those years?

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member looks at the Notice Paper, he will see that that is asked in the third question on notice. That question cannot be asked again.

Mr. HUDSON: Mr. Speaker, if I may make a point in relation to this, the question on the Notice Paper refers to water pumped "up to October 20". That is from January 1, I take it, because the question goes on to say "in each of the calendar years . . . ". My question concerns the total quantity of water pumped from April 1 to October 23, and from June 1 to October 23, so it is not the same question.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: *De minimis non curat lex.*

The SPEAKER: I will allow the question. The Minister of Works!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise to a point of order. This, in my respectful submission, is substantially the question I have on the Notice Paper, and the only thing that the honourable member has done is split it and pick two periods within the total period about which I have asked. I have asked for figures for the years to which the honourable member has referred, up to October 20.

The SPEAKER: Order! If I understood the question aright, the honourable member asked about a different period from that about which the member for Mitcham had asked.

Mr. Millhouse: It comes within my question, Sir.

The SPEAKER: The question I have allowed relates to the period from April to beyond October 20.

Mr. Millhouse: That's not what he asked.

The SPEAKER: Yes it is. That is the only question I will allow. I am not allowing an answer to a question on notice to be given to any member other than the member under whose name the question appears on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I regret that a tragedy in South Australia is becoming a political football. I did hear the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition last night on channel 7. In reply to the honourable member's question, the position is that water pumped through the Mannum-Adelaide main from January 1 to October 20 in the following years—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That is not a reply to the question asked.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Chair heard the dates. That information is specifically asked for in the third question on notice.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. How much water has been pumped through the Mannum-Adelaide and the Morgan-Whyalla mains, respectively, up to October 20 in each of the calendar years from and including 1958?

2. What was the total capacity for pumping through each of these pipelines in each of the abovementioned years?

3. What was the cost of such pumping in each of these years?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The replies are as follows:

1.

Period from January 1 to October 20	Quantity of water pumped through— Mannum-Adelaide main. Million gallons	Morgan-Whyalla main. Million gallons
1958	6,130	2,120
1959	10,160	2,340
1960	5,210	1,400
1961	3,540	2,050
1962	11,140	2,780
1963	4,290	1,900
1964	4,410	2,850
1965	7,290	3,330
1966	10,320	3,710
1967	13,040	4,040

2. The capacity for pumping through these mains varies between summer and winter and depends on the ability to use the water or to safely store the water in reservoirs. The total capacity a month from these two pipelines is as follows:

Mannum-Adelaide main:

From January, 1958, to August, 1961—1,600,000 000 gallons a month.

From September, 1961, to October, 1967—2,050,000,000 gallons a month.

Morgan-Whyalla main:

From January, 1958, to June, 1962—310,000,000 gallons a month.

From July, 1962, to September, 1965—380,000,000 gallons a month.

From October, 1965, to February, 1966—540,000,000 gallons a month.

From March, 1966, to October, 1967—630,000,000 gallons a month.

3. The cost of pumping is only available on a financial year basis, and is as follows:

Financial year	Cost of pumping Mannum-Adelaide main. $	Morgan-Whyalla main. $
1957-58	1,801,928	738,598
1958-59	1,250,702	713,486
1959-60	2,138,242	881,386
1960-61	1,227,612	734,176
1961-62	2,093,440	1,116,068
1962-63	1,702,668	540,287
1963-64	1,466,260	614,141
1964-65	1,413,314	1,568,406
1965-66	2,185,905	1,891,447
1966-67	1,865,792	2,027,189

It is pointed out that the cost of electricity for pumping on the Mannum-Adelaide main for the period of July 1 to October 20 this year is higher than for the same period in any previous year.

KEITH WATER SUPPLY

Mr. NANKIVELL: I understand the Minister of Works now has a report from the Minister of Mines regarding the discovery of a satisfactory source of water for the township of Keith. Will he give that report?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have two reports, one of which came to hand only a few minutes before the House met and which, therefore, officially has been presented to me rather than to the Director and Engineer-in-Chief of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. However, as I had some of the details of the report yesterday, last evening I talked over the matter with the Director, who is not available today because of other commitments. The report states:

Progress of drilling and exploration for the Keith township water supply is as follows: A second borehole completed to depth 260ft., some miles north-east of Keith township, encountered a limited supply of water considered rather too saline for a town supply. A deep bore (235ft.) belonging to the Highways Department in the township was reconditioned and fitted with sand screens. A second bore was drilled to depth 221ft. at about 87ft. away from the Highways Department bore and, after being fitted with sand screens, was developed and pump tested for about 72 hours overall using the Highways Department bore as an observation bore to test draw-down. The pump test completed on morning of Monday, October 23, 1967, indicates a steady supply of about 6,000 gallons an hour of water suitable in quality for a township supply. Drilling of a second supply bore within the township at about half a mile from the first is now in progress, and a third supply bore will be commenced within the next few days.

From this report and from other things I have heard, it seems to me that at last we have found a suitable water supply for the Keith township. I have asked the Director whether a reticulated supply will be available in Keith to meet the demands for water this summer, but I believe that is rather doubtful. Subject to the statements in the report being proved correct (and I believe they will be), so that the people in the township may have some supply to help them during the difficult summer ahead, an overhead tank will be built and a pipe will be laid with a stand pipe into Keith. We will subsequently go ahead with a reticulated system at the greatest possible speed to give the town the relief needed.

ELECTRICITY TRUST LOAN

Mr. SHANNON: In common with other members, I have been approached by representatives of the provincial press who have complained that the Electricity Trust of South Australia has not advertised its current loan in country newspapers. I understand that this is a departure from usual practice. These country newspapers, which are a valuable source of funds for such loan raisings, consider that they have been by-passed unfairly. If the Premier's Department has not examined this matter, will the Premier have it examined to make sure that such country papers are not overlooked when future loans for semi-government institutions are advertised?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Electricity Trust advertisements concerning its loan programme are entirely in the hands of the trust, and the trust has not consulted with the Government about the form or extent of these advertisements. However, as the honourable member has now raised the matter, I will take up with the Chairman of the trust the possibility of advertising in the provincial press, and let him have a report.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. CASEY: I read with interest at the weekend statements attributed to Mr. Wentworth, M.H.R., and to several other Commonwealth members regarding rail standardization in South Australia. Having known Mr. Wentworth for a long time, I am aware of his flag-waving of this subject over the years. Can the Premier comment on this matter, which is of great importance to South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: South Australia has consistently pressed for an integrated standard gauge rail system connecting Adelaide with northern lines. In fact, the Rail Standardization Agreement provides for the conversion to standard gauge of all lines in South

Australia except those on Eyre Peninsula. In April, 1966, the South Australian Railways Commissioner submitted to the Commonwealth Railways Commissioner his comments on the latter's proposed report to the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport on standardization north of Adelaide. Since then, this State has pressed for this work to be approved and for work to be phased in concurrently with the phasing out of current work on the Port Pirie to Cockburn line. I wrote to the Prime Minister on August 3, 1967, pressing for an early decision. No decision has been made by the Commonwealth, but this State will continually press for this work to be put in hand. The importance of Adelaide's being connected by standard gauge to Sydney and Perth is ever present in the Government's thinking.

Unfortunately, Mr. Wentworth's suggestion in last Saturday's *Advertiser* is not as simple as it sounds. The Government and the Railways Commissioner are well aware that between Adelaide and Port Pirie conversion, in some parts, involves only the moving of a rail. This is, however, an over-simplification of the work involved. It would be essential for standard gauge to come right into Adelaide with appropriate terminal and marshalling facilities. It also involves the problem of traffic flows on the remainder of the Peterborough Division and the consequent intermovement of trucks on both standard and broad gauge on the Adelaide Division. This latter point is of strong significance in the State's representations to the Commonwealth. It is essential for us to be involved in a minimum of expensive change of gauge transfer facilities, be they bogie exchange or otherwise.

In short, we want an integrated standard gauge system connecting Adelaide with Western Australia and New South Wales that will bring the maximum benefit to this State. The Commonwealth Government is well aware of South Australia's views on this and the State will continue to press for an early decision. On Friday last the Commonwealth Minister said in a television interview on an Australian Broadcasting Commission channel that the Commonwealth considered it still had some time up its sleeve on this score and would not need immediately to begin planning for taking over the work. This Government entirely disagrees with that point of view: in our view it is essential for us to proceed with this work immediately, so that, as work is phased out on the Port Pirie to Broken Hill standardization, we shall be able to commence the Port Pirie to Adelaide standardization, and we do not think that any time at all should be lost in the necessary planning for this course.

CEDUNA-PENONG ROAD

Mr. BOCKELBERG: Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads whether the Government intends to seal the road between Ceduna and Penong and, if it does, when the work is likely to be done?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall obtain a report for the honourable member.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: During the weekend some farmers in the drought-stricken areas of the Murray Plains in my district pointed out to me that they were in dire need of supplies of fodder. Apparently, fodder is not available in that part of the district, and the farmers would be obliged to go a considerable distance farther afield in order to get fodder supplies, particularly hay, for their livestock. I understand that the farmers have trucks and trailers with which they would be able to get their supplies. However, if they use this means of transport, the load-weight capacity of the vehicles will exceed eight tons and, therefore, the farmers will be liable under the road maintenance contribution legislation of 1963. Can the Premier say whether, in view of the drought conditions and the necessitous position in which these farmers have been placed, the Government would release the farmers from the obligation to pay road maintenance tax if their vehicles were used solely for conveying fodder for livestock in these drought-stricken areas?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall take the matter up immediately with my colleague and let the honourable member have a report.

Mr. HUGHES: I believe all members are concerned about the present drought conditions: no-one is more concerned than the Minister of Agriculture. From time to time he has appealed to those primary producers who have been less affected by the conditions than others to conserve fodder wherever possible to assist other farmers later. Can the Minister say what has been the result of the various appeals he has made to have fodder conserved in an effort to relieve the difficult situation that will soon exist?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I appreciate the remarks of the honourable member. True, all members, particularly country members, are concerned about the present drought position.

About a fortnight ago, the Minister of Lands and I received a deputation from the South Australian Dairymen's Association and the Chaff-cutters Association, at which meeting I took the liberty of having the Chief Agronomist (Mr. Pearson) present. From those discussions, it was agreed that Mr. Pearson should ask all agricultural advisers throughout the State to see where hay and fodder could be cut and to inform the farmers of such properties how hay prices compared with the grain prices. Since then agricultural advisers have contacted the people in their districts who it seems will have a stand of hay, and have informed them of the return they can expect from hay as compared with grain. As it is economical for them to cut hay, they have been requested to do so. Magnificent results have been achieved, the department now having information about just where hay is available. Recently I noticed that the Lucerne Cutters Association had fixed a price this year of $32 a ton for lucerne hay, and I believe this will be about the price of good cereal hay. Of course, in areas where good cereal hay is available, in some cases the price could be a little less than that. Some concern has been expressed that profiteering in relation to hay might take place, but evidence of this has appeared only in isolated cases. The co-operation of those concerned has been good and has been appreciated by the department. However, in areas of light and drifting soil some care should be exercised and, because of the conditions this year, hay should not be cut, it being better for people in those areas to reap what it is possible to reap in an effort to conserve some cover for the soil. This advice is being given to the people concerned. The position regarding feed and seed grain for next season is also being closely observed.

Together with his departmental officers throughout the State, the Chief Agronomist has considered the whole position with a view to improving the situation to the best advantage. I appreciate the ready co-operation that has been received from the majority of the people concerned. I have been informed that good quantities of hay are evident in the Clare and Maitland areas. As this is perhaps not known to people generally, it would be advisable if people wanting hay telephoned the district adviser at Kadina who could inform them just where it was available in the area. If people in other areas want to know where hay is available, they should contact the Agriculture Department to obtain the information.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I listened with interest to the comments of the Minister of Agriculture on the cutting of hay, and since then I have been considering the matter further. Perhaps the Minister's reply suggests that at present there seems to be sufficient hay cut to meet requirements, because he said that hay was available on Yorke Peninsula and that contact could be made with the suppliers through the agricultural adviser at Kadina. I do not know whether the Minister intended to convey that, but that was the impression I got. There is a real problem, and it always happens in these years when people respond in good faith to requests to cut hay and then find that they have this hay left on their hands, unsold. I know that the Minister and all other members wish to avoid that happening. For example, I know that a farmer in the Yeelanna district has in his paddock a quantity of, I think, 9,000 bales of good meadow hay that he has not been able to sell. Will the Minister consider making arrangements whereby the department, through Mr. Pearson, could make available to the Australian Broadcasting Commission a comment, for broadcasting, about the department's knowledge, gained from reports from advisers and other sources, about the areas in which hay is still required, so that farmers who still have hay to cut will know the position? I point out that this is a late year and that there is much wheat in the flowering stage that will be ideal for cutting during the next week. If what I have suggested is done, farmers will be able to make prompt contact with stock agents and contact potential buyers before cutting their hay. I know that Mr. Pearson is busy, but I think my suggestion may bring the buyer and the producer together to mutual advantage.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I agree entirely with what the honourable member has said. The impression he got was what I had hoped to convey, although perhaps I conveyed it a little clumsily. The hay in question is not necessarily cut at this stage: it is available. As the honourable member has said, what is required is information about buyers who are seeking hay, and we are trying to get co-operation between the purchaser and the grower on this. I can readily understand from previous experience that some people may not cut, although they may have stands that would be suitable for cutting. As they can sell the product as either grain or hay, we have told the farmers what is the break-even

price of one against the other, taking into consideration, amongst other things, the value of stubble.

One of the comments I heard from people in the Clare and Maitland areas was that they would cut if there was a demand, and they would like to know what is required. That is why I suggested that people desiring this information should contact the adviser at Kadina, as he could tell them where the hay was available so that they could make contact direct. I do not think we should do all the detailed work for the people, nor do I think the honourable member wants us to do that: the people concerned could be told the price, and then they could make their own arrangements.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: They would need to hurry.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: That is right, because although it is a late season and some hay may be available later, most of it would be available within the next few days.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: This week.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes. That is why last Friday I said that farmers should hurry to get their orders in. It would be too late afterwards. I appreciate the desire of farmers to have this information, and I know that they are still asking for it. I think the department can give a service by saying where hay is available so that the farmers who want it can then go ahead and arrange to get it. I think that publicizing the information by press and radio would be a good idea. Although some farmers will cut so as to have the hay available for sale later, many farmers have been accustomed to reaping rather than cutting, and they will be placed at some disadvantage this year in trying to help out. These people do not wish to be placed at a further disadvantage because they desire to help one another in this situation.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr. BROOMHILL: In view of the amount of business remaining on the Notice Paper, can the Premier say what will be the likely hours of sitting before Parliament adjourns, and can he also indicate the days upon which we are likely to sit?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In view of the amount of business still on the Notice Paper, I expect that the House will adjourn on November 2. In the meantime, I ask members to be prepared to sit on Thursday evening this week as well as on Tuesday and Wednesday evenings.

TEACHERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Today I received a letter from a constituent whose son finished his course at a teachers college last year and began his National Service training in February last. I am told by the mother that before her son went into National Service he had been told that he would have a refresher course of six months after completing his National Service before he would be required to teach. He has now been told (but I think not officially) that he will be given only a week in a school before he is appointed to teach at a school. In view of the importance of this matter (and I guess that the Minister of Education must have considered it), will the Minister outline the policy of the Education Department regarding those teachers who have completed their courses and their National Service and who, when discharged, are appointed to schools?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: If the honourable member gives me details of the case, I shall have investigations made and find out what is the position.

WALLAROO PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. HUGHES: A letter I have received from the Secretary of the Wallaroo Primary School Committee, dealing with the levelling and asphalting of the schoolyard, states:

Dear Sir,

Further to our letters on the above matter, I have to advise that urgent repairs were carried out in August, 1967. These repairs have lessened the dangerous areas in the school yard. Although the urgent repairs have been completed the committee is still hopeful of having the yard graded, relevelled, and asphalted in the foreseeable future. Fortunately from the school's point of view, the children have not been caught in the rain during the lunch breaks or recess periods, but next year could be a wet year.

Mr. Quirke: We hope it will.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. HUGHES: The school committee hopes that, too. The letter then refers to the urgent need—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. HUGHES: I will ask the question, Mr. Speaker, but I regret very much that I shall not, because of the interjection, be able to give the full reasons for asking it. Will the Minister of Education obtain a report on the latest developments of levelling and asphalting the yard at the Wallaroo Primary School, and will he discuss with officers of the Public

Buildings Department the possibility of providing the school committee with a master plan of proposed works at the school and any additional buildings intended to be erected on the school property, so that the committee may plan working bees to replace playground equipment, and also plan future projects?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I shall be pleased to do that.

ULOOLOO CROSSING

Mr. QUIRKE: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Transport a reply to the question I asked some time ago about the closing of a railway crossing south of Ulooloo that the District Council of Hallett would prefer to remain open?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Railways Commissioner reports that the level crossing at 126m. 29chs., Terowie line, was formerly traversed by the main road to Broken Hill *via* Peterborough. Because of the acute angle between the railway and road at this crossing, and the hazardous conditions arising from the observed tendency of road vehicles to traverse it at high speeds, flashing light warning equipment was installed in 1960. Recently, the main road has been re-established on a new route east of the railway, and the crossing is now used only by local traffic. Counts of such traffic made from time to time have disclosed that very few vehicles use the crossing. Nevertheless, the hazard still remains and, in the circumstances, the removal of the existing protection could not be contemplated whilst any road traffic at all continues to cross.

As there is another crossing only one mile away, it has seemed that little inconvenience would be caused if this crossing were closed. This proposal has economic advantages in that the council would be relieved of the need to maintain what is now a local road, and this department would be able to retire the warning equipment which must still be maintained at substantial cost to the taxpayer. However, should it be found practicable to deviate the road in the vicinity of the crossing so as to eliminate the present acute angle between it and the railway, and if the council desires to undertake this work, he will be glad to consider the matter further.

FRUIT CARGOES

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: As the Minister of Agriculture is aware, two ships carrying a large consignment of fruit were trapped in the Suez Canal during the recent hostilities and are still there, and I understand that the fruit has now deteriorated completely. I have been informed that the insurance companies have repudiated their liability for any payment in respect of the shipment and, as the fruit was sold on a guaranteed consignment basis, I believe that all payments for the fruit have been delayed. This is serious for the fruit exporter and the growers, and will have ruinous consequences. Has the Minister further information to that which he gave the House on this matter three or four weeks ago? If he has not, will he immediately consult the Prime Minister to see whether this matter can come within the ambit of the Commonwealth export guarantee plan?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I do not have all the information requested by the honourable member, but I note his final remarks and will ascertain what can be done in that regard. I have been informed that the people to whom the fruit was consigned have said that they will not accept it, and that is understandable in view of the fruit's possible condition. It is not true, however, that all of the fruit was on consignment: some of it was on firm order. The difficulty here is that the people concerned are regular customers, and, as we wish to maintain good relationships between the buyer and the producer, the matter must be handled tactfully. Although I am not sure how much produce was on consignment or what payments were to be made in connection therewith, I think we have a definite insurance claim, and I will certainly do all I can to see that an approach is made to the proper authorities.

MARGARINE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Agriculture seen an advertisement that appeared in the *Advertiser* of October 20 headed "Fats link with coronaries 'proved' ", in which Professor R. B. Blacket is reported to have said, amongst other things, that "just as people increased their coronary risk by eating fatty foods, they could reduce the risk by switching to a low-fat diet including . . . margarine"? Can the Minister say what is the latest medical opinion on this subject?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Although I do not have the latest medical report on the matter, I am aware of no change of policy on the part of the Heart Foundation. (For a long time medical opinion has been divided on this issue.) I reiterate, however, that countries consuming the most animal fats do not have the highest incidence of

coronaries. The United States, which has a low consumption of animal fats, has probably one of the highest incidences of coronaries. France, a large consumer of animal fats, has possibly one of the lowest incidences of coronaries. I will ask the Minister of Health whether he has any further information from the Heart Foundation on this debatable matter. I recall having caused controversy earlier among certain members of the medical profession by saying that it would not be a bad idea if people were to do a little exercise and thereby improve the situation. I know that many people who consume large quantities of butter live to a ripe old age. However, such matters as this should not be the subject of advertising, particularly under the name of such an eminent person, for equally eminent people have a different opinion.

SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier elaborate on his announcement concerning a plan to supplement the excellent work undertaken today by senior citizens' clubs, the Meals on Wheels organization, and other bodies, in helping aged and sick people? Can he say how this plan is to be financed and whether it is to be organized through councils which, today, administer senior citizens' clubs with funds provided by Government subsidy?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The announcement concerning the plan is being prepared. It is not ready yet and, as soon as it is, I shall let the honourable member know.

EUDUNDA CROSSING

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Transport a reply to my recent question about a railway crossing at Eudunda?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: The Minister of Transport has submitted the following reply:

I have to report that my officers have investigated the matter relating to the level crossing at Eudunda in the vicinity of the flour mill. This crossing is marked with standard level crossing and "stop" signs, and a wig-wag warning signal is installed on the south-west side. I am informed that drivers of vehicles proceeding in an east-bound direction, who stop within the prescribed distances from the signs, have a clear view of approaching rail traffic and of the wig-wag, except when trains are actually on the crossing. The installation of flashing lights is undertaken on a priority basis following consideration of relevant factors, including the degree of hazard, by a committee of officers representing the Highways and Railways Departments. I have no doubt that the committee will give consideration to this crossing, among others, when the schedule of priorities is next reviewed.

PEKINA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. HEASLIP: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Mines a reply to my question about the water supply in the Pekina area near Orroroo, where the Mines Department sank a trial bore, seeking artesian water? I point out that water flowed at a rate of about 600 gallons an hour, and the Minister said that, if a pump were installed, the flow could be increased to about 15,000 gallons an hour. However, as he doubted whether it was economical to pump this water, the Minister said he would inquire further.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member having indicated last Thursday that he intended to ask this question today, I tried to obtain the information for him. As I was unfortunately unable to obtain the information, I will try to let the honourable member know tomorrow.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government a reply to the question I asked last week about the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports that the interim report prepared by the committee has been forwarded to Cabinet and approval given for it to be distributed to councils, etc. It is not intended to submit the report to Parliament. Copies are available for members on request to the Minister's department.

LAKE LEVELS

Mr. McANANEY: I understand there is to be a restriction of licences in the lakes area near the Goolwa barrages. The quantity of water in the lakes at present is 1,800,000 acre feet and about 1,000,000 acre feet will pass into the lakes, although the effects of evaporation must be taken into account. Can the Minister of Works say what will be the minimum quantity of water desired by the department to be left in the lakes at the beginning of next winter?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: As some questions have been asked by the Minister of Agriculture, as member for Murray, about policy regarding licences for the lower reaches of the Murray River, I have called for a report from the Engineering and Water Supply

Department. After a discussion with representatives of the department, I hope to have final policy determined. As we know that people are anxious to know what is the position, we regret that, because of conditions this year, we must move with special caution. However, I shall try to obtain a reply as soon as possible, and I shall inform the honourable members concerned when it is to hand. If the House has risen, I shall inform them in writing.

RADIATA PINE

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Forests a reply to my recent question about the prices of radiata timber in the South-East and of oregon timber?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The following statement has been supplied by the Timber Merchants Association of South Australia:

The present retail prices for oregon and radiata scantlings in the South-East are as follows: oregon, $22.00 a 100 super feet; and radiata, $19.50 f.o.r. mill to $19.90 f.o.r. South-Eastern areas from Mount Gambier to Keith. In the metropolitan area, prices delivered on the building site are: oregon, $21.20 a 100 super feet; and radiata, $20.70 a 100 super feet. In addition, builders' discounts are much greater in the case of radiata as compared with oregon, when purchased in quantity.

WHEAT

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: I have often raised with the Premier the matter of ensuring that wheat is held in the Adelaide Division to overcome the necessity for expensive importations from other parts of the State. Can the Premier say how much wheat is held in the Adelaide Division and whether it will be sufficient to meet the requirements of the metropolitan area?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I thought I had given this information previously. However, I shall see whether I have a further reply.

POLICE POWERS

Mr. HUDSON: Last week Superintendent Lenton was reported in the *Advertiser* as saying that, in a modern society, the powers of the police were inadequate. He claimed that the police were not able to cope with the increased crime rate without being given increased powers. That evening, on television, when the Superintendent was questioned further regarding the specific powers the police needed, he indicated, first, that prior to charging an accused, the police were required to warn him that anything he might say would be taken down and used in evidence against him. Superintendent Lenton said that, because the police were required to give such a warning, he considered they were often hindered in gaining the information necessary to bring a charge against the accused. He said, secondly, the accused could decide to stay out of the witness box when being charged before the court and need not give evidence. The Superintendent suggested that all accused persons should be required to go into the witness box in court although not required to answer any questions put to them. Can the Premier say whether Superintendent Lenton's remarks indicate Government policy in these matters? Further, does the Government intend to alter the traditional liberties of the subject and the traditional protection given to the individual under our system of British justice?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not see the programme to which the honourable member has referred. If Superintendent Lenton said those things, they were his own personal views.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: He didn't say precisely that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can only say that anything of that kind would certainly not represent this Government's views. The retention of the normal caution to a person under questioning is something the Government would certainly uphold, and under no circumstances does the Government intend to introduce an amendment to the law in this State requiring a defendant to go into the witness box unless he chooses to do so. I believe that this would be the view of all people who uphold the rule of law.

BAROSSA WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked last week regarding the interconnection of the Warren reservoir and Barossa reticulation systems?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: The Director and Engineer-in-Chief reports:

The Warren and Barossa reticulation systems are interconnected in several places and at the boundary between the two districts locked valves are installed. These valves may be operated in emergencies to maintain supply but for the past 12 months this has not been necessary and no Warren water has been fed into the Barossa system at any of these points. There is one 4in. main, however, to the east of Owen and running south to Barabba Tanks which, although in the Barossa water district, has to be permanently fed from the Warren system. The consumers on this main,

although not legally bound, have accepted that they are so supplied and have been issued with permits. Consumption on this main is not metered through a master meter as this is not warranted. However, annual consumption is about 1,000,000 gallons.

EGGS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I was approached recently at the Loxton Show by a farmer who lives in one of the worst areas of the Murray Plains. He has a sideline poultry plant and, I understand, has a producer-agent licence that enables him to sell eggs directly to the public. He is paying 2c a dozen eggs for this privilege and is also paying a Council of Egg Marketing Authorities equalizing levy at the rate of $1 a bird a year. As this man is fairly typical of the farmers in the Mallee area, and in view of the drought and the difficult financial position of many farmers on the Murray Plains, will the Minister of Agriculture take up with the Egg Board the possibility of deferring Egg Board and C.E.M.A. levies until the farmers can pay them?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

NARACOORTE SEWERAGE

Mr. RODDA: Representatives of the Corporation of Naracoorte recently approached officers of the Engineering and Water Supply Department regarding the laying of water and sewer mains in the Sharley subdivision of section 761, hundred of Naracoorte, with a request that consideration be given to carrying out this work along the nature strips at the side of the roadway instead of beneath the roadway as is done at present. It is considered that if this could be done the need to restore the bitumen surface of the roadway could be obviated by having the excavation work carried out on the nature strips. It appears from the response the corporation had to its requests that the department will not agree. In view of the time that the subdivision has been laid out and because many residents living there are putting up with shocking roads, will the Minister of Works confer with officers of the department to ascertain whether such mains could be laid under the nature strips and not under the road?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not think the department would have treated such a request lightly. However, in case it has not gone to the senior authority, I shall take up the matter with the Director and Engineer-in-Chief. I appreciate the very good reason why a roadway should not be taken up if it can be avoided.

RIDGEHAVEN SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: On October 10, Cabinet approved a sewerage scheme for part of the Ridgehaven area, and it has since approved a further scheme. Will the Minister of Works furnish full particulars concerning these schemes?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Details of recently approved sewerage schemes in the Rideghaven area are as follows:

(1) An area at Modbury and Ridgehaven bounded by Jennifer Avenue, Hazel Grove, Hill Top Avenue, Highland Drive, Sunnyview Crescent, Lean Avenue, Selby Avenue, Keith Street and Fleming Avenue. There is 29,250ft. of sewers estimated to cost $133,300 in the scheme which was approved by Cabinet on October 10, 1967. Work on this scheme is expected to commence in about a month's time.

(2) An area at Ridgehaven bounded by Ashley Avenue, Stevens Drive, Penny Street, Fairview Drive and Scenic Way. There is 14,850ft. of sewers estimated to cost $66,800 in the scheme which was approved by Cabinet on October 16, 1967. Work on this scheme is expected to commence in about May, 1968.

CLARENDON HOUSING

Mr. SHANNON: I have been asked by the Meadows District Council to take up a request that was made to the Housing Trust, I understand directly, by the council, that rental houses be built in the township of Clarendon. That was done in June last year, but the council has not yet had a reply. Will the Premier, as Minister of Housing, ascertain whether the trust intends to build these houses and, if it does not, whether it will inform the council why?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a report from the Chairman of the trust.

KINGSTON BRIDGE

Mr. CURREN: Will the Minister of Lands ask the Minister of Roads when it is intended to commence construction work on the approach causeways for the bridge over the Murray River at Kingston, and whether any work will be done this year on the ancillary roads in the plan for the construction of the bridge?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

WATER RATES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: During the weekend one of my constituents, who is a registered trustee in bankruptcy, showed me correspondence that he had had during the last few months with the Minister of Works about a water supply to premises owned by persons who have made an application under the

Bankruptcy Act. I think I can best explain the gist of the correspondence by quoting these two paragraphs from the original letter of August 22:

This office has had two cases now where, when debtors have taken protection of this Act—

that is, the Bankruptcy Act—

and the Engineering and Water Supply Department has lodged a proof of debt with the writer as trustee and this has been admitted as a preferential claim, your Engineering and Water Supply Department has nevertheless proceeded to cut off the supply of water because of non-payment of the water rates amount. In one case, the position was even more serious than the other, in that the particular debtor had handed over his business operations to me as the registered trustee in bankruptcy and had shifted into another house where he had paid the water rates. Your department cut off the water on the house where he had paid the water rates because the rates had not been paid on the business premises which were being administered by me under the provisions of the Bankruptcy Act.

The Minister replied to the effect that he had had an opinion from the Crown Solicitor and that what had been done was legal. My constituent replied that he was concerned not about the legality of what had been done but about the justice of it. The Minister replied on October 13 to the effect that he did not intend to alter the present policy of the department on this matter. In view of the correspondence I have seen, I ask the Minister what reasons prompt this policy, because it seems that it can cause, and has caused, injustice in certain cases, and I also ask him whether he will reconsider his decision, whatever the reasons for the policy, not to review that policy.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I definitely will not reconsider the matter: it has been well considered. There are about 600 bankruptcies in a year. We have to protect the rights of the ratepayers and, therefore, operate within our legal rights.

KEITH AREA SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Last week the Minister commented on my proposals for the drainage of the Keith Area School but, as I understand that he has additional information, will he give the report?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have one report from the Public Buildings Department and another dated October 23 from the Mines Department, which, to a degree, differs from that received from the Public Buildings Department. As the report from the Mines Department is more pleasing I shall give that information to the honourable member. The Director of Mines states that the Keith school drainage bore dealing with the paved area in front of the school, has been cleaned out and tested by the department, and satisfactory drainage has been established.

LANGHORNE CREEK BORE

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply from the Minister of Mines to my recent question about the underground water basin in the Langhorne Creek area?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Minister of Mines states that owing to extreme pressure of work on other urgent groundwater activities, and with limited available staff in the Hydrogeology Section, it has been found impossible to commence the programmed field work in the Langhorne Creek and Milang area to date. A preliminary field assessment will be carried out in the next week or so, after which the detailed data collection prior to test drilling can be planned.

HACK SWAMP

Mr. RODDA: Some time ago I asked the Minister of Lands a question about Bool Lagoon, but as I understand that the Minister of Agriculture is concerned now with setting up artificial islands in Hack Swamp, has he a report on this matter?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The honourable member will recall that on the recommendation of the Land Settlement Committee this area was to be declared a game reserve, but a decision about Bool Lagoon has had to be delayed. In his Budget speech the Treasurer suggested that money collected from the additional charge for gun licences would be used for certain work. The Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department planned that islands would be built, that the area would be used as a holding basin for fish, etc., and that this development would be paid for from money raised from the increased cost of gun licences. However, motions on the Notice Paper refer to the disallowance of these regulations, and I have informed the department that nothing can be done until these matters are determined. No planning in this area can be done until a decision is made about the cost of gun licences.

MIGRANTS

Mrs. BYRNE: The Minister of Immigration and Tourism is aware of the announcement made earlier this month in the House of Representatives by the Minister for Civil Aviation that Australians will now be able to fly overseas and return at drastically reduced fares

under charter arrangements, this scheme principally being approved to combat homesickness among British migrants. On October 4, when I asked the Minister for information about this scheme, he said that he had not received official notification and that the information could not be given. Can the Minister now give me that information?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: True, I promised the honourable member information when I had received it from the Commonwealth Minister, but I have not received it yet. However, because of the announcement in the newspaper I inquired of the Minister and of the Manager of Qantas in South Australia, and I have the following details. The basic alterations in the regulations for charter fares as from November 1, compared with the present group affinity fare, are as follows:

(1) The entire aircraft must be chartered: the present affinity group fares allow for a minimum group of 15 persons.

(2) The charter price when reduced to a per capita basis shall not be less than 60 per cent of applicable current normal International Air Transport Association economy fare: the present regulations allow for a price not less than 70 per cent of the normal I.A.T.A. fare.

(3) The provision of charter flights for parents of migrants: the cost when reduced to a per capita basis shall not be less than 50 per cent of the normal I.A.T.A. round trip economy fare. Persons eligible to participate in the scheme must be the parents or legal guardians (or the spouse of such parent or legal guardian) of persons not born in Australia and have been so resident for not less than six months at the time of the charter flight.

(4) In the first instance the opportunity to operate the charter flights must be offered to the national carrier, that is the regular operator of Australia (namely, Qantas), or the national carrier of the country to which or from which the charter flight is destined or originates.

All contributory group charter to and from Australia must in all respects comply with I.A.T.A. Charter Resolution 045, a summary of which is as follows:

(1) The entire aircraft must be chartered, which means 120 persons for the smallest Boeing 707.

(2) Charter agreements may be made only with one person or legal entity. (This excludes the possibility of a "split" charter where more than one group or organization charters an aircraft.)

(3) The group must have principal purposes, aims and objectives other than travel, and sufficient existing affinity to set it apart from the general public.

(4) The purposes, aims, and objectives must be pursued in practice and not merely theoretical.

(5) Group membership must not exceed 20,000 or 5 per cent of the population of a political unit, whichever is less.

(6) Public solicitation is not permitted: however limited solicitation within the group from which participants are drawn is permitted.

(7) Participants must have been a member of the group for at least six months prior to the commencement of the charter flight.

(8) Parents living in the same household as a participant and the spouse and children of such participant are eligible to participate, but they must accompany the eligible participant.

If the honourable member studies that information she will realize that the conditions are not as bright as seemed apparent from the press report.

MINISTERIAL CARS

Mr. COUMBE: Because of the current hot weather, can the Premier say when he intends to introduce the white Ministerial car fleet, as he previously announced he would?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I understand the orders have been placed. Although the cars should be ready some time before the end of the year, I am not certain of the date.

TAXATION LEGISLATION

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: It has recently been reported in the press that the Commonwealth Government is considering taking action against the Victorian Government regarding the new form of taxation that has been introduced in Victoria. The reason for this action is apparently that the introduction of such a tax is a contravention of the uniform taxation legislation under which States receive a rebate from the Commonwealth Government if they do not collect any income tax. As it is apparently considered by the Commonwealth that the new stamp tax in Victoria amounts to a tax on income, it may be necessary for that State to forgo its rights under the uniform tax legislation. Has the Treasurer seen this report and, if he has, can he say whether the matter has been considered by the Government and whether any of the legislation applying in this State may be affected?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not seen the report, and this matter has not been considered by the Government. However, I do not think this State's legislation would be affected, because South Australia has no similar tax. As the honourable member is aware, this Government took stamp duty off salary and wage pay packets in South Australia. I am somewhat surprised at what the honourable member has said, because Western Australia

has legislation similar to that intended by Sir Henry Bolte. Indeed, the Commonwealth Government was anything but unencouraging of the States generally that they should follow Western Australia's example. We have made it clear that we do not intend to impose a tax of that kind.

SUBURBAN BORES

Mr. HUDSON: I have been approached by a constituent concerning certain unused bores in or near my district, one in the Warradale military camp, one on Marion Road near the railway crossing, and another at the Oaklands railway crossing. I am informed that the quality of the water from the first two bores is good, although the quality of water from the latter bore is (or was) poor. Will the Minister of Works refer to the Engineering and Water Supply Department the possible use of these bores during the coming summer, should the quantity and quality of the supply prove to be adequate?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I shall first have to ascertain who owns these bores, and negotiations can then be conducted with the people concerned with a view to using the bores during the summer if it becomes necessary.

LEVI PARK TRUST

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister representing the Minister of Local Government a reply to my recent question about the operation of the Levi Park Trust?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member desired to know why councils had received no contributions this year. My colleague reports:

By letter dated August 16, 1966, the trust informed me that the grant normally paid each year would not be requisitioned in the future unless circumstances forced the trust to reimpose the regulations of the Levi Park Act, 1948. A sum of $200 had, however, been included on the sub-estimates for 1966-67 but was not spent. The grant has been deleted from the Estimates for the 1967-68 financial year.

UNIVERSITY ACCOUNTS

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on October 17 about the Wheat Research Committee's finances, and about the fact that the university had apparently not issued a balance sheet for the year ended June 30, 1966?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: Apart from the financial statements of the university, 280 separate income and expenditure accounts are maintained by the university in respect of grants (usually for research purposes) from various outside bodies. The Vice-Chancellor has supplied me with a copy of the statement relating to the grant from the Wheat Research Committee which I shall be pleased to supply to the honourable member. The Vice-Chancellor is willing to provide any further information that may be required by the committee.

EDEN HILLS SCHOOL

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Over the weekend, at the invitation of members of the Eden Hills School Committee, I looked at the big old cyprus hedge, which borders Wilpena Street. In June, 1965, the Education Department bought the property adjoining the school which fronts Wilpena Street and on which this hedge grows as additional playing area for the school, which is a small one in size. The area has not yet been prepared as a playing area and one of the contentious points is whether this hedge should remain or be pulled out. The members of the committee are most anxious that the hedge should come out in order to give more room and because it is not in their opinion a thing of beauty any longer. They have applied to the department for permission to remove the hedge, and I have seen the correspondence about it. The latest letter, addressed to the secretary of the committee and dated October 3, states that the Minister of Education "has made a decision about the matter and that it is felt there are not sufficient grounds for reconsideration". Although I respect the Minister's decision, I wonder whether he looked at the hedge before he made the decision. If he did not, I wonder whether (as it is not far, I think, from where he is living) he would be prepared to inspect the hedge, with a view—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Fair go!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Members can laugh if they wish, but—

The SPEAKER: Order! Questions cannot be debated. The honourable member for Mitcham!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: This is a matter of great importance to people in my area and it is regarded as serious by members of the committee. Will the Minister be good enough to inspect the hedge, either in my company or without me, with a view to reviewing the decision he previously made?

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: I cannot recall the details of the report that I may have received concerning this matter. As it may go back some time, I will examine the report and see whether I should look at the hedge. I will tell the honourable member what I think about the matter in due course.

METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister of Works ascertain the figures concerning the quantities of water consumed in Adelaide over the last seven years?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: Although I can obtain those figures, I point out that a series of questions has been asked in respect of which it will take a considerable time to ascertain replies. I do not know the purpose of this question: indeed, it does not seem to have much purpose. I ask members not to create extra work for a department that is already overtaxed. Nevertheless, I shall try to obtain the information requested by the honourable member.

Mr. McAnaney: I was only assisting the member for Glenelg.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I do not think he requires the honourable member's assistance.

PENOLA ELECTRICITY

Mr. RODDA: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of last week about the Penola electricity depot?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have received a report from the General Manager of the Electricity Trust of South Australia who states that, in view of the fact that the trust has existing depots at Mount Gambier, Millicent and Naracoorte, it is not proposed at this stage to establish a new depot at Penola.

COLLECTIONS FOR CHARITY

Mr. HUDSON: On a couple of occasions, it has been brought to my notice that licences issued under the Collections for Charitable Purposes Act have led to the collection of moneys for charitable purposes that have barely exceeded the costs of collection. The costs have been charged against the moneys collected so that very little has been available to the charity that people thought they were helping by making a contribution. Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to ascertain what procedures the department follows regarding the issuing of licences under the Act? Does the Chief Secretary obtain information about the costs that various charities expect to incur in making collections, and also information about the percentage of contributions made by members of the public to charities that is absorbed in costs of collection?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will obtain a report from my colleague.

ELECTRICITY TARIFF

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of last week about the refusal by the Electricity Trust to apply to the Morialta Children's Home a single-meter tariff and about why such an organization should not qualify for the tariff that applies to an ordinary household?

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I have obtained the following report from the General Manager of the trust:

The single-meter electricity tariff applicable to domestic consumers is of the usual type where the first portion of the consumption each quarter is charged at a higher rate than subsequent portions. The tariff is designed to be related to the electricity consumption expected in a household of a few persons and cannot properly be extended to larger premises. The Morialta Children's Home is therefore not eligible for the single-meter domestic tariff and, because the trust is required to treat comparable consumers on a uniform basis, it is not possible to make any exception in this case. At present, some rewiring is being done at the home and there should be some reduction in charges resulting from the proposed use of the farm tariff for the non-residential electricity usage. The residential consumption is charged at the two-meter residential tariff which applies to large premises of this type but which is also still used by many thousands of domestic consumers.

MILANG BORES

Mr. McANANEY: In the Milang area, because of the salt content in the water, bores used for agricultural purposes cannot be used to water stock. Farmers in the area explain this by saying that the new water scheme has brought about many disused bores with the result that salt water has entered the basin. Will the Minister of Agriculture ask the Minister of Mines whether the farmers' explanation is correct and, if it is, will he ascertain whether action can be taken to have the bores sealed?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: Yes.

WINDY POINT

Mr. MILLHOUSE: A few weeks ago the Minister of Immigration and Tourism said that tenders for facilities at Windy Point would close at 3 p.m. last Thursday. I take this,

the first opportunity I have had since tenders closed, to ask the Minister whether any tenders have been received and, if they have, when he will announce the acceptance of a tender.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although tenders have been received, I cannot say when an announcement will be made on the matter.

WINNS ROAD

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have asked several questions, both this session and last session, about Winns Road, Blackwood. On July 6, in reply to my question, the Minister of Lands said, in part:

It was stated that the Highways Department proposed improvements to both Winns Road and the present main road through Coromandel Valley. These projects should be regarded as of a long term nature and it is not expected that any construction work will be commenced until such time as improvements are required by actual traffic volumes.

He went on to say that only preliminary investigations had been made. I transmitted this information to constituents of mine who live in the road and they acted on it. I have now been informed by one of those constituents that, when he applied to the council for permission to build a garage, I think, abutting the road, he was informed that the Highways Department had requested all such applications to be referred to it because roadworks were to be undertaken. On receipt of this advice, my constituent telephoned the Minister of Roads, who denied all knowledge of any work being undertaken on Winns Road and said that the position had not changed. The telephone conversation was followed by a call from officers of the department (I think at the request of the Minister), who said that a two-lane highway was in fact soon to be constructed along Winns Road. In view of this confusion between the answer given in this House and the impression given by the Minister to my constituent, will the Minister of Lands again ask his colleague what plans the department has for Winns Road and when those plans are likely to be put into operation? I should appreciate it if the Minister felt he was able to obtain the answer before this session ended.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

RENMARK SEEPAGE

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: This year I have addressed several questions and the Minister of Irrigation has given replies about the evaporation pond that is to be established adjacent to the irrigation area at Renmark. The site concerned is Bulyong Island, and I have asked the Minister of Lands to obtain from the Mines Department a report on the suitability of the site. In reply, the Minister said that the soil was considered to be impervious and that it was not necessary to obtain a further report. I have now received some information locally that casts considerable doubt on the suitability of this site: indeed, it is stated that the only satisfactory thing about it is that it is rather inconspicuous because it is so inaccessible. The report casts doubt on the wisdom ot proceeding with the project. In view of this information will the Minister reconsider his previous reply and ascertain whether officers of the Mines Department could inspect this area before any heavy financial commitment is made on a project that could lead to an increase in seepage problems on the Murray River?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member will recall that in my previous reply I said the soil was relatively impervious and that it was the same type of soil as that in the Disher Creek basin at Renmark.

The Hon. Sir Thomas Playford: Which, incidentally, is considered to be very unsatisfactory—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: —and which was constructed when the honourable member was Premier. At that stage no test was carried out by the Mines Department, and the honourable member would know that this is a matter for the Renmark Irrigation Trust, the constructing authority in this case. The work on the basin on Bulyong Island was estimated to take 16 weeks and, if it is not near completion, it must now be well advanced. The reason given for the need for haste was that the existing evaporation basin at block E was totally inadequate. The honourable member will be aware that last year the bank was breached and that this caused a tremendous salinity problem. I told the honourable member that in future I would enlist the services of the Mines Department to make the necessary tests before work on evaporation basins proceeded. However, when I replied to the honourable member, the work had proceeded to such an extent that tests would not have altered the situation and, in my view, they certainly would not alter it now. There is no point in taking the matter to the Mines Department at this stage. However, in view of what the honourable member has said, I will inquire and check on the accuracy of his statements.

HACKNEY REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. Which area in Hackney is the subject of a redevelopment plan?

2. Which development authorities are involved?

3. When will this area be acquired?

4. When will property owners be given a definite valuation of their properties?

5. How soon can a cash settlement to sellers be expected?

6. On what date will redevelopment commence?

7. Will the compensation paid to owners enable them to re-establish elsewhere at no extra cost to themselves?

8. Will the development authorities pay the costs of moving to an alternative home?

9. Will the development authorities buy any of the property for resale to private enterprise?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Generally the area runs from the river to the northern boundary of St. Peters College and from Hackney Road to Torrens Street. However, all land within that area is not necessarily included; a part, for example, is already a children's playground.

2. The initiative for this redevelopment came from the St. Peters council which forwarded to the Government a consultant's report. Both the State Planning Authority and the Housing Trust are investigating the proposals.

3. No land will be acquired until the Government has made a firm decision on a redevelopment plan.

4. As soon as possible after any decision is made to acquire property.

5. As soon as possible after agreement is reached on a value.

6. As soon as possible after enough property has been acquired to warrant the land being cleared and used for alternative purposes which would fit in with an overall development plan.

7. The basis of compensation is determined by law. However, in any redevelopment project it is essential that all citizens be re-settled with the minimum of cost and inconvenience to them. No plan will be approved which does not provide for this.

8. See previous reply. Each case will be treated on its merits. I have already personally explained to residents how assistance may be obtained.

9. It is probable that part, at least, of the site will be developed by private enterprise.

EQUAL PAY

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Have estimates been made of the cost to—

(*a*) the Government; and

(*b*) to private industry and commerce,

respectively, of the provision of equal pay for males and females in certain circumstances?

2. If so, by whom were they made?

3. What were those estimates?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. (*a*) Yes.

(*b*) No: the cost will depend upon the final form of the legislation and decisions of the Industrial Commission.

2. The cost to the Government has been estimated by the Director of Education and the Public Service Board.

3. Teachers: An additional annual cost of $340,000 accumulative during the five-year period of implementation.

Public Service: The additional annual cost or returns published by the board have been 1966, $9,500; 1967, $10,500.

TEA TREE GULLY TO PARA HILLS MAIN

The SPEAKER laid on the table the report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Tea Tree Gully to Para Hills Water Main.

Ordered that report be printed.

ACTS REPUBLICATION BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to authorize the reprinting and republication of Acts of the Parliament of South Australia; to repeal the Amendments Incorporation Act, 1937, and the Acts Republication Act, 1965-1966, and for matters incidental thereto. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It combines into one measure the provisions of the Amendments Incorporation Act, 1937, and the Acts Republication Act, 1965-1966, and removes the anomalies that presently exist between those two Acts. It also makes a number of improvements to the existing legislation under which power and authority are conferred for the reprinting of Acts of Parliament with a view to streamlining and shortening the procedures governing the preparation of reprints and a new edition of reprinted Statutes.

When the Acts Republication Act, 1965-1966, was considered by Parliament in 1965, it was brought to the notice of Parliament that it was then nearly 30 years since the Statute Law from 1837 to 1936 was reprinted. That reprint proved of great assistance to all those who have been concerned with the Statute law of this State. From the time of its publication up to the end of this Parliamentary session 31 annual volumes of Statutes have been either issued or in course of preparation. Honourable members will recall that Mr. J. P. Cartledge had been engaged on the editorial side to prepare the edition of reprinted statutes for which provision had been made by the Acts Republication Act, 1965-1966. Mr. Cartledge had also been responsible for the preparation for reprinting under the Amendments Incorporation Act of amended Acts with their amendments incorporated therein.

The untimely death of Mr. Cartledge and the lack of a suitable successor to him who had not only the experience but also the time and the willingness to undertake the work unfortunately held this work up. One of the few persons in the State who has wide experience and interest in the consolidation and reprinting of statutes and the preparation of Law Revision Bills in connection with the reprinting of Statutes is Mr. E. A. Ludovici, Senior Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, who at the time of Mr. Cartledge's death was already fully committed with work in connection with his duties as Senior Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman. The Government, however, feels that the work should be delayed no longer and had instructed Mr. Ludovici to examine the legislation on the subject in force in this State as well as in other States with a view, if possible, to streamlining and shortening the procedures governing the preparation of reprints and the new edition of reprinted Statutes.

This Bill is the outcome of Mr. Ludovici's examination and recommendations. If the Amendments Incorporation Act and the Acts Republication Act were combined into one measure, it would certainly avoid unnecessary duplication of work. At present all the things that are authorized to be done under the Acts Republication Act are not authorized to be done under the Amendments Incorporation Act, and a reprint prepared under the latter Act would not necessarily be capable of being used for the purposes of the new edition of the Statutes under the former Act. The Bill now before Parliament brings the provisions of the two Acts into harmony and will avoid duplication of work.

The Government has appointed Mr. Ludovici as Commissioner of Statute Revision in addition to his present office and, as Commissioner, he will be responsible to the Attorney-General for preparing and editing all reprints brought out under this legislation. At the request of the Law Book Company Ltd., with which the Government has made an arrangement for bringing out the new edition of the Statutes, the Government has approved of Mr. Ludovici, by agreement with that company, undertaking the preparation and editing of that edition while he holds the office of Commissioner of Statute Revision. It will also be the duty of the Commissioner to prepare for reprint such amended Acts as are in need of reprinting to meet the demands of the public and the professions.

Clause 2 of the Bill repeals the Amendments Incorporation Act and the Acts Republication Act, at the same time preserving the effect of reprints published under the Amendments Incorporation Act. Clause 3 contains necessary definitions. Clause 4 contains the authority for bringing out the new edition of reprinted Statutes and reproduces the effect of sections 2 and 5 of the Acts Republication Act including additional matter in subclauses (3) and (4) which had not been referred to or included in that Act. Clause 5 contains the authority for reprinting Acts that have been amended so that the reprint incorporates every amendment. This clause is a reproduction of section 3 of the Acts Republication Act and section 3 of the Amendments Incorporation Act.

Clause 6 will ensure that every Act that is reprinted under this Bill will be prepared for reprint by or under the supervision of the Commissioner. Clause 7 reproduces the provisions of section 4 of the Amendments Incorporation Act and section 6 of the Acts Republication Act, 1965-1966. These provisions relate to the things that are authorized to be done when an Act is reprinted. In addition, the clause authorizes the alteration of any reference to any year expressed in words to a reference to that year expressed in Arabic numerals to assist the reader and also authorizes the form of any Act to be altered, on the directions of the Attorney-General, for the purpose of achieving uniformity of style in the numbering of sections, in the use of capital letters and italics, and in the setting out of Acts generally or for the purpose of generally improving the form or manner in which the law is expressed; but no direction of the

Attorney-General for this purpose can be made to alter or modify the substance, effect or operation of any Act or enactment. This provision would be necessary in order to ensure consistency even in the incorporation of amendments to principal Acts—where the form of an amendment to a section is not always consistent with the form of the section itself. Subclauses (4), (5) and (6) are mainly consequential on the earlier provisions of the clause.

Clause 8, which authorizes alterations to be made to give effect to the Decimal Currency Act, reproduces section 4 of the Acts Republication Act, 1965-1966. Although this provision is not contained in the Amendments Incorporation Act, its effect in this Bill will extend to all reprints of amended Acts as well, whether they are included in the new edition of reprinted Statutes or whether they are separately reprinted. Subclause (4) of the clause, though not contained in the repealed Act, is a necessary consequential provision.

Clause 9 is a provision that has been adopted from the Reprint of Statutes Act 1954 of Tasmania, under which the current edition of the Tasmanian Statutes has been reprinted. The clause virtually deems the text of the Reprint of 1937 to be correct. This will avoid the necessity for the Commissioner to have regard to any text of any Statute that was printed prior to the publication of the reprint of 1937, or to go over the ground covered by the draftsmen who prepared that reprint. It is now 30 years since that reprint was brought out and if any errors have been detected in any Acts included therein, they would most probably have been corrected by now.

Clause 10 is a machinery provision that is not included in either the Amendments Incorporation Act or the Acts Republication Act. It requires certain endorsements to be incorporated in the volumes and copies of reprinted Acts. Clause 11, which deals with references to pages or lines of any Act included in the edition of Statutes reprinted under clause 4, reproduces section 9 of the Acts Republication Act. Clause 12 (1), which provides that any Act reprinted pursuant to this Bill is to be judicially noticed and deemed to be an Act of Parliament, is a reproduction of the effect of section 6 of the Amendments Incorporation Act and section 10 of the Acts Republication Act, and subclause (2), which is not included in either of those Acts, is a necessary consequential provision.

Clause 13 contains the necessary financial provision and is a reproduction of section 11 of the Acts Republication Act. Honourable members will see that when this Bill becomes law all reprints of Acts will be brought out under the same piece of legislation. It is the Government's intention that reprints of separate Acts will continue to be prepared by the Commissioner and published to meet the demand of the public and the professions. Those reprints would then be capable of being used for the purposes of the new edition of reprinted Statutes.

There would be a considerable amount of statute law revision to be done, as there is a number of provisions of amending Acts that cannot be incorporated in their principal Acts in their present form because, for one reason or other, there are no "homes" in the principal Acts for those provisions. This means that the Commissioner would have to go through every Act and isolate and examine these "homeless" provisions with a view to preparing one or more Statute Law Revision Bills for consideration and enactment by Parliament prior to the date up to which the law is to be expressed in the new edition of reprinted Statutes.

I should also mention to honourable members in this connection that it is proposed that the Commissioner will keep a master copy of every Act as reprinted under this Bill and, as soon as an amendment is made to that Act, the amendment will be incorporated in the master copy. This would mean that at any time thereafter an up-to-date text of that Act would be available and that text would be used by the Government Printer for any future reprint of that Act. The expense of editing and publishing a new edition of the Statutes will, therefore, not be a recurring one.

The printing of the new edition of Statutes will be carried out by the Government Printer. As it was mentioned when the Acts Republication Act was before this House in 1965, the compilation and printing of the new edition of Statutes is a long and arduous task, requiring a high standard of exactitude. Mr. Cartledge undertook the task upon his retirement from Government service and expected to complete his work in about five years. Mr. Ludovici, who will be doing this work in addition to his duties as Senior Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, will, for that reason, need more time and hopes to complete his task on the new edition within six and a half years. It is expected, however, that the volumes will be made available to the public as and when they

are ready. Subject to the provisions of this Bill, the general style and format of the new edition will be similar to the style and format of the reprint of 1937.

Mr. COUMBE secured the adjournment of the debate.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 18. Page 2785.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I can understand the Government's reason for discussing this measure before discussing the two Bills that have been temporarily postponed, because the crayfish season (especially in the South-East) begins on October 24, and this legislation should be operating by then: it should have been operating already. Other much less important Bills than this have been discussed. This is a most important measure dealing with an important primary industry, and I welcome it and agree with many parts of it. It is an interim measure that will expire in May, 1969, but by that time the Fisheries Act will be further amended.

The Hon. G. A. Bywaters: It will probably be repealed before then.

Mr. HALL: I hope that by that time the Minister will be giving advice only, because I hope to be on the Government side by then. After consulting with fishermen I agreed that it was necessary to restrict the numbers entering the industry, but it was desirable that this restriction be enacted quickly and apply for a specified time, so that we could learn more of the resources of crayfish around the South Australian coast and be able to have a more equitable distribution of licences. It is also desirable that a limit be placed on the number of pots used by fishermen. The Bill also restricts amateurs fishing for crayfish—another desirable move. The number of pots that the Minister recommends be used agrees with the number I recommended on behalf of South-Eastern fishermen. My motion dealing with this subject has been debated, but there has been a long history of requests from fishermen to take action on this aspect. These requests were made to the Liberal Government and to the present Government. Now, after some controversy, this regulation will become effective, especially after I addressed fishermen on the South-East coast and recommended to them what should be included in this legislation.

I am pleased that some of my recommendations are included, but one necessary recommendation (that is, that the Minister should act on the advice of fishermen through a properly constituted advisory committee) has not been included. This committee has not been set up, and the Minister is now taking action before receiving advice from this properly constituted authority. It would be simple to regulate the number entering the industry, but the question of a pot limit could become controversial. The Minister is on dangerous ground when regulating for a limit without receiving advice from fishermen through a properly constituted committee. No doubt many representations have been made to him, as have been made to me. He may be fishing in deep water if he regulates craypot limits without proper advice. It has been suggested to me that there may be a method of calculating pot limits other than that contained in the Select Committee's report.

The committee recommended that, in the South-East, 10 pots be allocated to each boat plus two additional pots for each linear foot, and in other parts 10 for each boat plus one for each linear foot. A 40ft. boat in the South-East could use 80 pots and a 20ft. boat could use 50 pots. Some fishermen suggest that this difference is not enough, having regard to the capital invested in a 40ft. boat compared with that invested in a 20ft. boat. This matter can never be completely settled, but the comparison must be considered after taking into account the difference in capital cost.

I received a telegram last night from a cray fisherman in the South-East, who said that he believed that the number of pots would be fixed, first, as 20 a man with a reduced number according to the length of the boat, but I am sure the Minister has not considered this proposition. It would ignore the capital investment of individual fishermen. When I know what the Minister intends I shall inform this person, and I hope that the allocation will not be made in this way. This limit cannot be altered until the coming crayfish season ends. It cannot be disallowed in the House before the next session of Parliament; therefore, it behoves the Minister to be careful and just in regulating the number of pots.

I am pleased that this short but important Bill has been introduced, but I am sorry that it was not introduced before other measures that have been before the House. I am pleased that the Government has considered the Opposition's representations. Many fishermen in the South-East are now saying that, unless the Opposition had taken a keen interest in this matter and moved its

motion, the present legislation would not have been introduced by the Government. In fact, I believe there was a re-writing of the report, so far as it had gone, after the ideas of the Opposition had been expressed to the fishermen concerned and to Parliament. As the Bill closely follows the recommendations made by the Opposition, and as it will be up to the Minister during the Committee stages to indicate what he has in mind concerning pot limits, I have pleasure in supporting the measure.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I support the Bill. I was interested in the Leader's usual beating of the breast; I suppose it arises because no-one will give him any praise if he does not praise himself. He indulges in this sort of thing whenever he receives an opportunity to speak. The Leader wishes to claim credit for these changes in crayfishing in the South-East, knowing full well, whether or not he has been able to mislead one or two fishermen, that what he claims is completely contrary to the truth. If he and the other members of the Opposition had been genuine in their interests in the crayfishing industry, they would not have withdrawn their members from the Select Committee; and if they had not withdrawn those members, they would have known that what the Leader just said about the committee's hurriedly re-writing everything in the report after the Leader had made certain remarks, was a lot of rubbish and completely untrue.

Mr. Burdon: A completely irresponsible statement.

Mr. HUDSON: Yes. The members of the Select Committee were fully aware of their responsibilities regarding this industry. The volumes of evidence presented to the committee clearly showed the kind of action necessary, the kind of action that the committee recommended, and the kind of action intended to be introduced by this Bill. There is nothing inconsistent between the committee's recommendations and those incorporated in this Bill, or between the committee's recommendations and the evidence presented to the committee over a long period. If members opposite cared to have some regard to the truth and recognized that a Select Committee such as this one had a big job to do in obtaining all the evidence necessary, in properly assessing that evidence, and in making a series of recommendations on a whole host of subjects, crayfishing included, they would know that the Leader's remarks were, once again, a lot of rubbish. The Leader is getting a real reputation for being a rubbish merchant, and I think it is about time members opposite pulled him up and said to him, "For goodness sake, have a greater regard for the truth!"

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: You'll see next year.

Mr. HUDSON: We shall all see next year.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: The public is waking up.

Mr. HUDSON: I think the public is waking up to the people on the honourable member's side. If it is necessary to tell untruths and to mislead the public in order to secure re-election, I shall face up to the fact of not being re-elected in that situation.

Mr. Millhouse: In that case, you and the Premier must be at odds.

Mr. HUDSON: The mind of the member for Mitcham is so distorted with bias, prejudice and impertinence, along with many other emotions, that he is incapable of assessing what is in the Premier's mind, or in anyone else's mind for that matter, and the sooner he wakes up to that fact the better off we shall all be.

Mr. Millhouse: They're hard words.

Mr. HUDSON: The substantive part of the Bill relates to the introduction of boat limits and craypot limits. The committee's report made it absolutely clear that one limit could not effectively be introduced without the other. The effort in a fishery that was being overfished could not be controlled simply by imposing a boat limitation, which would give a little corner to those fishermen already in the industry who would be able to over-fish to their hearts' content. Therefore, if a boat limit were to be introduced, a pot limit also had to be introduced. Exactly the same argument applies in the reverse: if there is to be a control of effort in relation to a particular fishery, a pot limit cannot be introduced without also introducing some control over the number of boats working in a particular area. Otherwise, existing fishermen are being penalized, others are being permitted to compete with them, and it ensures, in effect, that the penalty being imposed on the existing fishermen in the industry is far greater than is otherwise the case. The Bill seeks to impose a boat limit as well as a pot limit, and that is completely in accord with the Select Committee's recommendations.

Whatever pot limit is finally decided on will involve a reduction in income for those already engaged in the industry in the South-East, and the problem is one of securing an equitable arrangement for all concerned. It is by no means an easy decision to reach, and whatever

decision is ultimately reached may contain elements of inequity. The Leader said that in the South-East a 40ft. boat, under the Select Committee's recommendations, would have 80 pots, and a 20ft. boat, 50 pots, and he believed this ratio was not in accord with the capital investment concerning the respective sizes of boat. That involves a rather naive assumption on his part that a 40ft. boat costs twice as much as a 20ft. boat costs, but that is not necessarily the case.

Mr. McAnaney: He said it would cost more, and so it would.

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Stirling is being obtuse. If the capital cost of a 40ft. boat in relation to a 20ft. boat was in the ratio of eight to five, 80 pots for the 40ft. boat, as against 50 pots for the 20ft. boat, would be equitable. The fact that a 40ft. boat costs more than a 20ft. boat does not necessarily mean that the ratio of 80 to 50 regarding pots is inappropriate. I am sure the member for Stirling is capable of appreciating that fact, even if the Leader is not. It may well be appropriate, or it may not be: the matter requires investigation. But the question does not rest there with respect to the relative capital costs of a 40ft. boat and a 20ft. boat. The question must also be considered from the angle of the reduction of income that is likely to be imposed on a 40ft. boat operator compared with a 20ft. boat operator. We must ask whether or not, in the current circumstances, it would be possible for someone operating a boat of about 20ft. to 30ft. still to make a livelihood out of fishing. Could we recommend a series of pot limits for the South-East that would put out of the industry all boats of 20ft., 25ft. or 30ft. because their owners were not able to make a livelihood?

I should have thought that the Leader could see the distinction that applies between the Select Committee's recommendation of 10 pots plus two pots a foot and the straight-out limit of two pots a foot. The Select Committee's recommendation enables smaller boats to use slightly more pots. In circumstances where a substantial reduction in income may be involved for those owning smaller boats, that sort of adjustment is probably necessary. To bring back the owner of a 25ft. boat who has been using 80, 90 or 100 pots to 50 pots may, in terms of the return of crayfish a pot that currently applies in the South-East, put him out of the industry altogether. No member on this side of the House wants to put any fishermen out of the industry. I believe the fishermen recognize this and recognize that what is necessary in the South-East is a control on effort of such a type that the fishery can recover sufficiently to the extent that, in five years' time (or six, seven or eight years' time, if necessary), fishermen in the area will be able to obtain a satisfactory return a pot and a satisfactory livelihood if they operate Australia and Tasmania is one pot a foot. a foot instead of on the recommendation of the Select Committee of 10 pots plus two pots a foot. The pot limit imposed in Western Australia and Tasmania is one pot a foot. A pot usage of 80, which is the upper limit that the Select Committee suggested for the South-East, would have been completely out of court in both Western Australia and Tasmania. A 50ft. boat in Western Australia or Tasmania would be able to have only 50 pots and, if it is economical to use a 50ft. boat in Western Australia and Tasmania, it will become economical to use it in South Australia, even if the boat has only 50 pots, provided that the cray fishery has recovered enough to enable the returns a pot to increase sufficiently. Therefore, it is highly necessary to appreciate that any pot limit that is imposed in the South-East will involve some hardship and some reduction in returns for those fishermen already in the industry. They accept the necessity for this to enable the fishery to recover. At the same time, because they are going to take this reduction, they are entitled to expect protection in the form of a boat limit. In addition, we must approach the whole matter of a pot limit clearly understanding that in the years to come the pot limit that is appropriate in the South-East will be less than the pot limit recommended by the Select Committee. In other words, the recommendations should be treated as an upper limit. For this reason, I believe that the Leader's implication that an upper limit of 80 pots is too small is not correct.

If it is necessary in future (and experience in Western Australia, Victoria and Tasmania suggests that it will be) to reduce the pot limits that apply in the South-East, then I believe we should not start with a maximum figure that is too high. If we know that ultimately we must reduce the limit to 50 pots, it is better to start with a maximum of 80 pots rather than 100 pots. The higher the pot limit that we allow in the first place the less the control over effort in the fishery that will be exercised and the less chance there will be in years to come of reducing the pots each fisherman may use and introducing in the South-East the pot limit imposed in Western

Australia and Tasmania. As a member of the Select Committee, I am acutely conscious (as are other members of the committee) of the amount of hard work involved in the presentation of the report. I greatly resent the untruths and misrepresentations of the Leader in relation to this matter; I also resent his proud boasting, accompanied by long and sustained beating of the breast, to the effect that this was all his own work.

Mr. Rodda: What are the untruths you are talking about?

Mr. HUDSON: I dealt with them earlier.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: As I do not want to infringe on any ruling you may make, Sir, I will not reply to the honourable member's interjection; I realize that we must prevent the honourable member from suffering any embarrassment. I hope that the Bill will be the beginning of the recovery of crayfishing in the South-East. The Leader suggested that we must not do anything about a pot limit before taking the advice of a properly constituted advisory committee. At one moment the Leader says that the matter is urgent and at the next moment he says that nothing can be done until we have the advice of a committee. However, the Minister does not need the provisions of the Bill to constitute such an advisory committee.

The urgency of the situation demands immediate action that will be implemented from the beginning of the crayfishing season. In order to get that action at the beginning of the crayfishing season, it would be difficult to wait on the constitution of an advisory committee and desirable to seek instead the opinion of the constituent fishermen's associations that make up the South-Eastern Fishermen's Association, and I believe the Minister has already done that. Also, as the Minister is responsible to the industry, he would not be bound to the advice of a properly constituted advisory committee on a matter such as pot limits. The members of the industry may be governed too much by considering how they would be individually affected by a pot limit and may not consider the overall position. However, the Minister must consider not only the position of the individual but also the overall position of the industry. Inevitably, his attitude may be a little different from that of an advisory committee.

In view of all the circumstances and the need for urgency in this matter, I believe the Minister has acted appropriately in consulting immediately with the constituent bodies that make up the South-Eastern Fishermen's Association (which, after all, were to be the bodies represented on the advisory committee), and in proceeding with this matter as one of urgency. I can imagine the cry that would have gone up from the Leader of the Opposition if this matter had been further delayed and the Minister had said, "I can't do anything until I have constituted the advisory committee, and that will take some time!" Members on this side realize that they cannot win where the Leader is concerned, but they expect a little logic from him occasionally.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Flinders): I support the Bill. So far as it is able to go under the circumstances, it is a useful contribution to a solution of the problems of the industry. I did not take a point of order when the member for Glenelg accused the Leader of the Opposition of telling lies.

Mr. Hudson: I said "untruths".

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: It is a fine distinction. I have never heard the honourable member to less advantage than I heard him today. Obviously he was actuated by emotional and political considerations. It seems strange that he thinks it is highly improper for the Leader of the Opposition, in order to do anything to benefit the industry, to contact the people concerned—

Mr. Hudson: I didn't say that.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: —to interest himself in their problems, to make a contribution to this debate, or to study the legislation as the Leader has done. It is just too silly for words for the honourable member to make the accusations he has made about the Leader. One thing that can be said about the Leader of the Opposition with more emphasis than anything else is that he does not tell untruths, mislead the public, or distort the truth in order to seek re-election. Those three points aptly describe some other people in the House, but they do not fit the Leader of the Opposition. If the honourable member wants to take that line, he may do so, but he seems to be extremely on the raw on this matter and on other matters today. I can only deduce from that that he feels he and the Government are in an uncomfortable position on certain matters.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: He resorts to those tactics when he hasn't got an argument.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Yes. The honourable member for Angas and I have been in this House for a long time, he longer than I. We have both seen this happen

repeatedly: when there is no logical argument to be advanced, a member naturally resorts to abuse, misrepresentation and to statements such as the honourable member made today when he said that the Leader talks only rubbish. Well, the people who have access to the records of this Parliament can pass their own judgment on this matter. Indeed, I hope there are many people in the honourable member's district who can make their assessment of the level of his criticism and indeed the level of his contribution on many other matters that come before the House.

It is generally understood that this legislation has been brought into this place against a time factor. The Minister acknowledges that the Bill does not by any means go all the way towards solving or even trying to solve all the problems of the crayfishing industry. Ever since 1956, when I was Minister of Agriculture, I can recall discussions with representatives of the fishing industry generally. It is fair to say that no Government, whatever its political colour, is anxious to act in a way that will prevent or inhibit any industry from assuming its full proportions. Any Government would like to see every industry in this State develop as far as it possibly could. After all (and speaking with particular reference to this industry), crayfish has been an important item of export-earning income for this State. It has given employment to many people, both on shore and at sea, and it has brought considerable wealth into this State. The attitude of all Ministers (particularly Ministers of Agriculture, who are concerned with primary production) is that it is unwise to rush into legislation which tends to inhibit an industry from achieving its full proportions. Those who administer these Acts are conscious of the fact that seasonal variations in the output of a primary industry have to be regarded with suspicion. Merely because an industry suffers from some disadvantage known or unknown and its production drops for one year, or even for two years, below the previously established norm, this is not a sound reason of itself on which to base the restriction of an industry.

I think the Minister of Agriculture would agree that seasonal conditions have to be examined in their proper perspective. This industry has for several years been suffering from what appears to be the law of diminishing returns. That being so, it became necessary to heed the requests of those people in the industry and to do something about them. The Bill goes some way towards that objective. Admittedly, it does not go all the way, because there are many problems which have been raised in the evidence given before the Select Committee and many other problems which people concerned with the industry have been aware of for a long time, both on the administrative and the practical side, that the Bill does not attempt to solve. However, so far as it goes I am in accord with it, and I think that later these matters will have to be considered with a view to the implementation of a definition of certain zones which take cognizance of the varying conditions in the various parts of our coastline. The advice and consent of the responsible fishermen in these areas will need to be sought, and their opinions treated with respect.

In addition, further research and tabulation of results will be necessary to see what effect this measure will have on the industry in the short term. All these things need to be considered when we contemplate the next logical step in the control of this industry. I therefore approve of this Bill and hope that it will soon assist the industry to regain some of its momentum.

The honourable member for Glenelg made one rather interesting comment in his peroration. He said that neither the industry nor the Government desired to put any fishermen out of business and that, as a result of the imposition of some restraints, those in the industry would be able to earn sufficient to preserve their livelihood. That is extremely difficult to achieve. The industry's complaint now is that the number of boats operating and, presumably, the total number of pots are too much for the fish to cope with by way of reproduction. If that is so and if catches are becoming less, with resultant economic effect on the fishermen, how can we provide a full economic return for the same number of operators and the same number of pots while we are giving the fish a chance to build up numbers?

This is a difficult problem, and saying that all fishermen will be able to continue their activity is wishful thinking. Some, because of their inefficiency, their lack of capital, their lack of knowledge, the size of their boats, or some other factor, could be eliminated from the industry, although I hope that that does not happen. However, effect is being given to what the industry has asked the Government to do. A similar case was submitted to the Leader of the Opposition in his several

discussions with fishermen, and a similar submission had been made by the industry over the years to previous Ministers in charge of fisheries, but they were reluctant to give effect to it. The Minister, in his explanation of the Bill, said:

Effective implementation of these amendments can only be accomplished if the Fisheries Act is completely redrafted. This will not be possible during the current session of Parliament. However, the fishery for southern crayfish is so valuable to the South Australian fishing industry and the provisions of the Fisheries Act relating to its management are so urgently in need of revision that this Bill has been prepared as an interim measure.

Some weeks ago I made representations to the Minister about a similar approach to the problems of the tuna industry, and I submitted a proposal by the tuna fishermen at Port Lincoln. Admittedly, that proposal was not a complete solution of the problem, but it was analogous to the case of the cray fisherman and it could have been implemented and controlled by South Australia. Undoubtedly, it would have had an effect on over-fishing by the tuna industry. The Minister did not find it convenient to include such an amendment in this Bill, but I think he should have included it. The suggestion could have been tried, and it would have had some effect.

The Select Committee devoted a little more than one page to the problems of the tuna industry, and the report and recommendations on this aspect are clear and concise. The evidence given to the committee and the committee's report on it recite adequately the opinions that the tuna fishermen at Port Lincoln have expressed to me. The fishermen had told me these things just before I asked a question in this House about the restriction of the tuna industry. I regret that the Government has not seen fit to include a simple amendment to protect the tuna fishermen. The proposal was that boats fishing for tuna should have a licence in order to take bait in the inshore waters of South Australia, which waters are entirely in the control of the South Australian Government.

After the Minister had given me a reply, which I had to accept, I received from a spokesman for the Port Lincoln tuna fishermen a copy of a letter which had been sent to the Minister earlier and which the Minister would have had before the final draft of this Bill was prepared. The fishermen noted with "despair", as they said (at least, with deep regret), that the Minister had not seen fit to give the proposal a try. The report of the Select Committee says that, without the co-operation of the Commonwealth Government, it would be completely difficult to police the tuna industry. I agree with that.

Recommendation No. 1 is that the co-operation of the Commonwealth Government be sought to provide for both the limiting of licences and boat registrations in the tuna industry. I ask the Minister to say, when he replies to the debate, whether he has sought the co-operation of the Commonwealth Government to control the tuna industry. If he has not, I urge him to do so. Because of the recommendation of the Select Committee, I should think that the Minister would be anxious to approach the Commonwealth Government on this matter. Two recommendations were made by the committee on tuna fishing, the second being that improved shore facilities should be provided at Port Lincoln. This is not a matter for legislation and it can be carried out when finances are available. The Commonwealth Government will have to consult the State of New South Wales, and I doubt whether we will get co-operation from the Commonwealth. If I were more confident I would say that the situation was not so bad, but when we consider that the Commonwealth Government will not only have to bring its own policy into line but also obtain the co-operation of other States interested in tuna fishing, the situation is not simple.

We should give the tuna industry the protection it urgently needs: it needs it as urgently as does the crayfishing industry. For many years, both administratively and in public statements about the fishing industry, I have maintained that we should not rush into controlling a primary industry and should not be panicked by seasonal conditions, but that we should ensure that we are not adopting control as a convenient and short-term approach to solving a problem that would be better solved by greater efficiency and research and by expanding the basic resources of the industry, rather than retricting the encouragement of people in it. It has been soundly established that the crayfishing industry and, I believe, the tuna industry, have battled with conditions that could not be allowed to continue and, for that reason, I support the Bill and hope that it will achieve, in some measure, what the Minister has suggested it may achieve and what the people in the industry hope it will achieve.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): For many years the crayfishing industry has requested that some action be taken and, as the Government has had the power to move these amendments, they should have been moved before now. The Select Committee has not recommended anything new. Often, the Government has not acted on what has been recommended by these committees, which do not always serve a useful purpose when the cost and time is considered. A great need exists for further research in the crayfishing industry: little has been done in this State. When Mr. Moorhouse was in charge of the department crayfish were tagged in the Victor Harbour and other areas, but when a cray was caught the department was not interested in it. One essential requirement that should have been provided for in this Bill was an outlet in the pot so that small crayfish could escape.

Mr. Burdon: Have you read the report of the committee?

Mr. McANANEY: I have read it, but I am talking about what is in the Bill.

Mr. Burdon: You have not read it well.

Mr. Hudson: There are such things as reading and absorbing.

Mr. McANANEY: I am talking common sense, and about the practices in other States. I do not think much of the committee's findings. It heard evidence from limited sources, and did not study what is happening throughout the world. If the member for Glenelg had investigated these matters during his oversea trip he would not have been a party to issuing such a report, which was based mainly on hearsay.

Perhaps we are doing something that is necessary at present, but this is a negative action by the Government. How are we to maintain a crayfishing industry without a complete knowledge of crayfish? This is available throughout the world. This Government has done nothing for the crayfishing industry and has not conducted experiments that would protect it. I have six children, and none of them are as rowdy or talk as much tripe as Government members do. Perhaps the member for Glenelg will never learn to act politely like a gentleman in this House. Investigations have been undertaken in other States, and I have read a learned article written by a member of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization about crayfishing.

Mr. Burdon: You are admitting that you have not read the report carefully.

Mr. McANANEY: What I have read is of little value and provides nothing new. The Minister knew all of this before the Select Committee was appointed, and could have taken the action set out in this legislation without going to the expense of appointing a Select Committee. Anyone with an interest in the industry would have known about these things. Many small crayfish are caught in pots and have to be thrown back if the fisherman does what he should do. No doubt they are thrown out of the boat many miles from a good feeding ground: the small crayfish must return to the depths of the sea and, being subject to attack from predatory fish, may be damaged or even destroyed. We should know how to treat animals, but it seems that Government members have no knowledge of such treatment or of the habits of animals and fish.

Mr. Burdon: Are you sure?

Mr. McANANEY: The member for Mount Gambier may know more about forestry than I do, but he does not know much about handling fish. It has been shown that the numbers of crayfish in other parts of the world have not been seriously depleted as a result of the effort in the industry. It has also been shown that crayfish will not enter pots when sufficient natural food exists in the water. I understand that up to a certain stage crayfish grow about 1in. a year and that the age of a crayfish can be fairly easily determined. However, much more research should be undertaken in order to ascertain the present position in the industry as well as what the future holds. Nothing contained in the Select Committee's report makes this Bill any more necessary than it was about two years ago. Indeed, if the Government had had a little more drive and initiative the measure could have been considered much earlier than this. I shall not at this stage comment on saline slugs in the water at Victor Harbour that have apparently stunted the crayfish there. However, although I think the provisions do not go sufficiently far in respect of escape hatches, etc., and that more research must be carried out and advisory bodies appointed in order to keep abreast of the situation at all times, I support the Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I, too, support the Bill. Unlike the member for Stirling, who is apparently concerned with the effect of saline slugs in reducing the size of crayfish in his district, I represent a district that has no sea-front and do not, therefore, directly

represent fishermen. Indeed, unlike the honourable member, I live in a district that discharges much fresh water into the sea, and that may have an opposite effect on the size of the crayfish! For some time the numbers of crayfish in South-Eastern waters have been diminishing, and this measure is being considered almost on the eve of the commencement of another crayfishing season. It is a pity that at this stage more emphasis cannot be placed on the need for further research into the matter. However, this measure takes the only possible way out at this juncture of imposing boat and pot limits. The Leader has had discussions with fishermen in the South-East, as have also the Minister of Agriculture and his colleague the Minister of Lands. Everyone who has spoken to fishermen engaged in this industry must be concerned at what has been happening over the years.

Although the time factor has not permitted the setting up of an advisory committee, I hope that such a committe, fully representative of those engaged in the industry, will soon be established. As the member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) said, only those directly engaged in the industry know exactly what is taking place. Living in the South-East as I do, I know that many people are vitally interested in this matter, and I hope the Bill will work to the advantage of all concerned.

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): As a member of the Select Committee that inquired into South Australia's fishing industry generally, I was amazed at some of the remarks made today by one or two speakers on the other side about the committee's report. It is well known that the Opposition had the opportunity to be represented on the committee but that for reasons better known to itself it left it to the Government to undertake the inquiry. If members opposite were genuine about their concern for the industry, I think they would have fully appreciated the evidence tendered to the committee.

The Bill has three main features. It deals with permits to take crayfish and with the endorsing of cray fishermen's licences. Also, provision is made to permit amateur fishermen to use three pots or three nets. Another provision relates to the use of boats. A provision in the Bill allows a permit to be granted in the case of a person who was constructing a boat as at August 31, 1967. I know that in one or two places boats are being prepared. However, in the South-East a few part-time fishermen are preparing boats to enter the fishing industry this year, but they have not previously held licences. Under the provisions of the Bill, they could have some difficulty in getting a permit. I hope that sympathetic consideration will be given to them as it is being given to people preparing new boats.

I believe it is useless to introduce pot limits without boat limits and *vice versa.* The need for limits is accepted by nearly all professional fishermen in the South-East. I am informed that the need for limits was accepted unanimously at a recent meeting of fishermen held at one of the major ports and that at similar meetings in other places the decision was almost unanimous. Although at a couple of meetings fishermen voted against limits, I am sure that most fishermen in the South-East accept the provisions of the Bill. Under the Bill, the Minister may, at any appropriate time, with the approval of the Governor proclaim pot limits. Pot limits operate in most of the other States where crayfishing takes place. The Select Committee was informed that the limits in those States proved to be of considerable benefit to the industry as a whole.

Recently a new Director of Fisheries (Mr. Olsen) was appointed in South Australia. I understand he said that he was surprised that no statistical information was available from fishermen. He said that South Australia was the only State in which this information was not available. From what the Minister has said, apparently it soon will be available and this will improve the situation in this State. It is a reflection on previous Liberal Governments that this situation has been permitted to continue in South Australia over many years. This Government is to be commended for the action it took in appointing a Select Committee. For many years representations were made by fishermen's associations and others interested in fishing. Members opposite have said that what we are doing is something that they knew should be done. However, they were in Government for 30 years and did nothing, whereas we have taken action in three years.

The member for Stirling said that the reason for under-size crayfish at Victor Harbour could be the result of the large quantity of fresh water in the area. However, I believe other reasons exist. Because of a loophole that has existed, so-called Victor Harbour crayfish have been caught in places many miles from Victor Harbour. The Select Committee suggested action that would overcome the loophole and it is up to the Minister or the department to take that action. It has been said that the catches of crayfish have diminished over the

years, and that is correct. However, they have diminished in relation to the unit catch a pot. Because of the larger numbers of pot used each year the total catch of crayfish has been maintained. Although the implementation of pot limits will react against some fishermen for some time, I believe fishermen are prepared to accept this. Having discussed the matter with many fishermen, I am certain that they realize that, for a period, there could be a smaller catch. However, some say that, by better use of the pots, they may be able to maintain their present catch.

Mr. Casey: That's different from what the Leader said.

Mr. BURDON: I dismiss as irresponsible what the Leader said in the early part of his speech. His statement was not in accordance with the facts presented to the committee. When the Leader went to the South-East he knew a report from the committee was imminent. I have heard some South-Eastern fishermen say that the Leader has done nothing more than stir up discontent in the industry and that, if there is no implementation of pot limits, we will have the greatest concentration ever in the Southern Ocean. Having traversed much of the South-Eastern waters, I have never seen so many pots. Any greater concentration this year will make it almost impossible for boats to get through. With the reservations I have stated, I support the Bill.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I appreciate the consideration and support that both sides have given the Bill. It is evident that something must be done to protect this valuable industry. However, one of the hardest things to achieve in an industry such as this is agreement among the various people concerned. The former Director (Mr. Bogg) made recommendations to the Playford Government on August 21, 1961. Those recommendations, after being referred to Cabinet, were marked "hold", so apparently the Government was not prepared to go on with them. Again, on March 30, 1962, the Director referred the matter to the then Minister of Agriculture after the Chief Secretary had sought information, in accordance with the normal practice, about legislation to be introduced during the coming session. The Director drew attention to the draft Bill, recommending control, that had been submitted in 1961.

At that time organizations representing fishermen considered that there should be a difference between the licences for amateurs and those for professionals. The fishermen recommended that they be required to pay a licence fee of $10 and that the amateurs be required to pay only $2. Unanimity has never been obtained on pot limits. I think it fair to say that fishermen generally have reservations, and that the matter is still being considered.

I give the Leader full credit for his remarks in support of this Bill, although I do not think he meant his statement that this measure would not have been introduced but for the Opposition. In all seriousness, the Leader would have known that the Select Committee was set up to make recommendations to the Government and that a time limit for submission of the report had been set before he went to the South-East. I have no quarrel with his going there: if he had done that two years ago, perhaps the Opposition, the Government and the member for Ridley would have got down to a better understanding earlier, as I desired. I thought that the matter ought to be kept outside the realms of politics.

It has been said that this is only an interim measure because time has not permitted a complete review of the Act to be made. However, I repeat that I intend to have this complete review carried out and to introduce legislation next session to repeal the old Act. The Director recommended that some time ago, because the Act was so outdated then. Opinions still differ about pot limits, even in the South-East Fishermen's Association and the various fishing organizations in the area that go to make up the association. In the main, it is considered that pot limits for crayfishing should be on the basis of boats and linear feet, as has been suggested by the committee, but that there should be no ceilings, so large boats would be able to use more pots.

The member for Mount Gambier (Mr. Burdon) mentioned the appointment of the new Director of Fisheries. Since last February, I have not had a full-time Director, and I pay a tribute to the work of the Acting Director (Mr. Bert Rush). However, he could not devote to the work the time that was necessary and he did not have all the knowledge required of a full-time Director. Much expectancy, particularly in the crayfishing industry has been created by the appointment of Mr. Olsen. He has had a wide experience in crayfishing and is well known to cray fishermen. He has made an impact by the way in which he has gone about his duties and, although he and Mr. Caton, the Research

Officer, are in another State this week, Mr. Olsen will be back next week and will be putting some of his plans into operation.

I think the matter of pot limits will soon be determined with the co-operation with Mr. Olsen and the advisory committee referred to in the Select Committee's report. The Leader referred to something that I had in mind: that we should not determine pot limits until we had had discussions with the industry and the advisory committee. Guidance will be required and it will be given by this committee. The member for Flinders was approached concerning licences for taking bait in South Australian waters. That provision could have been included in this Bill, but officers of the department considered it undesirable to include it. The Select Committee was told (as I had been told before) that a reciprocal arrangement existed between New South Wales and South Australia for the exchange of fishing areas each year.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: It is rather an uneasy arrangement and has always been so. The New South Wales people tried to keep our boats out until we bluffed them out of that attitude.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: That is correct, but it also applies in reverse. This aspect was discussed at a meeting of the Fisheries Council in 1965, which was a light season. I received a deputation, from the same people as those represented by the member for Flinders, asking for a restriction of boats. I pointed out that we should not restrict boats in South Australia, because New South Wales boats could come in and our fishermen would thereby be penalized. The council almost unanimously agreed that nothing should be done at that stage, but that further knowledge should be obtained. In 1966 catches were increased considerably although there were one or two more boats operating. However, in 1967 catches were reduced. My information was that the tuna were there but, for some reason, did not take the bait. We have to find out why that happened.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: The fishermen at Port Lincoln do not accept that. They told me the fish were not there.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: That is what I was told by the fishermen, whereas our marine biologist claimed the fish were there but did not take the bait. It is logical to expect that next year could be similar to 1966. If we issue licences to South Australian fishermen but not to New South Wales fishermen, retaliatory measures would be introduced by that State.

The Hon. G. G. Pearson: Obviously.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: That situation is not desirable. Boats that have come from New South Wales could be included, but boats from that State fishing for the first time would have to be excluded. Also, South Australian boats fishing for the first time would have to be considered. It is not as simple to enter the tuna industry as it is to enter the crayfishing industry. With very small boats, people have fished for crayfish in the South-East, but tuna fishing requires a boat that is properly equipped and safe.

The Government realizes the need for some control in the tuna industry, and this aspect will be fully discussed when next year's legislation is considered. I have made representations to the Commonwealth Government for assistance for research into the tuna industry. At a meeting of the Fisheries Council it was agreed that the Victorian, New South Wales, and South Australian Directors would confer when our new Director was appointed, and when Mr. Olsen has settled down he will confer on this major aspect with the other Directors. Tuna fishermen need not despair, because something will be done.

The member for Stirling, in saying that this legislation should have been introduced earlier, should have realized that the same thing could be said about the Playford Government, which had the same opportunity but did nothing. The Select Committee was appointed to obtain knowledge, and the information given to it confirmed what the department already knew. Its recommendations will be available to me and my officers when preparing the legislation to be introduced next year—legislation that I hope will be accepted by both Houses in the interests of the industry.

For research, the *Investigator* is not a suitable vessel; the vessel is not an economic proposition, and the Government has been criticized for allowing it to lie idle. However, that is not the fault of this Government: the vessel's previous captain resigned prior to our taking office. I think it would be better to sell the vessel and obtain a smaller and faster one, or perhaps two vessels. In addition, the new Director of Fisheries has suggested that frequent aerial surveys be made at minimal costs, and the merits of this proposition will be considered soon. I think such a method will prove beneficial. The receipt of increased licence fees will naturally provide more revenue.

This will enable more research work to be undertaken and should benefit fishermen generally. I thank members who have contributed to this debate; I know that their support is genuine; and I look forward to further debate in Committee.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

[*Sitting suspended from 5.59 to 7.45 p.m.*]

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Permits to take crayfish."

Mr. RODDA: Will the provisions of this Bill be restricted to crayfishing?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): The Bill relates specifically to crayfishing and has nothing to do with scale fishing. Scale fishing will be the subject of another Bill, which will be introduced next session.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Governor may make regulations."

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): How will the allocation of the number of crayfish pots be managed?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: We may have the assistance of an advisory committee, as suggested in the Select Committee's report. I have a list of the names of people desiring to be members of the committee. The newly appointed Director of Fisheries (Mr. Olsen), who has a complete knowledge of crayfishing, is at present attending a conference in another State. On Monday I intend to discuss with him the appointment of the committee to consider craypot limits.

Mr. Hall: You are not tied specifically to the committee's recommendations.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: No, but such a report is valuable. Amongst various organizations in the South-East there is a difference of opinion about the number of pots. Most agree on the number for a boat and for each linear foot, but they do not all agree on the overall limit. However, members will be appointed to the committee from the list of names I have had submitted to me and we will try to work out something acceptable to the industry.

Mr. RODDA: Will the committee give full emphasis to research into crayfishing?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: It is intended to conduct much research, probably next year. However, at this stage we can only protect the industry from over-fishing.

Mr. McANANEY: Can a person who has been engaged in crayfishing for only two months continue in this industry? Can a person with a crayfishing licence fish for crayfish anywhere in South Australia?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: The Bill specifically states that, provided a person was engaged in the industry before August 31, he shall be entitled to continue. If a person has a licence to fish in South Australian waters, that permits him to fish anywhere in South Australian waters.

Clause passed.

Clause 7 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PLACES OF PUBLIC ENTERTAINMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 19. Page 2868.)

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): I support the second reading. The Premier illustrated clearly in his explanation that the major purpose of the Bill was to remedy a series of abuses that have been taking place in relation to places of public entertainment. Some people have been deliberately skirting the law on extremely fine technical points, and at the same time have been jeopardizing the lives of young people by not providing the safeguards required to be provided under the Act. Any Government that continued to ignore that situation would be remiss in its duty. Further, the present position is unfair to people who have been complying with the Act.

The Leader has elaborated on cases where abuses are occurring, and it seems from the speeches that have been made that there is little difference of opinion in the House and that the Bill has wide support of the community in general. However, there is some obection to clause 6, which deals with Sunday games. I, as well as other members, have received a letter from the Reverend M. C. Trenorden, President of the South Australian Conference of the Methodist Church of Australia, outlining objections, and I understand that other church organizations have expressed similar views. We respect the views expressed by those organizations. However, members of Parliament, as the representatives of the people, have a duty to perform and are obliged to examine the provisions of the legislation. The Premier told the House that he had conferred with church leaders and had requested them to discuss the amendment of the legislation and the matter of Sunday entertainment generally.

I understand from what the Premier has said that most of the church organizations agree in principle with the Tasmanian Sunday Observance Bill. However, they have objected to clause 6 on the grounds that it goes too far. I have carefully examined the Tasmanian legislation, and a comparison of that measure with our Bill discloses that our provisions are more strict than those of the Tasmanian measure. Only two phases of entertainment and games on Sunday are dealt with in the South Australian Bill. The Tasmanian measure refers to trading and work permitted on Sundays, but clause 7 of that measure provides:

No person shall on Sunday provide, engage in, or attend any of the following games:

(*a*) A match between senior teams representing football clubs that are members of the organizations known as the Tasmanian Australian National Football League, the Northern Tasmanian Football Association, and the North-Western Football Union;

(*b*) Matches between teams representing clubs which are members of a soccer football association but not matches between junior or more subordinate teams in such clubs;

(*c*) A horse race, horse parade, or horse trial other than a horse trial for normal training purposes;

(*d*) A greyhound race;

(*e*) a rodeo;

(*f*) A boxing match between participants who are not *bona fide* amateur boxers;

(*g*) A wrestling match between participants who are not *bona fide* amateur wrestlers; and

(*h*) Any game or class of game which the Minister may by writing declare to be a game or class of game not lawful for any person to provide, engage in, or attend during the whole or any specified part of Sunday or a specified Sunday.

The South Australian legislation, particularly clause 6, is more stringent than the Tasmanian Bill. We know that there are people who examine the law closely so that they can overcome its provisions, and this attitude was one of the main reasons why this legislation was introduced. In Tasmania the Bill refers to three main sectors of that State in which the size of the population is similar to that of Hobart, but that state of affairs does not exist in South Australia, because in South Australia Adelaide is the main city.

This Bill prevents league football or top grade soccer from being played in the metropolitan area, and similar provisions also apply to some country areas. For many years sport has been played on Sunday in certain country areas and people have not objected. Under the Bill the Minister has some form of control. Occasionally, league football teams travel to country centres and play on Sunday, as that is the only day on which organized sport can be held, and it would be wrong to deprive country people of the opportunity to attend at such matches.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Can the Minister give consent to allow play before 1 p.m.

Mr. HURST: Yes, but he is guided by provisions in the Bill, which are more severe than similar provisions in the Tasmanian legislation. Unless the Minister permits it, sport is restricted to certain hours in this State, but in Tasmania it is allowed in the morning and in the evening, with certain provisos. The Tasmanian Bill does not restrict the hours of public entertainment but, in this State, theatres and cinemas will not be allowed to open between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m., the time when most people who wish to, attend church. This Bill has not attempted to permit any entertainment during times that are normally reserved for church attendance.

I know of three organizations that have objected to this legislation, although in principle they support the provisions of the Tasmanian Bill. I cannot understand this attitude, because the provisions of our Bill are more restrictive than those in Tasmania. I have sufficient confidence in Ministers to know that they will realize their responsibility towards the public of this State. If they do not (particularly with respect to granting permits), I am certain that the public's reaction will have an immediate influence on them. I am confident that if, in the course of permitting certain Sunday activities, nuisance, noise and undue discomfort to the public are created, the Minister will have no hesitation in withdrawing a permit. You, Mr. Deputy Speaker, have referred to an amendment dealing with this matter which, if it is incorporated in the Bill, I am sure will have the desired effect.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): Although some features of this Bill are good, I protest at the undue haste with which the measure has been introduced, even though the Premier says that he had been negotiating with the churches for three months about these provisions. We are expected to debate the Bill immediately after its introduction, without having had sufficient time to discuss its provisions with constituents.

Mr. Shannon: It is a strange thing that the churches are now contacting us.

Mr. McANANEY: Speaking to a representative of the churches this morning, I was informed that insufficient time had been allowed for them to discuss the matter. This legislation is being rushed through Parliament on the excuse that it is necessary in order to stop certain practices affecting one section of public entertainment. However, these practices could have been prevented merely by implementing clause 3, which defines a "place of public entertainment".

I think the churches have adopted an intelligent attitude on Sunday entertainment: they believe that Sunday should be a day of recreation when each citizen should be allowed to decide what he or she may do. Whereas people on the Continent generally work six days a week and participate in organized sport and other activities on the seventh day, I point out that not many people in Australia work more than five days a week, so that people have ample opportunity to do as they wish on Saturday, leaving Sunday as a day of recreation. By that I mean that people should not be required to work unnecessarily on a Sunday, as they would be in the case of organized sport held on a large scale: for instance, many people including South Australian Cricket Association employees, caterers, and members of the Police Force would be required at the Adelaide Oval if a test match were conducted on a Sunday. I believe that such fixtures as test matches and interstate and international tennis matches, etc., should be prohibited on Sundays.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What does the Bill provide?

Mr. McANANEY: I object to the fact that, although certain activities may be prohibited on a Sunday, the Minister may permit them under certain conditions. I object also to the fact that the Chief Secretary may discriminate and, in fact, dictate in respect of certain sporting activities: he allows racing at Tailem Bend on a Saturday, yet Saturday trotting meetings at Victor Harbour are not permitted.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What's his sport?

Mr. McANANEY: He likes to go to the races and to think that he is a big man making an impact on a racing club, although racing clubs have never objected to Saturday trotting meetings being conducted at Victor Harbour and although the South Australian Trotting League has asked that they be permitted. I strongly object to a Bill that gives the Chief Secretary or any other Minister such unlimited powers to discriminate between sports. Surely it is the prerogative of Parliament to lay down more definitely what is allowed: we should not leave it to the discretion of a Minister.

This Bill was introduced hastily. Instead of the Bill we should have had legislation introduced at a more appropriate time dealing with other aspects of Sunday observance, such as land sales on Sundays. In that case, over 90 per cent of land agents object to land sales on a Sunday. We should not provide for activities on Sunday that necessitate the employment of many people.

Mr. Hudson: Would you ban shift work on a Sunday?

Mr. McANANEY: Yes, unless an essential industry were involved. If picture theatres are to be opened on Sundays, I cannot see why provision should be made for them to be closed between 6 p.m. and 8 p.m. People attending church between 7 p.m. and 8 p.m. will certainly not go to a picture theatre afterwards. The only provision in the Bill that needed to be introduced quickly was that dealing with places of public entertainment that have evaded the provisions of the Act by offering membership to their clients. The other provisions in the Bill could have been dealt with in other legislation and without the undue haste that is associated with the end of a Parliamentary session.

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): In supporting the Bill, I draw members' attention to the provisions of the Tasmanian Bill, because it is clear from what has been said, particularly by the members for Flinders and Albert, that that Bill is simply not understood. That Bill is, in fact, less restrictive than the Bill before the House. The public in South Australia and members of this House have been unintentionally misled as to the provisions of the Tasmanian Bill. True, in its superficial appearance, that Bill appears to be a Sunday Observance Bill but, in fact, it regulates both sport and entertainment on Sunday in much the same way as this Bill does, although it pays lip service to the traditional attitudes with respect to Sunday. For example, clause 3 of the Tasmanian Bill provides:

(1) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, on Sunday no person shall—

(*a*) purchase, sell, offer for sale, or negotiate the purchase of property;

(*b*) carry on his ordinary calling;

(*c*) transact any business of or in connection with his ordinary calling; or

(*d*) do for gain any business, work, or labour.

The exceptions and exemptions to that clause are so extensive that that provision is just a bit of lip service to the traditional humbug we are subject to in certain quarters on this matter. I do not object to the legitimate opinions that have been put forward by certain church organizations, but I believe that some members are paying pure lip service to those attitudes, whereas they really believe that Sunday should be free and use it as if it were free.

Mr. Nankivell: How do you know?

Mr. HUDSON: However, in public they are prepared to pay lip service to attitudes they do not hold in private. I believe we need to recognize a number of principles. First, where it is economically justifiable to work on a Sunday throughout the business world, work is carried out on that day. Shift work has become common in our industrial society, and no-one objects to that, nor has there been any attempt in recent years to legislate against it. No attention has been given to that problem at all: the whole matter has been ignored.

Mr. Nankivell: It is strange that you would be interested—

Mr. HUDSON: The member for Albert may find things strange, but I certainly believe in economic arrangements that enable a product to be produced more cheaply for the benefit of the whole community, and Sunday work is operating in important sections of industry. It was introduced by a previous Government without there being any protests, for the very reason that I have given. Yet, when mild and moderate proposals come before this Parliament, the argument that one must not encourage work on Sunday suddenly is advanced. The member for Flinders (Hon. G. G. Pearson) said at page 2867 of *Hansard*:

> In Tasmania people are specifically prohibited from playing any major sport on a Sunday if it involves people having to organize it. The principle of the Tasmanian Act is that any organized sport requiring a number of people to work on a Sunday who would otherwise not have to is "out" for Tasmania.

That is simply not the position. The honourable member has misread the provisions of the Tasmanian Bill. Clause 7 provides certain exclusions regarding sporting events on a Sunday, and these exclusions cover the matters mentioned in our Bill; but they do not include motor-racing, so motor-racing on Sunday in Tasmania will be allowed if the Tasmanian Bill passes, whereas this legislation will not allow it. There is no limitation in the Tasmanian Bill regarding the sports that will be allowed: they will include organized or professional tennis and interstate or international cricket matches. These may start earlier than 1 p.m., and charges for admission may be made. To that extent, the Tasmanian measure is less restrictive than our Bill, yet the member for Flinders has quoted with approval this statement by the President of the Methodist Conference:

> If the South Australian Parliament follows the principles of the Tasmanian Act, there will be a total prohibition on Sunday Davis Cup matches, State tennis tournaments and professional tennis events, and interstate and international cricket matches.

That is simply not correct. These things are not excluded by the Bill now before the Tasmanian Parliament. Furthermore, clause 7 of the Tasmanian Bill expressly provides that a person may work in relation to the provision of these organized sporting activities and clause 8 makes a similar provision regarding persons working in connection with the entertainment. Those provisions are quite apart from the exemptions from the basic prohibition (in clause 3) contained in clause 4 and in other clauses. It is crystal clear that the members who lead for the Opposition did not bother to study the Tasmanian Bill. It relaxes the law regarding Sunday sport and entertainment more than is intended for South Australia.

I am sure at least one Opposition member, the member for Burra (Mr. Quirke), will agree with me about the basic principles that should apply with respect to Sunday sport and entertainment. I consider that people who wish to follow their religion in their own way have a right to do so on a Sunday without let or hindrance from any other members of the community. That is a basic right in relation to freedom of worship that must be guaranteed in any legislation. Secondly, I consider that any individual in our community (which we regard as a free society) should have the right to conduct himself on a Sunday, with respect to the playing of sport or attendance at a sporting function, cabaret or any other form of entertainment, as he sees fit, provided that he does not interfere with the right of others to observe Sunday in their own particular way. After 1 p.m. on Sundays people should be free to attend sporting functions and to take part in entertainment, provided they do not interfere with the rights of others regarding the observance of Sunday.

The basic reason for the banning of football matches between A grade teams is that such matches would involve the congregation of many people at suburban ovals, resulting in

the noise of motor cars and activity associated with the matches that would disturb people living in the area and interfere with the right of people to observe a quiet and relaxed Sunday. Many people in my part of Brighton would like to observe a relaxed Sunday afternoon, but, oddly enough, they cannot do so at present. Jetty Road, Brighton, near where I live, has become a meeting place for many teenagers and people in their early twenties on Saturday and Sunday in the afternoon and evening, and these people walk aimlessly along the street, congregate around the delicatessens that are open, and generally disturb the peace of the neighbourhood. Complaints have been made and the local police sergeant does his best to do something about the problem.

Our present laws are too restrictive. Opposition members cannot put their heads in the sand and imagine that the prohibition of entertainment on Sunday will stop people from disturbing the peace of others. If they believe that we should not do more than regulate those places of public entertainment at present escaping the provisions of that Act, they are closing their eyes to one of the main social problems for young people in the community today. Young people in the community, when asked in what social matters they are interested, will not talk about 10 p.m. closing, the lottery, or legalized off-course betting: without exception, they are concerned with provisions that can be made with respect to their enjoyment of Sunday. In many parts of the metropolitan area their current observance of Sunday is to wander aimlessly around, congregating outside seaside delicatessens, disturbing the peace, and preventing residents from enjoying Sundays in the way they wish to do. These young people have nothing else to do. The shop is a meeting place.

Our youth, when not properly provided for, develop their own meeting places, which can be various and many, through the whole metropolitan area and in any country town. The more aimless Sunday becomes, the greater the number wandering aimlessly around the streets, and the greater the disturbance to other people's rights to take part in the Sunday activities in the way they want to.

Mr. Hall: Are you saying that most young people are aimless on Sunday?

Mr. HUDSON: I did not say that. I said that a significant number of young people, at present, have as their major activity what seems to be a relatively aimless getting together on, say, Jetty Road, Brighton, or in other seaside areas. They do not swim: they merely meet. It could be in Unley, in the city, or elsewhere, but at present it is in Jetty Road, Brighton. The provisions of this Bill, which concerns legalized entertainment on Sunday and permits picture shows to open on Sunday evenings will affect the numbers of young people who now get together in what seems to be a rather aimless fashion.

We cannot generalize about the behaviour of young people on what one may gather from the newspapers to be an attitude of the most "way out" of them. Nevertheless, if we believe that young people do not represent a social problem in our community, if we believe that we can shut our eyes to this question, and if we believe that we need not worry about providing for these young people, we fail in our duty as legislators. More sporting activities and certain classes of entertainment on Sundays, if they do not interfere with the privacy of the average person and do not interfere with the rights of the individual to worship, will help young people. These things may not solve the problem completely, but they will help eliminate what is now in my district an endless battle between the young people and the police that is bound to lead, on the part of the young people, to an attitude of hostility to the police and a general disrespect for authority.

It is time that we, as representatives of the people, paid attention to this serious social problem. This Bill, a progressive step, is designed to protect the basic freedom to worship that every person must have. Also, I believe it is designed to protect, as far as possible, the rights of the individual not to have his peace disturbed on Sunday by motor-car racing at Rowley Park or by a huge crowd at the local football ground. I do not think that tennis matches at Memorial Drive and cricket matches at the Adelaide Oval would seriously interfere with the privacy of residents and their enjoyment of Sunday. I agree with the present provisions but, if this area were completely surrounded by a residential area, or Sunday activity there would disturb the peace of the neighbourhood, I would take a different view. In the present circumstances, however, I believe that some of us are indulging in the worst humbug if we do not permit these activities. I am not questioning those who sincerely believe that these things should not happen on Sunday, nor do I question those who have a sincere point of view that prevents their participating on Sundays, although I find it difficult to understand that point of view.

Mr. Quirke: They may believe it strongly: why are their beliefs humbug?

Mr. HUDSON: I did not say that. Why doesn't the honourable member listen?

Mr. Quirke: If you did say it, you were speaking to yourself.

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member was half asleep.

Mr. Quirke: I was listening and you said "humbug".

Mr. HUDSON: The honourable member was not listening.

Mr. Quirke: Rubbish!

Mr. HUDSON: I specifically said that I did not refer to those who held sincerely to the view that they should not participate in any sport or entertainment on Sunday.

Mr. Quirke: Then you said they were guilty of "humbug".

Mr. HUDSON: I did not say that. Let me get this clear, so that I am not misquoted by members opposite.

Mr. Quirke: Did you use the word "humbug"?

Mr. HUDSON: Yes, and I shall explain how I used it: I said humbug did not apply to someone who sincerely believed that he should not play sport or indulge in any entertainment on a Sunday, although I said that I found it difficult to understand the attitude of a person who did not believe in playing sport or indulging in entertainment on a Sunday but who did not think anyone else should do so. I believe that humbug is the attitude of people who believe that they should play sport or indulge in entertainment on a Sunday, yet are not prepared to support the changes sought by this Bill. I hope the member for Burra is now clear about what I mean.

Mr. Quirke: I know that you have taken five minutes to explain it.

Mr. HUDSON: I should not have to take five minutes.

Mr. Nankivell: It was your peculiar definition.

Mr. HUDSON: It may be a peculiar definition, but at least it is my own, and I am at least prepared to express my legitimate views on this matter. We live in a modern industrial society, which is developing all the time, producing changes in our way of life, not only throughout the week but on Saturdays and Sundays as well; it is altering work patterns, and no member opposite has suggested that we should refuse to permit that alteration to the work patterns on a Sunday that have been brought about by the continuing industrial change in our community. I believe also that our modern industrial society creates much tension and complications in the lives of the ordinary people of the community and particularly that our modern society and the kind of home life to which young people are subjected are creating great problems and tensions amongst our young people. The church is unfortunately not reaching out to our younger people to the same extent that it did in the past. Although the church is still able to look after a percentage of our younger people, for whom it does a good job, large groups of younger people in the community are not touched by any organizations.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It's the parents' responsibility as well as that of the churches.

Mr. HUDSON: I agree but, unfortunately, as the Minister realizes, parents have the bigger responsibility yet so many ignore it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: The church can't take their place.

Mr. HUDSON: No. We are faced with the problem that, for one reason or another, the percentage of young people who are not touched by a church, who are not touched by the attitude of their parents, and who are not controlled properly by the attitude of their parents, is growing every year. But our society has to pay attention to these young people, because they have become a social problem and because the way in which they develop in their formative years is fundamental to the future health and vitality of our society. If we, ostrich-like, pay no attention to the views and problems of these young people, if we condemn them without a hearing, and if we do not provide for them properly, I believe that we are not providing the kind of society that we should be providing. I believe that this Bill, which does not go as far as the Tasmanian Bill, which regulates certain abuses regarding the Places of Public Entertainment Act, and which liberalizes our too strict laws that have been applied to Sunday is a good Bill and should be supported.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support the Bill, and I assure the member for Glenelg that I do not wish to engage in any humbug. As the member for Albert and the member for Flinders have said, the Bill falls into two categories: certain provisions give effect to the safety and welfare of people who participate in entertainments in South Australia; and other provisions break completely new ground. Apropos the remarks made by the member for Glenelg, I am proud of our young people.

Mr. Hudson: I am, too.

Mr. RODDA: True, many young people have much time on their hands and they have meeting places, as the member for Glenelg said.

Mr. Shannon: Doesn't our free society permit that?

Mr. RODDA: Most certainly, but I am not so sure that, by giving an "open sesame" to the holding of a host of organized sports on Sundays, we shall stop young people meeting at such places. Although I may be a little old-fashioned, I think the old maxim of working six days and resting on the seventh has much to commend it. On the other hand, if someone else wishes to play sport on a Sunday, I shall be the last to forbid that. When we referred to large-scale organized sport within a built-up area—

Mr. Nankivell: Commercialized!

Mr. RODDA: Yes, and it involves many considerations.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You can sell something to someone only if he wants it.

Mr. RODDA: Yes, although at the moment it is something which does not exist and which he does not want. I subscribe to the recent report in the *Advertiser* of the Methodist Conference to the effect that any law in regard to Sunday activity should be readily understood, clearly enforceable, and not subject to the personal factors involved in a permit system interpreted and administered by a Minister without reference to Parliament. That is the real crux of the matter: a large responsibility would be placed on the Minister.

I intend to support the amendments that have been placed on the file by the member for Yorke Peninsula (Mr. Ferguson). Much interest in this matter has been displayed by the churches, which do important work in the interests of people. This morning I met a church leader who had a broad-minded approach to the matter, his underlying concern being for the welfare of the people. A man such as that makes us realize the important role we must exercise in regard to legislation of this type.

Much has been said about the Tasmanian Bill, but we should not lose sight of the fact that what happens in Tasmania need not necessarily be what we want for South Australia. It behoves us to provide legislation that will suit this State, and that is the attitude that has been taken on this Bill by members on this side. People outside have expressed interest in the matter but they have had to take decisions hastily. It is a pity that such decisions must be taken hastily at the end of a Parliamentary session.

Mr. SHANNON (Onkaparinga): I wish I could agree with the member for Glenelg in his laudable sentiments about those who want to enoy the Sabbath under the present conditions and about those who want to enjoy more freedom. I wish the honourable member would stick to those principles. However, I wonder whether the Bill will prevent the freedom that young people enjoy now, that freedom of association on which we pride ourselves. Provided young people do not cause a nuisance to people in the areas in which they congregate, I do not see anything wrong with their meeting in such places. The member for Glenelg tried to put certain members of the teenage group into a category into which I should not like to put them. I was young once and I enjoyed my freedom as much as the young people of today enjoy their freedom. I think that I should have been the first to complain about any attempt to hamstring me in my selection of a place in which I wished to spend my leisure time.

By creating a commercial Sunday, I cannot see that we will encourage young people, such as the people at Jetty Road, Brighton (to whom the member for Glenelg referred), to spend their money attending types of entertainment that they would call "square". When I was young I had to create my own fun and this did not cause any real harm to anyone; I do not think young people today cause any real harm either. Certain elements of society do not conform, and that is not unusual; however, we should not damn a whole group because of a few who do not conform to the established pattern.

Most people were led to believe that the Bill was designed to deal with certain problems arising in places of public entertainment. However, we never dreamt that we would have thrust upon us, without proper consideration by the people concerned with Sunday entertainment (if I am to judge from correspondence and telephone calls I have received), a Bill that provided for major changes in our way of life.

Under the Bill, permits will be granted to allow certain forms of entertainment for profit on Sunday. Previously no charge has been allowed to be made for Sunday entertainments. I should hate to have to decide whether a permit should be granted to one person to conduct a profitable form of entertainment and not to another person. I am a little intrigued by the vociferous objections that have

been made by members opposite to the conducting of football matches on a Sunday. Why should we prevent the playing of what is the Australian national game? Football is certainly more our national game than is cricket, which we borrowed from the old country. Our national sport has been evolved for Australians under Australian conditions. Why do we suggest that this form of entertainment should not come under the permit system? Is there anything inherently wrong or immoral about watching a football match any more than there is about watching a picture that is probably classified as fit for adults only? Personally, I would prefer to be in the open air watching a football match rather than in a theatre watching either a live or a dead show. I find difficulty in lining up the reason why certain Government members are supporting these drastic changes in our laws regarding Sunday. The Minister will have the right not only to grant a licence but also to cancel one.

I draw attention to the problem that the Minister will face if he decides to withdraw a permit. I think he has power to withdraw a permit if, in his opinion, certain conditions that he has laid down in the granting of the permit are departed from. I hate the permit system and consider it entirely wrong. It lends itself to all sorts of undesirable practice. Everyone knows that business interests are only too enthusiastic to encourage a Minister to give them something from which they want to make profit. I think everyone knows the drift of my thinking on this matter. I would prefer to leave the matter of Sunday entertainment entirely out of the measure so that we would have more time to sift the matter properly.

The dissertation from the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) was confined almost entirely to the Tasmanian Bill. Why have we to worry about something that Tasmania has not yet done? That Bill has not been passed by the Parliament in that State. I am interested not in what happens in Tasmania but in what happens in South Australia. Once we establish the principle of a commercialized Sunday, we create vested interests that will be hard to break. In all walks of life, it is difficult to get Governments to say to a vested interest that has profit as its motive, "It's time we put an end to this." Vested interests have much influence and oppose anyone who tries to take a right away from them. They can create a state of affairs in which they can make or break a Government, and that is undesirable.

I do not think that the Bill will make any difference worth mentioning in regard to the spare time that people get at the weekend. Although people will be encouraged to spend money on Sundays, they will have only a certain sum to spend and, if they spend it on another day, they cannot spend it on Sunday. I think thrift is desirable, particularly for young people who each day are moving closer to the time when they will have to accept responsibilities and when hard cash will be valuable to them. After listening to the arguments advanced in support of the Bill, I see the measure as the creator of great ills. It will be a cancer in our body corporate that will be hard to cut out. These provisions will be engraved as our way of life and we will say that we are not going to do without them.

I am displeased about the short time we have had to consider this measure. Frankly, I consider that public opinion matters in issues such as this and I think that people who have spoken to me have done so legitimately: they have a perfect right to discuss such matters with me. When we break new ground, we cannot give too much consideration to what we are doing. Despite the Premier's assurance about the negotiations over a period of months between interested parties and the Government regarding the preparation of the measure, it is now obvious that some people who, it has been suggested, were not unhappy have now become anything but happy. A cog has slipped somewhere. These people cannot have been fully cognizant of what was planned. If they were, I would not have received some of the correspondence that I have received.

I shall not oppose the second reading, but I shall oppose certain clauses in Committee. A Bill designed for the original purpose is desirable. Tightening up is required in regard to certain things that are happening. However, the Government has, perhaps a bit cleverly, tacked on these other provisions, and we would be wise to defer their consideration until everyone has had the opportunity to put his views. If we do that, we shall be able to reach a decision that meets with general approval. We cannot satisfactorily legislate ahead of public opinion. We should not force members of the public into an action that is repugnant to them, because the law will not be obeyed if we do. Some provisions of this Bill that I oppose should be reconsidered.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS (Minister of Agriculture): I support the second reading, but I did not want to vote without expressing my opinion. Perhaps it was thought that, with

my attitude on other social questions, I should logically oppose this Bill. Government members are free to support or reject this Bill, because it has been considered as a social question. I am not happy with recent trends: I believe that what is happening is inevitable, but I do not think it is right. When He made the earth, our Creator made a wise statement when He said that for six days should we labour and for one day should we rest, but I do not necessarily mean from the point of view of churches: I am considering it from the point of view of the human frame.

The mad rush of the world today is one of the main reasons, rather than eating certain food, for so many coronary occlusions. Present-day pressures are causing much mental and other disturbance. Today, the law of the land dealing with Sunday entertainment is being flouted, and provisions to control this entertainment are necessary. Undesirable things have happened in this fair city and some discotheques that are subjecting our young people to many dangers should be controlled by the provisions of the legislation so that they can be supervised. I have received correspondence and representations from people concerned about whether we should have sport on Sunday afternoon or entertainment on Sunday evening, to which an admission fee is charged.

Many places in country areas have sporting activities on Sunday, particularly in the larger towns in the northern area of the State where Sunday is the day on which league football matches are played. I do not know whether an admission charge is made but, frequently, I am embarrassed, when invited to a Sunday function, to notice that a back-door method of charging is used. Recently, at a gala day organized for charity, the programme was sold for 50c which, no doubt, was really an admission charge. These practices will increase, because no longer are people content to have a quiet Sunday. Regardless of our religious beliefs, we would benefit if we could take it easy for one day of the week. People, such as ourselves, who are obliged to attend functions on Sunday, are deprived of a quiet day at home with the family.

Mr. Shannon: This would wreck us for Sunday, too.

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: That has already gone. Few Sundays pass when I am not obliged, as a Minister, to attend at functions in my district or in other parts of the State. Perhaps recreation on Sunday could be considered a method of relaxation, but what concerns most people is that organized sport annoys people who do not wish to participate but want a restful afternoon. The Minister, under the provisions of the Bill, should resist granting permits for motor-car racing and other noisy sports in built-up areas on Sunday. Many people living in a built-up area want a quiet day, and the Minister may prohibit certain sports, especially if they annoy nearby residents. Apparently, we are expected to allow people to do what they want to do on Sunday.

Freedom of the individual has been discussed many times in this House, but I plead for those who deserve freedom from noisy sports and the freedom to enjoy a restful afternoon. I live adjacent to an oval, the controlling body of which has resisted all applications for sport to be played on it on Sunday. A number of elderly people living close to the area desire peace and quiet on Sundays. A completely new pattern seems to have emerged today, possibly because people are coming into our midst who have been used to participating in certain Sunday activities elsewhere and who expect to participate in those activities here. The Bill will permit charges to be made for certain activities but, as I say, these charges are already being made and I do not think that what is taking place at present is much different from what is likely to take place in future. However, I think it is incumbent on the Minister concerned to ensure that freedom is provided not only for people who wish to play sport on Sundays but also for those who desire peace and quiet in their own homes. Although I am not altogether happy with the measure, I think it will provide for something that is catching up with us in our changed way of life.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: Why help to precipitate it?

The Hon. G. A. BYWATERS: I do not think it will, for I think certain practices will arise in any case. I believe, however, that it is necessary to have control, and I am sure that the Minister responsible for administering this legislation will consider the wishes of both sides and that those desiring peace and quiet on a Sunday will not be disturbed.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The Bill should not have been introduced in its present form, or at least not introduced and passed through Parliament with the haste with which it is being passed both through this Chamber

and, no doubt the Government hopes, through the other one as well. I accept that some changes in the law are necessary, because of the matters to which the Premier has referred from time to time regarding cabarets, the new Licensing Act, and the widespread evasion that is taking place of the Places of Public Entertainment Act. These things could have been dealt with simply on their own in this Bill, and the wider issues could have been left. There is no urgency at all that I can see to deal with the other matters. I personally do not know what people in this community, even in my own district, really want on this matter.

The Government's action in this case is in great contrast to the action it took on another social matter, which has meant and will mean a great change in our social customs: I refer, of course, to the Licensing Act. In that case the Government was content to introduce the Bill and to let it lie for some months before coming back to it and before Parliament had finally to consider it. Why the difference between licensing and our observances on Sunday? Of course, we know the real reason why the Government has moved so hastily in this area is that it wants to use any change in the law: it wants to parade it as a so-called reform and to use it as election bait at the next election.

Mr. Langley: That must hurt you, then.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is a measure not of the hurt to me or my Party but of the desperation on the part of the Government to get something to take to the people. I remind members that only a little over a fortnight ago the Premier in reply to a question, which I think I asked him, said he intended to introduce a Bill on this matter during the current session. Until then we did not know the Government's intentions. This places every member of Parliament in a difficult situation: we are here to try to do the right thing by the people of this State, yet it is impossible in the time we have had to ascertain the real consensus of opinion of people in this State.

I personally believe that one's first duty on a Sunday is to worship God and that once that duty or obligation has been discharged the rest of the day can be spent as one wishes. Having studied with interest the submissions of the churches on this matter, I intend to quote from those of the Lord Bishop of Adelaide (Dr. Reed) and His Grace the Archbishop of Adelaide (Dr. Beovich), because these opinions come closer to my own conviction than the statements of any other church heads. Dr. Reed said:

The principle which may be expected to commend itself to all sections of the community today is that it is to the benefit of the community as a whole and to individual members of the community that there should be at least one day in each week which everyone may use, as he sees fit, unimpeded by the necessity to be occupied upon that day in the work by which he gains his livelihood.

Dr. Beovich said:

For the Christian, Sunday is first and foremost the day for giving worship to God. This is the primary purpose of the Lord's day. Sunday also has the purpose of being a day of rest and recreation. Thus Sunday for the Christian need not be funereal but it should not be godless.

I think all of us have seen the submissions on this question, made to the Premier at his invitation, but there is no doubt that those submissions were made under a misapprehension as to the Government's intention in amending the Act. The Government has gone much further than any of the heads of churches contemplated, and much further than appeared from the letter of June 19 which the Premier wrote to the Lord Bishop of Adelaide. Only today (to emphasize that point, the misapprehension the heads of the churches have had, and the embarrassment they have been caused in the last fortnight or so) I have been sent by Pastor Minge, President of the South Australian District of the Lutheran Church of Australia, a copy of the letter he has written to the Premier on this matter, and I intend to quote a couple of sentences to show that when the heads of the churches made their submissions they did not understand what was in the Government's mind. The letter states:

I feel constrained to make a few comments and to submit an appeal to you with reference to the legislation regarding Sunday entertainment now before Parliament. First, according to statements of yours published in the *Advertiser* this past week, more forms of entertainment will be permitted on Sundays than were visualized from your first letter to the heads of churches. Had I known this, the submissions on behalf of my church forwarded to you by the Bishop of Adelaide would have been more specific than they were.

I think that is sufficient to state the tone of the feeling of the heads of the churches on this matter. It is easy enough for one to give one's own conviction or for a prelate to give his conviction: it is far harder to convert principles into practice. I suppose that all members know that there is a difference between the principles which we espouse and which we proclaim, and our own practices. I know that, although I have said what I have, frequently on a Sunday I work in one

way or another, either as a member of Parliament (and that is common ground among all of us—Sunday is a day on which a member of Parliament is frequently occupied) or in one of my three extra-family interests in life which happens to be the Citizen Military Forces. Of course, that is an activity that is carried on frequently on a Sunday. Is this to be condemned? In the situation in which we members of the C.M.F. find ourselves, it is unavoidable because Sunday is one of the few days on which we can have a full day's training without interfering with our normal occupations.

To begin with, this is a departure from the principle I have laid down but the consequence of that activity is something which I think is common to many people: that is, when I am away from home on C.M.F. duty or on Parliamentary duty in which my family cannot participate (although I am glad to say that my family can participate in many of these Parliamentary duties), the family complains very much, because they say Sunday is one of the few days on which they can see me and I am not at home. That is one of the vices of making Sunday like any other day and it is one of the great objections to sweeping changes in the law on this matter. As I see it, there are two great considerations before we change the law on Sunday observance. The first is the religious consideration, and I do not intend to canvass that any further; every member must make up his mind on this as must every member of the community.

The other consideration is that of health. It has been found from experience, certainly in the last few hundred years, in what we can call contemporary western society that it is impossible for a person to go day after day constantly without some change from the normal routine. That is a physical impossibility and, if a person does if for too long, he will break down. I think I am right in saying that at the time of the French Revolution the revolutionaries, who were atheists, abolished Sunday, as they sought to abolish God. It was found that this did not work; people could not go on working constantly without some break in the routine. That has been the common experience in western countries (not in all countries of the world but in countries with the same traditions and background and the same pattern of activities as we have). There is always one day that is to a greater or lesser extent different from the others. The two considerations to which I have referred lead me to believe that there should be one day different from the others. However, it is easy enough for me to say this; I literally do not know what the community really feels about it. I am certain that most would not be swayed by the religious considerations I have put because most people in the community are not practising Christians.

Mr. Coumbe: They may be nominal Christians but they are not practising Christians.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. However, I am not at all sure that the majority of the community is not swayed strongly by the other consideration I have put—that of physical well-being. The only way we can do our job properly here is to have time to go out in the community and to talk to people about this in our own districts and anywhere else to try to get an idea of public opinion. After all, that is the job we are here to do. As I understand it, the job of a politician has always been to tread the path between leading the community and telling it what is good for it on the one hand and, on the other hand, representing it and mirroring what the general feeling of the community is. It is difficult to keep on the path (we generally go too far one way or the other), but we should make an attempt at least to find what people want before we vote on a measure. However, in this case we have not had a chance, because we have had only about a fortnight from the time the measure was introduced until the time we will have to vote on it.

I can sum up my feelings by saying that I will not oppose the provisions of an urgent nature dealing with cabarets and places of public entertainment in the narrow sense, but I object strongly to the Premier's taking on these other wider measures simply to try to get them through before the election. I do not think this should have been done.

I wish to make one final point and it is prompted by something said by the member for Glenelg. I do not believe the Tasmanian Bill is any real guide to us. We do not start from the same position as the Tasmanians; we do not have the same customs and we have not had the same legislation in this State as the Tasmanians have had. Since 1908 they have had different legislation from ours relating to Sundays and therefore their whole pattern of living in this regard is different. We cannot get much out of the report of Sir Philip Phillips, let alone out of a Bill that has not gone through the Tasmanian Parliament as yet. Therefore, I cannot oppose the second reading because I think there are some things that should be passed. However,

there are some clauses in the Bill about which I intend at the appropriate time to protest vigorously, not necessarily because I am against them but because I do not think the time is right for us to pass judgment on them.

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): This legislation was foreshadowed in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech at the beginning of the session. I support the provisions in the Bill which relate to cabarets and clubs and which have been specifically alluded to. I first became aware of the need to investigate the conditions under cabarets and clubs operating when, about two years ago, with two other members of my Party, I had discussions with members of the motion picture industry. In the August of that year the Liberal and Country League conference passed a resolution that the matter of showing films on Sunday should be investigated. In order to find out the attitude of the people who would be most affected, we invited members of the motion picture industry to discuss the matter with us and to give us their views on it. One matter they raised was their concern about places of entertainment, particularly where cabaret shows were held in hotels. They pointed out, of course, that hotels were not built originally for this purpose but that the custom became popular over the years and that entertainment was being provided, particularly on Saturday evenings, for patrons of the hotels who came to dine and who looked forward to a floor show. The members of the motion picture industry were concerned, because they were compelled by the Act to provide all kinds of safeguards for the public in theatres and places of entertainment, such as the employment of firemen and people responsible for ensuring that the entertainment was provided in the safest conditions. They were up against the cabarets and the hotels that did not have to comply with such conditions.

There was a danger, because cabarets and hotels did not have such facilities as escape stairways or sufficient exits. This was added to by the danger of interior decorations and carpets in hotels in case of fire. The motion picture industry representatives contended that the hotels were their rivals in business and were having an effect on their business. Therefore, I consider that the amendment to control this sort of entertainment is appropriate, and I support it. However, I believe that the introduction of the other social question in the Bill should be questioned by every member.

The first notice that we got that this was contemplated by the Government was, as the member for Mitcham (Mr. Millhouse) said when asking a question several weeks ago, when we read on the posters for a mid-day edition of the afternoon newspaper that this was to be introduced in Parliament. The Premier said, in reply to the question, that that was so, and I was interested in the Premier's statement in his reply that he had already announced that he had had discussion with the Lord Bishop of Adelaide and that it was intended to introduce this legislation.

I do not recall the Premier's making such an announcement in the House, and I do not know whether it was made over television or radio or in the press. I was absent for about six weeks in the early part of the session, but I cannot find any reference in *Hansard* to the statement. So, the first we knew was a rumour outside the House, and that was confirmed by the Premier in reply to a question. It was obvious from what the Premier said that he had been having discussions with the leaders of the churches and that these discussions were initiated by a letter to the Lord Bishop of Adelaide. I think it right to say that most church leaders believed that the type of legislation to be introduced would be along the lines of the Tasmanian legislation. Be that as it may, I do not think that is important. It may have helped the Government establish guide lines on what to do in South Australia, but I do not think we have to follow an investigation made in another State, where conditions may be different from those here.

Adherents of the various churches consider that this matter was unduly hurried. Although the Premier has given dates, the rank and file members of the churches consider that they should have been allowed to discuss the matter, that it should not have been left to the leaders of the churches to convey what they considered to be the views of church members. Because of this, I have received from church members in my district several petitions signed by hundreds of people who are not happy about this kind of legislation. As the member for Mitcham has said, Christians are probably in the minority, therefore the majority will should prevail, provided that justice is done to the minority. In this instance, because of the haste with which the legislation is being handled, I consider that justice is not being done to the minority and that the individual members of churches have not had time to consider the provisions of the Bill.

Previous speakers have said that it has long been Christian belief that Sunday should be a day of rest. It is known as a family day, a day on which all members of the family get together and take their relaxation in whatever form they desire. Of course, until the period between the First and Second World Wars, the normal thing was to go to church on Sunday morning. The children would go to Sunday school, and the family probably went for a walk in the afternoon. Gradually, people started playing tennis on private tennis courts, went driving with the advent of the motor car, and they did other things. Gradually, the attitude was relaxed. In recent decades, social and moral attitudes have changed greatly and many people do not go to church and they regard Sunday as just another day.

When it comes to legislating to permit certain activities on Sunday, I think, as the member for Onkaparinga (Mr. Shannon) has said, that this is moving ahead of public opinion. It is all very well to say that one can do certain things but cannot do other things on Sundays. I cannot see why there should be a distinction between playing some forms of sport on a Sunday and debarring people from playing football. In organized sport of any kind, such people as groundsmen, gatekeepers and ushers have to be employed. It is no use saying that these people will be compensated by being paid double time, because they, too, deserve their leisure and, as the Minister of Agriculture has said, we are being told by medical officers and psychologists that the human body needs relaxation. Someone has to pay the piper whatever the sport, because they are denied the opportunity to relax.

I cannot see that there is much difference between a cricket match at the Adelaide Oval and tennis at the Memorial Drive. At an international tennis match the noise of the applause after a good rally is tremendous, and as the excitement of the crowd rises, so do the voices and the applause. A previous Bishop of Adelaide said that the noise emanating from a football match was like the noise from the zoo, and he found it hard to distinguish the difference. Any organized sport disturbs the peace of the neighbourhood adjacent to the arena in which the sport is played.

The member for Glenelg referred to young people walking aimlessly up and down the streets and, by their noise, disturbing the peace of others. I consider that young people will not benefit from the leisure they have these days unless they participate in sport. There is no point in organizing sport at which they are onlookers: to be healthfully employed in leisure they have to be participants. Unless they are encouraged to join clubs and to play sport they will still wander aimlessly up and down streets or attend sporting functions at which they will make nuisances of themselves. The argument of the member for Glenelg does not hold much water. I support the amendments that truly remedy anomalies in the present Act, but I consider that more time should have been allowed to consider this type of legislation. Social legislation introduced this year (lotteries, totalizator agency board betting, and licensing) was introduced without pressure from the public. This legislation is delineating the relaxation of the people and the sort of activities that can be followed. I believe that such legislation is making its mark on the community, to the detriment of the present Government.

Mr. Langley: We're going too well, that's the trouble.

Mrs. STEELE: I support the amendments that are necessary to control cabarets and clubs, but I shall have something more to say about the other part of the legislation in Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON (Yorke Peninsula): I, too, partly support the Bill, especially the amendments that are necessary now. I am not a kill-joy and I believe that one should be able to please oneself about playing sport on Sunday. When I was a boy Sunday sport was taboo in our family, but I like to think that I have grown up and can decide for myself. If one uses sport as a relaxation there is nothing wrong with enjoying it on Sunday, and I have encouraged this attitude in my family. I have played bowls on Sunday, but I oppose sport being commercialized. I believe that representatives of the churches in this State and the people who constitute the churches, are concerned with the speed with which this measure is passing through Parliament. Many people who, perhaps, are indifferent to what churches are doing are also concerned that this Bill is passing through Parliament too quickly.

The member for Glenelg made some extraordinary statements. In effect, he said that there might be Opposition members who did not practise what they preached about the observance of Sunday and about the playing of sport on that day. Apparently, the member for Glenelg described as humbug the

attitude of those people with definite convictions about not playing sport on Sunday. These statements were unnecessary.

Mr. Hudson: What did you say that I said was humbug?

Mr. FERGUSON: I shall not repeat what I said. The Tasmanian legislation has been referred to in connection with international and interstate tennis and cricket matches on Sunday. I am not concerned with what applies in Tasmania, but these sports could be included in the list of those for which a permit could be obtained to be played on Sunday. Little difference exists between an international cricket match and a league football match. I remember one occasion on the Adelaide Oval when there was more noise and fuss at an international cricket match than there has ever been at a league football match.

Mr. Langley: How many times did that happen?

Mr. FERGUSON: That was in the "bodyline" days. I think most of the older members will remember what took place. If we legislate to commercialize these types of sport, we are not providing a participating exercise for the young people to whom members have referred. Indeed, we shall merely be providing additional venues at which certain young people will congregate. I believe that clause 6, in particular, should be amended at the appropriate stage.

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER (Angas): I raise no objection to the first three or four clauses of the Bill because, as the Premier said, they are necessary in respect of entertainments conducted in certain premises. However, I object to certain other clauses, particularly clause 6, for I am against commercializing sport on a Sunday. Although clause 6 provides that various games and certain classes of entertainment shall not be engaged in on a Sunday, I point out that a permit may be granted by the Minister enabling such activities to be carried on. Further, although the clause provides that no sports or entertainment shall be carried on between 3 a.m. and 1 p.m. on a Sunday I doubt whether, once a permit is issued by the Minister, such permit can be limited only to the period from 1 p.m. onwards. The member for Adelaide (Mr. Lawn), who said that he believed the Bill was considerably better than the Tasmanian legislation, pointed out that games could be conducted at any time on a Sunday under the Tasmanian measure. The honourable member said:

The Bill at present before the Tasmanian Upper House seeks to permit games to be held at any time on a Sunday, although it provides that entertainment shall not take place before 1 p.m.

The honourable member later said:

As the Bill states that games shall not commence before 1 p.m., we are giving more effect to the resolution than would the Tasmanian legislation, which allows games to be played on a Sunday morning.

The Tasmanian Bill (clause 7) specifically provides that no person shall on Sunday "provide, engage in or attend" certain activities, including matches between senior teams representing certain football clubs and soccer matches. However, the member for Adelaide did not say that clause 7 of the Tasmanian Bill also prevented the holding on a Sunday of horse racing, greyhound racing, rodeos, boxing matches and wrestling matches, etc. Clause 6 of this Bill, which is almost identical to clause 7 of the Tasmanian Bill concerning games and entertainments, provides in new subsection (4) that the Minister may grant a permit concerning certain activities that are not, in fact, permitted under the Tasmanian Bill. This Bill therefore goes much further than the Tasmanian measure.

I am completely opposed to the holding, on a Sunday, of some of the activities enumerated in clause 6. I do not agree entirely with the member for Onkaparinga, who said earlier that he was not concerned with the Tasmanian Bill, because we were not living in Tasmania; that we were living in South Australia; and that we should be concerned only with the position here. I remind the House that the Tasmanian Bill is based on the recommendations made by Commissioner Phillips who was appointed as the head of a Royal Commission to investigate the Tasmanian situation. I believe that the people in this State are, after all, not much different in type and outlook from Tasmanians or from other people in the Commonwealth. I consider that the Government has been too hasty in introducing the latter part of the legislation because the religious bodies, the opinions of which were sought, have not properly understood the entire position or otherwise have been led into a sense of false security.

That was made apparent by what was said by the Reverend Keith Smith at a Pleasant Sunday Afternoon. He said that South Australia needed much more comprehensive legislation on Sunday activities than the Bill now before Parliament, and that no reference had

been made to other commercial activities such as land sales, door-to-door sales and the like. I draw honourable members' attention to the fact that the Tasmanian legislation specifically deals with those matters under clause 3. The Rev. Mr. Smith also said that the more one examined the Bill the surer one became that the criticism of undue haste was valid and proper. He said that we needed legislation which had been understood and accepted by the public before it was passed and which was clear in what it permitted and what it banned.

I wish to quote from a letter that I received today from the President of the South Australian District of the Lutheran Church of Australia (Pastor Minge). I think this letter shows that at least this church (if not other churches) has misunderstood the position or has not been fully informed of what is intended. This letter, dated October 24 and directed to the Premier, states:

According to statements of yours published in the *Advertiser* this past week, more forms of entertainment will be permitted on Sundays than were visualized from your first letter to the heads of churches. Had I known this, the submissions on behalf of my church, forwarded to you by the Bishop of Adelaide, would have been more specific than they were. Not for a moment did I think that the S.A. National Football League would be permitted to run their seconds matches on Sundays, or that Davis Cup tennis matches and interstate and international cricket matches would be permitted. To say that such fixtures would not attract "large concourses of people" is not facing up to possibilities, nor taking into account the fact that a considerable amount of noisy barracking has been heard considerable distances round the Adelaide Oval at interstate and international cricket matches in the past. Secondly, I fully subscribe to the contention of the Methodist Conference, published in the *Advertiser* last week: "Any law in regard to Sunday activity should be readily understood and clearly enforceable, and not subject to the personal factors involved in a permit system interpreted and administered by a Minister without reference to Parliament."

I said at the outset that I believed this Bill, if passed, might, through its permit system, be the thin edge of the wedge for the complete commercialization of Sunday, and I oppose that. I agree with what has been said by the three previous speakers: that, in a Christian community such as we have in this State (and I hope that we have it in the whole of Australia), Sunday should be treated as a day of rest and worship. Therefore, I cannot support clause 6, but I raise no objection to the earlier clauses to which I referred and which I think are necessary.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD (Gumeracha): I ask the Premier to consider the numerous applications made to him and to all members of Parliament to the effect that this matter should be held over so that the community can consider it. We have had a great deal of social legislation since the Government came into office. I was pleased to hear that the other day the Premier said publicly, in effect, that "you should not travel too far too quickly". I do not believe the provisions of the Bill are necessary and it could well be held over so that it could be further examined and better understood by the community. Although I have not canvassed any of the churches, it is clear that when the Premier first submitted the matter to them he did not achieve general agreement. It is also clear that the elements of agreement he did achieve have been retracted since the churches have gained further knowledge of the Bill.

The present Act gives the Minister powers to control all forms of public entertainment. He can control public entertainment with regard to the safety of the public and with regard to morality and good manners. He has complete authority to close down any activity that he believes to be improper. That is the present position, and the Premier knows it. The definitions in the present Act are so wide that they have never been challenged successfully by anyone. The provisions of the Act have been fairly consistently followed by Liberal and Labor Governments, with one exception to which I shall later refer. The background has been that it is not desirable to commercialize Sunday or to introduce a Continental Sunday. Unfortunately, some people have to work on Sunday at present because of the nature of their employment, but in some parts of the Continent most people have to work on Sunday. The introduction of a commercialized or Continental Sunday is not in the interests of the community, but that is being done by this Bill.

The Bill widens present provisions to permit all sorts of activities, and the churches have every right to express concern about what is being done. In one particular type of administration by the new Government, there has been a change of policy. There is not the slightest doubt that certain places that have been licensed by this Government should not and would not have been licensed by my Government. These are the places that are causing trouble at present. For example, they

do not have proper sanitation or proper protection against fire risk. Surely it is a simple matter to overcome that difficulty without breaking down the whole of our administration by introducing a commercialized Sunday that will compel more people to work. That is the basis of the opposition of the churches and the cause for the retraction by certain churches of previous approval. We have seen public statements by church leaders that, if they knew what would happen, they would not have supported it.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Who said that?

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: A letter from the Lutheran Church has been cited.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Right from the outset the Lutheran Church did not support the change.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: The Premier knows there has been a retraction.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was not a retraction. Why don't you read what they said originally? They said they didn't want any change at all.

The Hon. Sir THOMAS PLAYFORD: If the Premier contains himself and does not become petulant, he will agree that the churches have retracted substantially. I have seen the original letters and I have spoken to church leaders. When they were asked to agree, they did not have a Bill before them and they did not know what was intended. As soon as they knew that the Bill contemplated major sporting facilities and such matters as are provided for in clause 6, they proceeded to the best of their ability to make statements against the Bill in the pulpit and in public. The Premier knows that.

We have allowed other legislation not nearly as important as this to stand over for further consideration, and I consider that that should be done with this Bill. The tightening up that the Premier wants can be done by a simple amendment. I do not consider it desirable to try to change the social habits of the people too quickly, and the Premier himself has made a statement to that effect. I consider that the people are beginning to realize that there is difficulty about some legislation. As the Bill is unnecessary and should be held over, I oppose it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): Having listened to what members have had to say, I am disappointed that, because of the subjects with which the Bill deals, most members of the Opposition have seen fit to make this issue a political football.

Mr. Millhouse: Aw!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As is his wont, the member for Mitcham ascribed the basest of motives to the Government in dealing with this matter.

Mr. Millhouse: I am certain I am right, too.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At one moment when I point out what the member is doing, he gasps and scoffs at what I say, and then he specifically agrees that I was correct. I draw the attention of members to the basic problems facing the Government, and I may say that, as a result of discussions with certain church leaders, there has been some retraction from a previous position but the retraction is not in the direction referred to by the member for Gumeracha (Sir Thomas Playford). I have a new letter on behalf of the President of the South Australian Methodist Conference putting further matters to me, because it was brought home to the church just what were the practical problems in this matter.

Members opposite, as a result of the statement originally prepared by the Rev. Keith Smith, have based the whole of their opposition to the measure on the view that there was no essential connection between dealing with matters affecting Sunday and closing loopholes in the Places of Public Entertainment Act. I would have counselled them that, rather than take a political decision of this kind, as they obviously did in an endeavour to embarrass the Government for Party-political purposes, they should have turned their attention to the measure before the House and what it was amending. They should have done their job as representatives in this House instead of trying to play base politics.

I draw the attention of members to the reason for the introduction of this measure. There was (and Opposition members have admitted it) a considerable evasion of certain provisions of the Places of Public Entertainment Act. A major evasion, either extant or widely threatened, was the use of the device of clubs to provide entertainment without control under the Act. In order to cope with that situation it was necessary to bring clubs under the purview of the Act.

Activities of clubs that were previously not subject to the control of the Act had to be made subject to the Act in order to deal with the evasions taking place. The churches have unanimously accepted that something needed to be done, especially the Methodist Church,

which has submitted more to me on this subject than has anyone else and which has accepted that this is a necessary step. I emphasize that once that is done without any further amendment to the Act, the existing Act prohibits the activities, on Sundays, of clubs previously subject to no control, and in order to allow those clubs to continue if the present Act was maintained (as in one submission of the Methodist Church it was suggested it would be) there would have to be thousands of applications made by clubs to the Chief Secretary for written permission to continue to do what they were doing.

Because of this difficulty the churches were asked urgently for their view on what was allowable on Sunday, so that we could specifically exempt those things, and make subject to application or specific prohibition those things which were not wanted or which could be allowed only in exceptional circumstances. It was pointed out to the churches that this problem would have to be dealt with if the loophole open to the clubs was to be closed, otherwise there would be an administratively impossible situation, and that, if we did not close this loophole, the situation of control of places of public entertainment would be out of hand within six months. This was clear and, in fact, not denied.

After the Methodist Church had passed a resolution, which has been referred to by Opposition members and which seems to be the basis of their strategy in this matter, I was able to talk with the Rev. Keith Smith and the Rev. Keith Seaman, who prepared the document, and pointed out there were some difficulties in the course they proposed. I put these difficulties plainly to them, and I am pleased to say that the Rev. Mr. Smith, who saw me today, is well aware of the difficulties and has suggested a course by which the wishes of the church may be met without practical difficulties arising that would have arisen from the document on which members opposite have based their political suggestion.

Mr. Millhouse: Does this mean that you are going to agree to certain amendments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. During my discussion with the church I also suggested some amendments. I never worry about having to amend a Bill I have introduced. My attitude is not that of the member for Mitcham, that one loses face merely by finding something better than one has originally proposed as a result of a dialogue with those people interested in the measure. This is part of the normal course of sensible Government and that is what Parliament is here for.

Mr. Millhouse: I notice that you adopt that practice normally with every Bill you introduce!

Mr. Hudson: It does him credit.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That does not detract from what we proposed. I claim that our amendments show that instead of this Government being inflexible and dictatorial, as members opposite like to suggest to the public, it accepts from members of the public sensible suggestions and, if they are an improvement on our original proposals, we are pleased to sponsor them.

Mr. Millhouse: It will be interesting to see the amendments you have on the Unfair Trading Practices Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member may be interested to see them soon. No doubt there will be many amendments to that Bill, and they will be sensible ones. They will be much more sensible than the absurd, exaggerated, and intolerant nonsense that has been spoken about it by the Leader in the past few days. What we have done in dealing with Sunday activities had to be done in order to close the club loopholes. The member for Gumeracha may shake his head, but he has not considered the situation if he thinks that it can be fixed by a simple little amendment that he does not specify. I suggest to members opposite that they pay attention to the material placed before them.

The member for Gumeracha said that the church leaders had retracted from their position. True, during the last week or so, as a result of discussions with leaders of the Methodist Church (discussions in which they have complimented the Government and expressed considerable appreciation of the Government's attitude in the matter), there has been a change in the attitude that they had expressed, and a better understanding and realization of the problems facing the Government. I know of no change by any of the other church leaders in their position as represented to me. The Churches of Christ and the Lutheran Church said that there should be no change on Sundays regardless of the problems that faced the Government, and they made no specific suggestions as to how the problems should be coped with. They have maintained their position. The letter read by the member for Angas in no way alters the position of the Lutheran Church as originally expressed in this matter.

I do not know to what other churches the member for Gumeracha is turning his attention. Does he suggest that the Bishop of Adelaide has altered his submission, or that the Archbishop of Adelaide has altered his? They have not.

Mr. Coumbe: Have they seen the Bill?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They have seen the details of the Bill and since that time, although I have not discussed the matter with the Lord Bishop, I have discussed it with the Archbishop, and there is no difference in the attitudes that are expressed. Indeed, I have not the slightest doubt that if the Lord Bishop of Adelaide had any further matters to submit to me he would have done so. I have had a discussion with the Lieutenant-Colonel of the Salvation Army, and there is no change whatever in the position that organization represented to the Government. I do not know what the member for Gumeracha is talking about, but I suggest to members that, if they examine the submissions of the church leaders, they will see that the measure we have designed is based on the submissions of the majority. The majority of church people in South Australia, as a result of the submissions of the church leaders, overwhelmingly asked for a measure of this kind regarding Sunday activity, and the model they drew to our attention was the model used.

Concerning the commercialization of Sunday, I draw the attention of the member for Gumeracha to the fact that the churches in South Australia said overwhelmingly that they did not see any reason to prohibit commercial entertainment after 1.30 p.m. on Sunday, except that some of the churches asked for a gap in the time during which evening church services were conducted. What some of the churches have submitted (and this refers specifically to the Methodist Church) is not concerned with the commercialization of Sunday: they have sought that certain other major sporting events (not commercial entertainments) be added to the list of prohibited sporting events on Sundays, namely, major cricket and tennis matches. The reason for this was that it was considered that the holding of such matches might bring into employment on Sunday many people who would not otherwise be employed on that day. There are some things with which, I think, the Government can go along in order to assist the Methodist Church in the objections it has raised on this aspect of the matter, but I also point out that, although objections have been raised to the Minister's having the right to give special permits in exceptional circumstances, the existing Act gives a complete and unfettered discretion to the Minister, and that discretion is not bound up with the Minister's turning his attention to certain matters specified in the present Act. Under the present Act, the Minister can give his permission for anything.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: For any reason.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Or for no reason at all. It is not true that the Minister has used his discretion in such a way as to depart from the general standards of the community. Indeed, by the Legislature's laying down what it is permissible to do on Sundays, it has set general guide lines from which it is only clearly indicated that there be a departure in most exceptional circumstances. Although suggestions have been made through the press that league football matches will be allowed in Adelaide on Sundays, it is clear from the legislation that that is not so. I suggest to honourable members that, rather than attempt to delay something that is administratively necessary in order that we cope with the difficulties with which we are faced regarding places of public entertainment, they get down to the business of fixing just what is required and permissible on Sundays. In fact, the difference between ourselves and the Methodist Church on what is permissible on Sundays is a small one indeed.

Mr. Millhouse: It must have changed in the last few hours.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not think it has. For the benefit of the honourable member, I shall read what I have received from the President of the Methodist Conference, as follows:

Dear Mr. Premier,

In reference to our conversation earlier this afternoon in regard to the amendment to the Places of Public Entertainment Act, I now enclose a copy of our submissions. I trust that even at this late stage it may be possible for some further discussion to take place in order to secure the passage of legislation which will meet the immediate situation which you outlined to Mr. Seaman and myself last week and still express the principles which have been adopted by the majority of the churches in this State.

With best wishes,

Yours faithfully,

(Signed) Rev. KEITH SMITH

for the President of the Methodist Conference.

Mr. Millhouse: That doesn't seem to bring you much closer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Perhaps the honourable member had better listen to the following:

We recommend that section of the Bill be amended as follows:

1. By the listing of major sporting events to be prohibited on Sundays.
2. By the listing of other sporting events which may be played on Sundays under a permit from the Minister as at present provided in section 6 (*c*)—

—so the permit of the Minister is to be allowed—

3. By the rephrasing of clause (4) (*a*) to give greater clarity.

I discussed this with the Rev. Mr. Smith, but he was unable to show how we were to do that. The submissions continue:

4. By the inclusion of a new subsection (4) (*c*) reading "whether the granting of the permit will cause a significant number of people to work on Sundays who would otherwise be free from work", or similar words to that effect—

which was precisely the suggestions I had previously made to the Rev. Keith Smith and the Rev. Keith Seaman—

5. By granting to the Minister power to revoke any permit given under subsection (4) should this be necessary—

actually, the power to revoke is there—

6. By providing for a right of appeal against the decision of the Minister to grant, refuse or revoke a permit—

I am afraid that is not practical, but that is the suggestion—

7. The list of major sporting events which we ask to be prohibited is:
   (*a*) the present paragraph (*a*) with the addition of "interstate league football teams, national football carnivals and league teams from different States";
   (*b*) test cricket and interstate Sheffield shield matches;
   (*c*) Davis Cup tennis matches;
   (*d*) soccer federation and interstate soccer matches;
   (*e*) horse races (wording as in present Bill);
   (*f*) boxing (wording as in Bill); and
   (*g*) wrestling (wording as in Bill).

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: There can be no permit in respect of these?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is correct.

Mr. Millhouse: You are prepared to agree to this?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not say that. The submissions continue:

8. The present power to add to this list to be retained.
9. The list of other sporting events which may be played with a permit is:
   (*a*) Amateur league football, B-grade football of the S.A. National Football League matches and country league football matches (to be listed in schedule);
   (*b*) State tennis tournaments and professional tennis matches;
   (*c*) motor racing; and
   (*d*) rodeos.

We submit that these amendments meet the special situations provided by

(1) the Mallala and Rowley Park motor races—

and it is not the Government's intention to allow Rowley Park to conduct races on Sundays, anyway—

(2) country football matches at places like Port Pirie and Whyalla;
(3) country soccer matches.

We believe that such amendments would more fully express the mind of the heads of Churches in supporting the principles of the Tasmanian report.

I think those things need to be knocked into shape slightly but at the same time, if the honourable member takes care to read this, as he has not taken care to read other documents placed before him on this matter, he will see that my statement about the difference between the Government and the Methodist Church being small is indeed correct.

Mr. Millhouse: We don't know what you're going to do yet.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am sure the honourable member will be able to contain himself until tomorrow. I see that the honourable member is upset that he is losing what he has thought to be a political advantage about which he has been chortling privately with the member for Angas in recent days.

The Hon. B. H. Teusner: I take it that conversion has taken place.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know who the honourable member thinks has been converted. I believe the Bill will, or should be, passed largely in its present form with some minor amendments. In consequence, I urge honourable members that, when the Bill is in Committee, we should turn our attention specifically to the provisions of clause 6 and that, with some minor amendments, we should be able to cope with the wishes of the majority of the churches and of the majority of the people in South Australia and have a workable, sensible and reasonable provision. The Bill will not be something that is deeply disturbing of the common weal, but will be in

accordance with majority opinion of the people of this State.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

TRAVELLING STOCK RESERVE: KOORINGA, BALDINA AND KING

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the House of Assembly's resolution without amendment.

TRUSTEE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Trustee Act, 1936-1953. Bill read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It widens the power of investment of trustees in two respects: first, by empowering them to lend on the short term money market and, secondly, by providing that a trustee may lend on real estate to an extent exceeding the present limit of two-thirds of the value of the property where the loan is the subject of insurance with the Commonwealth Housing Loans Insurance Corporation. This will mean that more money will be available for building in this State where it is backed under the policy of the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation. This has been requested by the building industry and should be of considerable assistance to it.

Clause 3 deals with the first matter by the addition of a new paragraph to section 5 (1) of the principal Act setting out authorized trustee investments. The new paragraph will enable trustees to lend to dealers in the short-term money market approved by the Reserve Bank on condition that the dealer hands to the trustee a safe custody receipt issued by the bank for Government securities held by the bank and directs the bank to hold the securities on behalf of the trustee. Alternatively, the loan may be made to the dealer on the security of a commercial bill of exchange which has been accepted by a proclaimed bank.

The object of listing authorized investments for trustees is, of course, to protect both beneficiary and trustee in the event of loss. A trustee is exonerated from loss arising from authorized investments, provided of course that he has not been negligent, and a beneficiary is protected from loss arising through investments in securities of doubtful value. The short-term money market is a safe form of security, so long as the conditions laid down in the Bill are observed, and provides a remunerative form of investment for trust moneys which may be available for only a short period. Instead of investing directly in Government securities which are authorized investments, a trustee will be empowered to lend money on favourable terms for a short period with the guarantee that his loan is covered adequately by Government securities held by the Reserve Bank on his behalf. A secondary effect will be greater mobilization of resources actually held in Government securities, thereby contributing to the finance for governmental works programmes.

The other amendment is made by clause 4. Although section 5 (1) of the Trustee Act authorizes investments in real estate, section 10 provides that a trustee may be guilty of a breach of trust if he lends more than two-thirds of a properly made valuation of the property, and consequently liable for any loss on realization to the extent of the excess. Under the Commonwealth Housing Loans Insurance Act 1965, the Housing Loans Insurance Corporation thereby established is empowered to insure lenders against losses arising out of loans made by them in respect of house properties: the corporation under such a policy of insurance issued by it binds itself to make good to the lender the amount by which all sums owing (including agreed expenses for repairs and maintenance) exceed the proceeds of sale of the mortgaged property. In these circumstances, there appears to be no reason why trustees should not be empowered to lend up to the limit of the insurance on an insured property whether or not the amount lent exceeds the limit of two-thirds applicable in the ordinary case. Clause 4 so provides. A substantial advantage of this provision will be an increased mobilization of financial resources to contribute to financing high-ratio loans for housing purposes.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 11. Page 2599.)

Mrs. STEELE (Burnside): I commend the introduction of legislation that amends the Mental Health Act in regard to the control and supervision of psychiatric hostels. As all members know, great changes have taken place in recent years not only in attitudes

towards mental illness and towards patients who suffer from mental illnesses but also in the methods of treatment. These changes have been largely caused by the introduction of drugs, which are used to a much greater extent now than they were used before and which are achieving such excellent results, particularly in this field of public health. I was in London when I read with interest that the Hon. Mrs. Cooper had drawn the Government's attention to the state of some of the hostels that were providing accommodation for patients who had been discharged from mental hospitals.

I believe her attack on the laxity of control was in some way responsible for the introduction of this measure. However, I do not believe that it was entirely responsible, because I remember, and the Minister of Works probably remembers, that some years ago he and I were invited to discuss these kinds of hostel with the Mental Health Advisory Council; this matter was causing much concern and one of the difficulties was that the licensing of these types of hostel was under the control of councils, and rightly so, because they were closest to the problem and they represented ratepayers, who sometimes were critical of the nature of this type of establishment and its proximity to their homes. The Minister and I were asked whether we had any suggestions on how this difficulty could be overcome. I suggested a model by-law for the guidance of councils or alternatively a central licensing authority.

It might be argued that there was time to do something before the introduction of this legislation, possibly years ago. However, we must remember the difficulty connected with local government and also that the treatment of patients has changed. Many more patients are voluntarily entering mental hospitals for treatment and, because of the use of modern drugs, there has been a greater rate of discharge.

I believe one of the difficulties has been overcome by an assurance from the Chief Secretary in another place; he was asked how the councils would regard the kind of control envisaged in this legislation, and after consultation he replied that he had discussed the matter and that it would be the department's policy to contact councils and ascertain their attitudes to control of specific hostels in their areas.

The provision of the right kind of psychiatric hostel is very important. When a person who has been suffering from a mental illness has received treatment and can be discharged from a mental hospital and take his first steps back to the outside world, it is at this time that he needs the right kind of environment, the right kind of accommodation, and the right kind of sympathetic understanding. This is a very delicate stage in his march forward to complete rehabilitation; consequently, I believe the provisions in this Bill setting out the kinds of accommodation that shall be registered, the kinds of people who may control such psychiatric hostels, the qualifications of the staff and the ratio of staff to patients are most important. They set the climate in which these people may make a full return to normal health. As I have said they are in a delicate stage of their rehabilitation, when the wrong kind of handling by the wrong kind of people could impose tremendous stress and strain upon them and could not only retard their progress towards full and complete recovery but could even put them back into the hospital from which they had been discharged so soon before.

I am pleased that the term "boarding out" is being dispensed with, because that term is an affront to human dignity. I think the term "trial leave period", which is to be used, is much better because, with the modern understanding of and attitude towards mental illness, trial leave is synonymous with the period immediately following a patient's discharge from a mental hospital but when he is still a patient within the meaning of the Act. Because of what I have said, I consider that the penalty of $500 that will be imposed for a breach of the conditions set out for the conduct of a psychiatric hospital is appropriate. I think that this is a right and proper penalty to impose on a person who has undertaken the care of such patients but who is not fully qualified or able to provide the kind of conditions so necessary for the well being of the patient.

Further, I understand that the Government intends that the Director will be able to give a certificate that the person named therein was not the holder of a licence granted under section 87 (1) of the Act. This shows the importance of careful investigation of the qualifications of people undertaking the responsibility of conducting a home of this kind, because the period in question is an important period in the patient's life. Of course, it can be argued that it would be better for the patient who had suffered some kind of mental illness to return to his own family. In some cases it is, but the general experience of people who have been associated with this kind of

health problem is that the home is often the last place to which a mental patient should return and that he makes a much better response and is encouraged much more to stand on his own feet and face the realities and challenges that lie ahead if he is in a place where he is understood by a person properly trained to meet this kind of situation.

For all these reasons I consider that this kind of legislation is right and proper, and I am pleased that it has been introduced. I understand that the Director will have flexibility in regard to the issue of a certificate, according to the size of the psychiatric rehabilitation hospital. I think the points I have made cover the amendments being made to the Mental Health Act and, on behalf of the Opposition, I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Repeal and re-enactment of Division V of Part IV of principal Act."

Mrs. STEELE: Can the Minister say exactly what new section 87 (3) (*d*) means? Does that paragraph refer to the staff employed in the hostel, or what? It is a little ambiguous.

The Hon. FRANK WALSH (Minister of Social Welfare): This is to ensure that old people and sick people are not accommodated in the hostel to the detriment of patients generally. It is a complete safeguard with regard to psychiatric treatment in the hostel.

Mrs. Steele: It is confined to mental patients as distinct from other types of patient?

The Hon. FRANK WALSH: Yes.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (7 and 8) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS (Minister of Marine) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Harbors Act, 1936-1966. Read a first time.

The Hon. C. D. HUTCHENS: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It deals with two matters. Clause 3 amends section 78 of the principal Act, which enables the Minister to grant licences for the construction of wharves and other works to owners and occupiers of land adjoining the foreshore, by making it clear that the power extends to the grant of licences in respect of land adjoining any place within the limits of the jurisdiction of the Minister, an expression defined in section 43 as including "harbours". The Murray River has been declared a "harbour" since 1914. The power granted by section 78 has been exercised for a number of years in relation to land adjoining the Murray River, but recently the department has been informed that section 78 in its present form may not extend to the Murray River. Hence the amendments made by clause 3 (*a*) and (*b*). Clause 3 (*c*) is designed to validate licences already granted by the insertion of a new subsection in section 78.

The other amendment is made by clauses 4 and 5. By section 144 of the Act, the Governor is empowered to make regulations relating to the licensing of surveyors of the hulls and cargoes of vessels, while section 168 makes it an offence to act as such a surveyor without a licence. Both sets of provisions are repealed, so it will be unnecessary for such surveyors to be licensed in the future. Only in Western Australia are marine surveyors required to be licensed: in New South Wales the provisions for licensing were repealed in 1960, and the three remaining States have never licensed such surveyors. While it may have been useful to require licences in the early days when the condition of cargoes for export had to be watched carefully, this work is now largely performed by officers of the Department of Primary Industry and surveyors of the Department of Shipping and Transport. It is considered desirable under modern conditions to remove the licensing requirements completely, and clauses 4 and 5 do so.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11.37 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 25, at 2 p.m.