HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 28, 1968

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Bulk Handling of Grain Act Amendment,
Dairy Cattle Improvement Act Amendment,
Motor Vehicles Act Amendment (No. 2),
Railways Standardization Agreement (Cockburn to Broken Hill),
Trustee Act Amendment,
Wheat Industry Stabilization.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The SPEAKER: I notice in the gallery Mr. A. E. Allen, a member of the House of Representatives of New Zealand. Mr. Allen is the Australasian Regional Representative on the Executive Committee of the General Council of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. I know it is the unanimous wish of honourable members that Mr. Allen be accommodated with a seat on the floor of the House, and I invite the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition to introduce our distinguished visitor.

Mr. Allen was escorted by the Hon. R. S. Hall and the Hon. D. A. Dunstan to a seat on the floor of the House.

QUESTIONS

UNEMPLOYMENT

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Despite the optimistic statements made about employment in South Australia and about the situation in the building industry, numerous reports that have been made to me by builders and architects throughout South Australia have shown that, in their view, the building industry is declining. These reports seem to be confirmed by statements made in this morning's newspaper by Mr. D. H. Laidlaw, the Joint Managing Director of the Johns-Perry group of companies, who stated that 25 workers had been put off at Croydon Park in the past month and that 16 workers had been retrenched recently at Whyalla (in fact, they were retrenched last Friday). That means that 41 workers have been retrenched in this month by the Johns-Perry group of engineering companies. The reason given is a reduction in the call for structural steel for building purposes. It seems that the extent to which the building industry is declining is somewhat concealed in the employment figures by the transfer of large numbers of workers to other States, a situation that has been confirmed with me by the unions concerned. As, before the last State election, members of the Liberal Party stated that a major plank in their Party's platform was the revival of the building industry, will the Minister of Labour and Industry say what action the Government is taking in this matter?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I read with interest the article in this morning's newspaper and, as the Leader has said, the figures I gave last week could be largely influenced by the large numbers of tradesmen moving to other States. This has happened in the past: I and other members of my Party emphasized when in Opposition that it occurred during the period of the last Government. The figures I gave in this House last Tuesday were the official figures of the Commonwealth Statistician relating to employment that had been released the evening before. They showed that there had been a remarkable decrease in the number of persons unemployed in this State: in fact, they showed one of the greatest reductions and the smallest number of unemployed persons in this State since 1965. I also gave figures relating to employment in the building industry. True, the building industry is certainly not as buoyant as we should like it to be: over the last couple of years it has become rather depressed, but according to the figures I gave earlier, for the first time since the slump occurred in that industry a couple of years ago, it was officially announced that more jobs were available than there were men to fill those jobs, particularly in the bricklaying and plastering sections. Regarding the latter part of the Leader's question, I initiated inquiries after reading the article this morning, and I shall probably be able to give the Leader further information next Tuesday.

GRAPE PRICES

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: Has the Minister of Lands obtained any information following my question yesterday about the Prices Commissioner's investigation in connection with the prices to be paid for the 1969 vintage grapes?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Prices Commissioner's recommendations will be considered within the next few days, and

I shall be able to give further information on the matter within a fortnight, or perhaps a little earlier.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. CASEY: A few weeks ago I asked the Premier a question about rail standardization, and he supplied me with information regarding the cost of converting to standard gauge the existing lines between Peterborough and Adelaide and between Port Pirie and Adelaide, and the estimate he gave for the Adelaide to Port Pirie section was $17,000,000. However, a recent statement, attributed to the Political Roundsman in Canberra (Mr. S. W. Stephens), and appearing in this morning's *Advertiser* reports that "estimates were that the Adelaide to Port Pirie section would cost $50,000,000 on the basis of the South Australian Government's latest proposal". I assume that the proposal incorporates other sections, that is, from Wallaroo through to Gladstone but, even so, it seems to be a fairly large sum, considering the $17,000,000 quoted by the Premier. The article also states that "the Commonwealth is confronted with an alternative proposal that the building of a standard gauge line between Whyalla and Port Augusta should be undertaken before the standardization of the Adelaide to Port Pirie link". Will the Premier say where we are going in respect of gauge standardization in this State, and can he say exactly what were the proposals he submitted to the Commonwealth concerning priority: whether the Adelaide to Port Pirie section would come first or the Port Augusta to Whyalla section would come first, or whether, in fact, work on those two projects would be carried out simultaneously?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Many of the facts surrounding the project are under investigation. As the honourable member will know, the Commonwealth has recently suggested that an independent firm inquire into the feasibility of connecting Adelaide with the standard gauge line at Port Pirie or at some other associated point. I believe this is a major step forward in negotiations on this particularly important link for South Australia, and I have informed the Prime Minister that South Australia will be pleased to join in this survey, to provide what information we have at our disposal, and to obtain additional information if so desired. The Commonwealth Government will obviously come back to our technical people to discuss terms of reference. I do not believe we will have any difficulty in agreeing terms of reference, and I believe the inquiry will go ahead. I am sure that the honourable member will be encouraged by the remarks of the Minister (I think the article to which he referred also quoted this) when he said that the Commonwealth Government would look at this link soon (or words to that effect). That statement makes me rather optimistic. I think it is fair to say that the Government believes the link to Port Pirie to be more urgently needed in the State than the other line, although we are promoting both projects and would very much like to see a railway built to Whyalla, especially as the traffic in steel products has increased significantly recently. The immediate progress that has occurred in relation to the Port Pirie link can be seen in the acceptance by both Commonwealth and State Governments of the principle of an independent investigation. On the other hand, the State Government's proposal about the Whyalla link, which is before the Commonwealth Government, would be an important work for the State. There is little more information that I can give the honourable member. However, I will examine the files and see what recent communications there have been (as this is a current matter, there may have been correspondence in the mail today, for instance) and, if there is further information, I will give it to the honourable member. I am encouraged by the Commonwealth Government's attitude as expressed both in the Prime Minister's letter to me and in the Minister's statement reported today.

TAXI-CABS

Mr. RODDA: I understand that regulation 100 under the Metropolitan Taxi-Cab Act states that a taxi-cab is licensed to carry five persons but that a child under the age of five years is not regarded as a passenger and that every third child between the ages of five and 12 years shall not be counted as a passenger. A taxi-cab operator can be reported if he refuses to pick up a fare that constitutes five persons, even when that number is made up with children as defined in the regulation. However, a conflict arises in that, under the insurance provisions, in the event of an accident all heads are counted. The conflict appears to be that an operator can be reported for refusing to accept a fare, including children, of up to five persons as defined in the regulation whereas, by so doing, he can violate the terms of his insurance policy. As this matter seems to require examination, will the Premier have it investigated?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I shall be happy to examine the matter to see whether there is any conflict in the requirements, and I will bring down a report for the honourable member.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. VIRGO: Last Thursday's *News* contains the following report about a meeting held the previous evening:

Hearing of the first Commonwealth award for South Australian local government officers will begin in Melbourne on December 2. A meeting of 200 local government officers from all parts of South Australia was told this last night.

They were also told that "the State Government, through the Attorney-General, has sought leave to intervene in the case in an attempt to prevent the making of a Commonwealth award". Will the Attorney-General say whether that report is correct and whether the Government has taken this step, which has been described, I think correctly, as most deplorable? If the report is correct, it appears that the Attorney-General is using the office of Government to carry on the proper function of employer representative groups. This meeting of 200 members out of a possible 250 members throughout South Australia was attended by members from as far away as Streaky Bay, Tumby Bay and other places on the West Coast; from as far afield to the east as Renmark; and from the southern areas of Victor Harbour and beyond. Will the Attorney-General say whether the Government is intervening in this matter and, if it is intervening, as the case is set down to begin in Melbourne on Monday next, will he instruct the South Australian representative to support the making of a Federal award so that wage justice may be extended to local government officers in South Australia in common with the payments made to their counterparts in other States? I understand that in most cases the amounts paid to local government officers in South Australia are considerably less than the amounts paid in other States—in one instance, I believe, about $1,500 less.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I do not recall this matter at the moment, but I will have immediate inquiries made, confer with the Minister of Labour and Industry, and inform the honourable member on Tuesday next.

Mr. VIRGO: I am indebted to the Minister of Labour and Industry for expressing his concern and for expediting his consideration of the matter. Will he give any further information that he has?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The honourable member would be aware that two organizations (the Municipal Officers Association, which is registered with the Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commission, and the Local Government Officers Association, which is registered with the State Industrial Commission) are concerned in this matter. Some months ago the Government, at the behest of the Local Government Association, sought and was granted leave to intervene in the action referred to in order to maintain the jurisdiction in South Australia. Officers covered by the association operate under the Local Government Act, and it was considered that the jurisdiction should be maintained in South Australia. However, the situation has changed radically in the last 24 hours, and my latest advice is that neither the Local Government Officers Association nor the Local Government Association is now opposing the making of a Commonwealth award. In view of that advice, the Government does not intend to proceed with its intervention.

WATER LICENCES

Mr. ARNOLD: On Tuesday, the Minister of Works said that he expected to make a statement next week regarding water licences. Will the Minister of Irrigation also be able to make a statement then regarding the conversion of vegetable land within the Department of Lands to permanent planting, as a result of the submission I made to him two or three months ago? At that time the Minister of Irrigation indicated that a decision would be made on this matter following the making of a statement by the Minister of Works on water licences.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The two statements will not be made simultaneously, but mine will follow that of the Minister of Works as soon as possible.

WARDANG ISLAND

Mr. CORCORAN: The Minister of Lands will recall that some time ago I asked him a question about the leasing of Wardang Island. At that time the Minister replied that this matter was being considered and that, in due course, he would report to the House on the results of his consideration. Has the Minister completed his consideration and, if he has, what was the outcome?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have completed the consideration but not the

entire process. I am proposing to issue a perpetual lease to the present lessee of Wardang Island for a part of the land and I have told him that I would do that, but the actual formalities, possibly involving a survey, have not yet been completed. The present lessee purchased from Broken Hill Associated Smelters Limited a miscellaneous lease of Wardang Island that had about two years to run, and I approved the transfer of the lease from one lessee to the other. Following some publicity by the Aboriginal Lands Trust and also some questions in Parliament, the lessee asked me about his position in relation to the future of Wardang Island. I said, as I had said in reply to questions in the House, that, although the trust had raised this matter at its inaugural meeting, the Government then in office decided that it was not practicable for the trust to take over the island. I heard nothing of the matter. In fact, I did not know of the inquiry at the time of transfer of this lease, but the lease was transferred in the normal way, under the usual conditions. I think the intention to transfer was gazetted twice and, there being no objection, the transfer was made. The new lessee has considerable plans for the development of the island as a tourist resort and he intends to spend much money on that development.

Following the publicity, the new lessee told me that he would like to know what would be his position when the miscellaneous lease expired in 1970, because he intended to spend a large amount of money. He said that his development work would not be completed when the miscellaneous lease expired. After careful consideration, we evolved a plan whereby the lessee would be given a perpetual lease not over the whole area of the island but over an area of about 100 acres, which was the part of the island that included the improvements. I am subject to correction regarding any figures I give, because I did not know this question would be asked today. However, a perpetual lease over the nucleus of the land will be granted and the remainder will continue to be held under a miscellaneous lease. Before this action was taken, I told the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs of the position and I discussed the matter generally with the Government. The Minister informed the Aboriginal Lands Trust and, I understand, asked for the trust's comment, which was that the trust was not able to take further action regarding the island. That objection having been removed, there seemed to be no barrier to giving the lessee some security for the expenses that he would incur. Some time ago I told him that an application for a perpetual lease would be considered favourably. Although the formalities and final issue of the lease have not been completed (they are now being dealt with), a perpetual lease of the area including the improvements will be granted, and the lessee has given the necessary undertaking regarding a condition of the lease that he carry out improvements to develop the land as a tourist resort to the satisfaction of the Minister of Lands. It will not be a no-condition lease.

GRAIN STORAGE

Mr. EDWARDS: I have been told that meetings of wheatgrowers in my district (mainly the Caralue and Kimba branches of the United Farmers and Graziers) strongly favour the rationalization of wheat deliveries by South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited but that they also ask whether, if the silos are filled, the co-operative will receive wheat for open storage alongside the silos. Will you, Mr. Speaker, make a statement on this matter, and will you discuss it with the co-operative?

The SPEAKER: The co-operative has negotiated with the Australian Wheat Board and the Railways Department in an endeavour to get as much covered storage space as it can at railway centres for the storage of wheat in excess of silo capacity at the respective places where sheds for this type of storage are available. Apart from the provision of silo space and surplus storage space, the matter of open storage has not yet been decided by the board of the co-operative. It is hoped that the shipping programme will improve in the new year, so that there can be more movement of wheat by rail from country silos and also so that there would be no need for open storage. If the expected shipping programme does not materialize, the Wheat Board, in collaboration with the co-operative, will have to consider the matter. However, at present it is hoped that in the new year we will get the shipping and rail movement that will render unnecessary the provision of open storage, and we hope to be able to receive wheat delivery on a 100 per cent basis. I will take this matter up with the co-operative.

Mr. JENNINGS: I address my question to you, Mr. Speaker. It concerns the question asked recently by the member for Eyre. It is the first time I can remember the Speaker, who is the impartial presiding officer of this Chamber, giving an expression, no matter how qualified he is to give that expression, on things

of a public nature. As far as I know, questions addressed to a Speaker usually concern the conduct of the House and of the Chamber. As far as I could understand the question asked by the member for Eyre (and I suffer from a certain disability which, I think, is shared by other honourable members; I could not follow it completely), it concerned either South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited or the Minister of Agriculture. I realize that you, Mr. Speaker, decide what is in order in the Chamber (even to the clothes we should wear), but do you think it might be more proper when you answer a question such as the one asked by the member for Eyre to advise an inexperienced and junior member such as the member for Eyre to address the question to the appropriate Minister?

The SPEAKER: I am sorry the member for Enfield could not follow the question: that is no fault of mine. The member for Eyre directed his question to me, seeking information. If I am able to give information, I am only too happy to oblige. In this case I was able to give the information required. It is up to the member to decide whether to direct his question to a Minister or to me: that is the function and privilege of the honourable member himself.

Mr. CORCORAN: On a point of order and to clarify this situation, I have studied Standing Order 124, which deals with questions regarding public affairs and which states:

At the time of giving notices of motion, questions may be put to Ministers of the Crown relating to public affairs; and to other members, relating to any Bill, motion, or other public matter connected with the business of the House, in which such members may be concerned.

My interpretation of that Standing Order is that the matter raised by the member for Eyre had nothing to do with any public matter, Bill or motion before the House. I am not ridiculing the fact that the Speaker supplied the member with the information he sought, but I think that Standing Orders should be adhered to and I ask whether you, Mr. Speaker, were in order under Standing Orders in replying to the question asked by the member for Eyre.

The SPEAKER: There are other Standing Orders governing this matter and I think the question asked by the member for Eyre was in order. However, I shall be pleased to discuss the matter with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

BUSH FIRES

Mr. LANGLEY: I recently asked a question about the bush fire danger in this State, pointing out the amount of foliage in various places and the seriousness of the fire risk. The Minister of Lands said that Government departments would expedite the removal of fire dangers on Government land. As I have noticed stickers attached to the rear windscreens of motor cars, reminding people of the fire danger, will the Minister ask the Minister of Agriculture to consider making such stickers available so that members can place them on their cars?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I think that that suggestion is worth considering. It would be better for members to have on their cars stickers warning people of the danger of bush fires rather than stickers bearing a Party slogan, or something like that. I will suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that this matter be considered.

BURRA COPPER

Mr. ALLEN: Several announcements have been made recently regarding the reopening of the Burra copper mines. It is intended, if these mines are reopened, to treat the ore to the concentrate stage at Burra, and much electric power will be needed for this ore treatment. If the mines are reopened, as the natural gas pipeline is to pass within 15 miles of Burra will the Premier ask the Minister of Mines to request that a T-joint be placed in the pipeline at the nearest point to Burra so that that town can be served with natural gas?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have seen recent statements, and I have spoken to the Minister about possible new copper mining operations at Burra. I will bring to his attention the possibility of using gas in the treatment of that ore. After bringing this matter to the Minister's notice, I will obtain a report for the honourable member so that he can inform his constituents.

PRICES

Mr. CLARK: For some time my constituents in the city of Elizabeth and the surrounding area have been most concerned (and I share their concern) at the many discrepancies between prices in Elizabeth and those in the metropolitan area. It seems that in some cases Elizabeth is regarded as being in the metropolitan area but in many other instances it is regarded as a country district. I know of no other matter that has caused more disquiet in this area than that of prices, unless it is the inadequate transport services.

Will the Treasurer obtain from the Prices Commissioner, if possible, a report showing the comparison between prices in Elizabeth and those in the metropolitan area, particularly liquor prices, and also an opinion whether such difference in prices is justified?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will gladly refer that question to the Prices Commissioner. The honourable member referred to one item, but it would help in the inquiry if he would be good enough to narrow down the field of inquiry.

Mr. Clark: I should like it to be as wide as possible.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Quite so, but I suggest that the honourable member be good enough to contact the Prices Commissioner and discuss the matter with him. Although the Commissioner will note the honourable member's question in the ordinary way, and I shall be pleased to obtain a report from him for the honourable member, I suggest that the honourable member confer with the Commissioner about any matters he wishes to have investigated.

TEXTBOOKS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the provision of multiple textbooks for student teachers?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: The criticism by the Auditor-General of arrangements for students to borrow books from teachers college libraries was not made in any public document, but, apparently, the honourable member has other sources of information. The Auditor-General did, in fact, in August, 1967, refer to the relatively high rate of loss of library books at Wattle Park Teachers College, in comparison with the rate of loss at the State Library.

The Acting Principal of Wattle Park Teachers College at the time, submitted a report on measures taken at that college to ensure that library books were returned by borrowers. The Principal recommended some structural alterations to the library to improve "book security", and he stated that additional ancillary staff were required in the library. The Public Buildings Department is considering ways of improving "security" in the Wattle Park Teachers College library. As the honourable member knows, three additional lecturer-librarians and four additional library assistants will be appointed to teachers colleges from January 1, 1969, and four additional library assistants will be appointed to teachers colleges from July 1, 1969.

The administration of the library at each teachers college is the responsibility of the Principal, who makes every effort to implement a system of book borrowing which serves the needs of students at the college. Although work in teachers college libraries is the special responsibility of the lecturer-librarians and library assistants, each Principal makes the maximum use of other professional and ancillary staff in ensuring the efficient functioning of the library. The Principals of the teachers colleges keep in close touch with the appropriate administrative officers in the Education Department over all matters affecting their colleges, and I am confident, from reports of detailed discussions which the Superintendent, Teacher Education, has held with the Principals, that the multiple collection book system will function smoothly in 1969.

RUBBISH DUMPING

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about the dumping of rubbish at West Beach near the Torrens River outlet?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: No provision in the Metropolitan Drainage Act, 1935, places any responsiblity on the Minister to dispose of rubbish on the foreshore at Henley Beach from the Torrens River outlet discharge, but it has been the practice for the metropolitan drainage gang to spend some time cleaning the debris from the beach after a major flow in the Torrens River. With the limited labour and finance available under the Act, it is not practicable to assume any responsibility for the cleaning up. The Act covers the Torrens River between South Road and the Breakout Creek outlet structure, and the maintenance gang regularly removes rubbish and debris from this section of the river, but illegal dumping of rubbish is a major problem, as well as all the debris that comes down the river during flood from above the city of Adelaide. In the River Torrens Protection Act, 1949, sections 8 and 10 cover the question of debris and rubbish in the river. The powers of the Minister under this Act have been given to councils along the river.

IMPORT RESTRICTIONS

Mr. McANANEY: At present, we have record supplies of wheat and barley in South Australia and in Australia, but we are unable to dispose of all of them overseas. In this morning's newspaper under the heading

"Imports Bill is Threat", the Federal Director of the Associated Chamber of Manufactures of Australia suggests that we may have to introduce import restrictions as has been done in Britain, because we are importing far too much and it is about time we placed a restraint on our voracious appetite for oversea goods. He points out that this situation is caused not so much by the demand inflation as by the cost inflation that we inflict on ourselves. As the idea of restricting imports from those countries with which we have a favourable trade balance fills me with despair, will the Treasurer comment on this important matter?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I, too, saw this article and it caused me some concern because of the suggestions made by the Federal Director and the terms in which he expressed his view. I think the facts that led him to make a statement are well understood because the erratic movement of national currencies and the pressures that bear at present on the currencies of the various major banking nations have caused much concern. They seem to be arising with increasing frequency, but they seem to be caused by the instability of the internal economy of the particular country and the fact that its trade balances get out of line and cause a run on the currency. I think the message of these incidents comes to Australia loud and clear. In Australia our balance of trade situation is maintained largely by exports of our primary products (to which the honourable member referred), including our raw minerals, and is assisted by a capital inflow from overseas. It seems to me, however, that the effect of the statement is somewhat reduced, because it is the kind of statement that we have become accustomed to hearing from this and other sectional groups. Such groups are prone to interpret the situation in the way it suits them best and to prescribe remedies accordingly. I believe there are two ways to solve the problem to which he refers: that is, by restricting imports and by increasing exports. Mr. Anderson in his article has referred to "Draconian curbs" imposed in the U.K. and to our voracious appetites for oversea goods, but he makes no reference to the strenuous efforts that are being made in the United Kingdom at present by the Prime Minister and his Government to improve the U.K.'s balance of payments problem by adopting each of these two methods, particularly that of stimulating exports.

It is wrong for Australian industry to assume that it cannot compete effectively in volume with oversea manufacturers, and it is also wrong that we should try to create within Australia artificial shortages, or that any country in the world should try to create artificial shortages, because these do nothing to solve world problems; indeed, it seems to me that they only accentuate problems and increase tensions. We in Australia and people in other nations grow prosperous and our standards rise not just by taking in one another's washing within our own home circle but by developing trade and commerce between nations and, in so doing, creating international understanding and goodwill. Primary exports, raw minerals and investment cannot for long continue to solve Australia's balance of payment problem.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Treasurer is beginning to debate the question.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I will round off my comment by saying that I think the proper approach to this matter is that, rather than restrict imports and therefore antagonize those countries with which we hope to do business in respect of our primary industries, more attention and concentration should be given by industry in Australia to increasing its export business. This requires certain components and contributions on the part of all people who are concerned in industry. I have referred to those people who invest their money in industry: they cannot expect to get such high returns on capital as will at the same time force up the price of our industrial products. Such people must come to the party; I think that industrial management must continue research into the efficiency of administration and management, and I also believe that the workers in industry in Australia realize that it is the unit cost of production that determines our ability to compete in the export field and that they appreciate that our needs are best served by an expanding activity in the export world and not merely by processing something for sale within our own local domestic area.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT

Mr. HUDSON: Yesterday in the debate on the Highways Department, the Premier, in reply, gave an example of the possible adjustment in the allocation of idle time to jobs by saying, for example, that a mechanic might be waiting for a part to be delivered before he could proceed with a job and that a proper accounting system would require the extra waiting time to be costed to that job. One of the complaints repeated to me a number of times (and I mentioned this in the debate yesterday) was that considerable

delays occurred in the motor repair shop, in particular, in getting the necessary approvals for work to be carried out. Until approval was obtained, no spare parts could be ordered and, even with the most simple spare parts, a delay of up to two weeks sometimes occurred. If the information is correct, these are fairly serious matters of administration, and I should be grateful if the Premier would ask the Auditor-General to have a look at this matter of organization as well.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have spoken to the Minister of Roads and Transport about this matter and, as I indicated yesterday, he will ask the Auditor-General to investigate any malpractices and the alleged falsification of time cards. The Minister hopes to have the report on those allegations available by the end of next week. When it becomes available, I hope it will include the point the honourable member has raised today. I will draw it to the Minister's attention and, in addition, I point out that the report will be tabled in the House.

MOTOR VEHICLE CONSTRUCTION

Mr. EVANS: Will the Premier ascertain whether in this State any comprehensive insurance policy issued on a Standard Cooper S can be considered null and void for the reason that this car does not conform to our State laws?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I believe this question relates to one the honourable member asked me previously about cars which were alleged to be sold in South Australia but which did not conform to the requirements of existing legislation. I will refer the matter to the relevant authorities that are already dealing with the honourable member's previous question, and I will obtain a joint reply for him.

SHIPYARDS

The Hon. R. R. LOVEDAY: In the *Advertiser* today there is a report concerning the putting off of certain tradesmen in Whyalla, and I know also that some subcontractors who are engaged in steel construction in various parts of the Whyalla shipyard are experiencing difficulty in keeping their work force together. There is also a report to the effect that the Premier is alleged to have said that his recent visit to Canberra led him to think that the Commonwealth Government would help Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited enlarge its shipyards so that it might build vessels of 80,000 tons and over. Has the Premier anything more definite to tell the House on Commonwealth assistance for B.H.P. Company with regard to the shipyards, so that larger vessels can be built, and will he say whether such help will be given soon?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I said in reply to a previous question (I think it was a question and not a debate) that I had spoken to the Prime Minister informally about shipbuilding in South Australia and that I believed that the Commonwealth Government stood behind the shipbuilding industry in this State. I did not go into greater specifics with the Commonwealth Government concerning employment at Whyalla. I understand there has been a drop in employment in heavy engineering because of the completion of the steelworks and associated work on the pelletizing plant. This was a large project, as the honourable member realizes, involving much capital expenditure, and it would obviously create a peak in heavy engineering work of that type in the area. However, the consequent problem is that work in this field tends to tail off. Regarding the honourable member's inquiry specifically about shipbuilding, I will obtain a report and bring it down soon.

CODLIN MOTH

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Lands obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question whether the flights of codlin moth could be broadcast over the Australian Broadcasting Commission stations on three consecutive days to warn growers of the flights of this pest?

The Hon D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture states:

It is usual for the Agriculture Department to issue warnings on the need to spray against major pests when observations indicate that a flight of adult insects or a hatching of larvae is occurring. The difficulty in issuing such warnings with regard to codlin moth is that the over-wintering population of this insect is very much affected by local climatic conditions and can be very variable in its hatching period. This means that the timing of sprays must be based on localized records. The department maintains moth trapping records at the research centres at Lenswood and Blackwood and this information will continue to be made available as a general guide and warning.

JUVENILE EMPLOYMENT

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my recent question about employment at Port Pirie?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The Regional Director of the Department of

Labour and National Service has advised that the area served by the Port Pirie office of the Commonwealth Employment Service covers the whole of the Lower North of the State and all of Yorke Peninsula. There is a population of 64,000 in that area and a work force of 24,000. At the end of October there were only 44 adult females and 113 junior females awaiting placement. Information is not readily available as to how many of those 157 females were married or single.

Mr. McKEE: I originally asked for details of the number of unemployed female juniors at Port Pirie, because I have a special interest in this area. I previously pointed out to the Minister that a deputation asked me to seek this information because of the unusually large number of unemployed juniors in my district, and I also said that another large contingent would be leaving school soon and that that would aggravate the situation. I do not think it is an unreasonable request that the Regional Director of the Department of Labour and National Service obtain the figures for the Port Pirie district. These people must be registered in the department, and the information should be readily obtainable. Will the Minister again try to obtain these figures for Port Pirie?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Twice I have tried to satisfy the honourable member in his request for information. The information I have provided for him is what we have been able to obtain from the Commonwealth Department of Labour and National Service, and I have said that it is not possible to dissect it further. As far as I can recall, I said that, including Port Pirie, Yorke Peninsula and the general area of the northern part of the State, only 44 adult and 117 junior females were unemployed. I could not give the honourable member specific details of the position at Port Pirie, because I had not been able to obtain them. Further, the Commonwealth department informed me that it did not have this information. If the honourable member wishes to take this matter further I can arrange an interview for him with the Deputy Director of that department, and he can ask him whether this information is forthcoming. I and my department have done everything to satisfy the honourable member.

TAILEM BEND RAMP

Mr. WARDLE: A ramp that has been constructed in the railway yard in the centre of the township of Tailem Bend is sufficiently high to allow trucks to back up it and deposit a load of lucerne pellets into railway trucks. As there are many shops and houses nearby, will the Minister of Works (in the temporary absence of the Attorney-General) ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to consider the sealing of the surface of the road on the ramp and the metalling of the battering of the ramp?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I will ask the Minister for a report on the matter.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RYAN: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked yesterday about the salary of Mr. Ramsay as Director of Industrial Promotion?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The matter of additional salary to be paid to Mr. Ramsay as Director of Industrial Promotion is currently before the Public Service Board for a recommendation.

BANK HOLIDAY

Mr. HUGHES: Last week I received correspondence from the Secretary of the Australian Bank Officials Association (South Australian Division) informing me that the Premier intended to receive a deputation from the association last Friday concerning the Government's refusal of the association's request for a bank holiday on December 31 this year. As I have already asked questions about this matter, will the Premier now tell me the final decision made at that meeting?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I told the deputation from the association that the Government could not vary its decision and approve the additional holiday sought by the association, and I understand that members of the deputation went away to consider their position.

PRO RATA LEAVE

Mr. BURDON: I think the Minister of Labour and Industry is aware that late last year an amendment was made to the Public Service Act that was proclaimed earlier this year. Subsequently an anomaly was found in sections 90, 91 and 126 of the Act whereby Government daily-paid employees are not now receiving *pro rata* leave. On October 7 it was said in another place that Cabinet had agreed that amendments to the Act would be introduced to overcome this anomaly. Can the Minister say whether these amendments will be introduced this session to solve the problem?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I understand from the Chief Secretary, who has conferred with me on the matter, that drafting is proceeding. When it is complete, an amending Bill will be introduced.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION

Mr. RICHES: A constituent of mine has found great difficulty in registering a Land Rover to be used for work on patrol stations out from Port Augusta. Although requests have been made from time to time for the decentralization of some of the work of the Motor Vehicles Department, I know the department believes this is not practicable at this juncture. We have asked that there should be a review of the present methods of handling applications with a view to seeing that cases such as that of my constituent (who took 29 days to get his registration disc) do not occur again. On October 11 my constituent applied for the registration of a Land Rover (registration no. RFK 553) for which a 14-day permit was issued. On October 18 a notice was received stating that $4 extra was required and that a weighbridge notice should be forwarded. On October 21 a cheque was forwarded for $4. On that same day, the applicant telephoned the Motor Vehicles Department explaining that there was no weighbridge operating at Port Augusta. He was assured that he would receive his registration disc and a declaration form regarding the vehicle's weight which he was to sign and return to the department. After 11 days, on November 1, following another telephone call which cost $2, my constituent was told that the department could not trace the third party insurance certificate. This certificate was issued by Hartford Fire Insurance Company of 68 Grenfell Street, Adelaide, on October 11 (and I have the policy number). The vehicle was required for work at the Twins Station and should have left a week after the application for registration. The weighbridge notice was enclosed but, to have the vehicle weighed, it was necessary to take it to Quorn and back (a distance of 50 miles). This all added up to a fairly expensive registration disc. Finally, the disc arrived 29 days after the application and then, on November 21, a further request was received from the department for the $4 which it alleged had not been paid. Actually, the cheque for $4 was passed for payment at a Port Augusta bank on October 29. It is a serious matter when vehicles of this kind are kept out of operation in a town where contracts are entered into for work so many miles into the outback. I consider there are circumstances here that need investigation. Although the registration disc has now been obtained, steps should be taken to see that this does not happen again.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I agree that this is an intolerable situation: a wait of 29 days for a registration disc should not be allowed. I am surprised to find that there is no weighbridge at Port Augusta, as I would have thought a town of its size would have a weighbridge. However, that is only one of many factors in a trail of errors, but it seems to have had some impact on the situation. I know the Minister of Roads and Transport, who is a most energetic Minister, is looking into the way registrations are obtained by the public, with the idea of bringing greater efficiency to the system. It is relatively easy in the city, if one has the time, to obtain a registration for a vehicle personally, but it can be most difficult under the circumstances that have been outlined. I will ask the Minister how far he has inquired into registration procedures and to follow up this incident so that it will not be repeated.

NATIONAL PARKS

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question concerning a parcel of land at Tea Tree Gully proposed as a national park?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Detail has been prepared so that valuations can be made of the land east of Tea Tree Gully that it has been suggested should be purchased for a national park. These valuations will be effected, it is hoped, within the next fortnight and this will allow a decision to be made whether, in the light of the amount of money involved, it would be practicable to purchase any or all of the area referred to.

BAROSSA PASSENGER SERVICES

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I understand that earlier this week a decision was made regarding the Government's railway passenger service rationalization plan so far as it affects the Barossa Valley. Will the Premier now give the details of the decision?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Minister of Roads and Transport states:

Road passenger services will operate to Barossa Valley towns such as Lyndoch, Tanunda, Angaston, Nuriootpa and Truro, and to Kapunda, Eudunda and Robertstown from December 16 next. The decision to replace existing rail services had only been

made after very full consideration of representations made to the Government by deputations from both districts and a petition from the Tanunda-Angaston area. All these representations and suggestions of altered services had been fully considered. A suggestion of a trial period with Bluebird cars is not practical, for the reason that these cars are not available without taking them from other services. The position would not materially improve when the Moonta rail passenger service is closed and, in due course, rail standardization will create a further demand for these cars. Experience has also clearly shown that on lines where Bluebirds are used, patronage continues to be most disappointing. To meet full costs on the Angaston line, for instance, with Bluebirds operating there would need to be an average patronage of 72 a train and at least 30 a train to meet out of pocket costs consisting of charges other than interest, depreciation and other less important items. Average patronage on the Barossa line at present is 11 passengers a train. Reduced services with existing equipment would not noticeably affect the financial position.

Promises made a few years ago for new equipment on these railway lines on more detailed investigations proved to be quite impracticable. Equipment to rehabilitate services that it is proposed to cancel (and these include services other than the Barossa Valley ones) would cost $4,000,000 and an additional annual interest bill of $270,000. We cannot afford this when experience shows that it would bring no material gain. The road services to be introduced will provide good quality equipment, flexible service and daily fares substantially lower than daily rail fares. In addition, parcels up to 50 lb. in weight can be carried, with special permits, where appropriate in emergency circumstances, for overweight items. Other road parcel services already exist, and the railways themselves will operate a parcel service. The Government is confident that these road services will provide all the service required by these areas and that experience will bring satisfaction to local residents. Present pension and student concessions will apply to the proposed new services. One matter that has been mentioned by deputations is tourism. In the past this has been catered for almost exclusively by road charter trips. This will continue, but can be augmented by the new road services. This must benefit the Barossa Valley. The annual savings to the State are $80,000 on the Angaston line and $90,000 on the Eudunda line. With a suitable alternative service at no cost this cannot be ignored at any time and it is more vital when we are trying to restore the State's finances, particularly in an era of rising wage and other costs. Time tables for road services will be forwarded to the councils in the area by the Transport Control Board within the next few days. In the Barossa Valley, on week days there will be two morning services to Adelaide and an afternoon service, together with one morning service from Adelaide and two afternoon services. There will be a service each way on Saturdays and Sundays. For Freeling, Kapunda, Eudunda and Robertstown, on week days there will be one service each way, with an additional early service from Eudunda on Monday mornings. There will also be one each-way service on Saturdays and Sundays. Examples of approved fares are:

	Single Fare $
Truro	1.00
Angaston	.90
Tanunda	.80
Robertstown	1.20
Eudunda	1.00
Kapunda	.90

It is important to note that a road service is readily adaptable according to demand. Arrival and departure times, for instance, are matters that can be quickly altered according to demand.

AIRCRAFT WORKS

Mr. CLARK: Recently the Leader of the Opposition, in asking a question of the Premier, deplored the pending closure of the Commonwealth aircraft works at Parafield, and I know that the Premier shared that concern. Many of my constituents in Gawler, Elizabeth and Salisbury are concerned about the matter. Has the Premier any further information consequent upon his promise to do the best he could regarding this pending closure?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: As promised, I wrote to the Commonwealth Minister about this closure. However, before receiving a reply, I read from the Minister's public statement that there was a possibility of the additional manufacture in Australia of a wing for a new type of aircraft, and I had my officers contact the Commonwealth department, only to find that this had no effect on additional manufacture in South Australia, because any such work undertaken would require the construction of a new factory of a type to which the plant here could not be adapted. The Commonwealth Minister told me that his department would make every endeavour to provide for the employment of those now employed at the Parafield plant, and I will bring down the Minister's reply in full for the honourable member.

AGRICULTURAL MACHINERY

Mr. FERGUSON: Many small agricultural manufacturing firms in South Australia have invented machinery that has relieved much of the hard manual labour in primary production. I refer mainly to the manufacture of stone-gathering machines and stump rakes. I understand that there is a potential export market for this type of machinery but that firms that manufacture it are not able to send demonstration machines. Will the Premier find out

whether there is such potential and, if there is, whether the establishment of this trade can be assisted?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: My department and I are conscious of the innovations accomplished in South Australia regarding farm machinery, particularly that for land clearing, in which some South Australian machinery leads the world. Shipments of these items have been made to such unlikely markets as Canada, and I have attended functions in connection with sending such plant overseas. Although we are keen to foster this type of manufacture as one of our specialties, any backing that the Government gives must be examined by the Industries Development Committee. I suggest that any firm or constituent in the honourable member's district desiring assistance in this matter approach me or the officers of the department or prepare a case for the Director, who will forward it to the appropriate authorities for consideration. Any technical help required will be given by my department.

CHARLESTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. GILES: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about repairing the toilet block at the Charleston Primary School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Funds have been approved for the provision of new toilet blocks at this school, and it is expected that tenders will be called in January, 1969. Because of the condition of the existing toilets, an inspection will be made to see whether any urgent repair work should be done before the new toilets are erected.

SUPERANNUATION

Mr. ARNOLD: In the absence of the Premier I ask a question of the Treasurer about superannuation of officers in Government departments, particularly the Lands Department. It has been pointed out to me by one or two of my constituents that if a husband dies and the wife survives she can collect only about half the husband's superannuation benefit, but if the wife dies and the husband survives he is able to collect the full benefit. When the wife survives she would be almost as well off if she did not receive superannuation, because she could collect a full pension. Obviously, it is more difficult, financially, for the wife after her husband has died, because she is then responsible for repairs to the house and other costs. Will the Treasurer consider whether anything cannot be done to improve the present situation, in order to increase, if possible, the amount received by the wife from the South Australian Superannuation Fund?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: This aspect is common to every superannuation scheme. It is certainly built into the Public Service and the Parliamentary superannuation schemes and, as far as I know, it is a principle that is generally observed. Whatever may be the merits of this suggestion, I think the honourable member will appreciate that, if the Superannuation Fund is to provide an equal benefit for either husband or wife or provide a benefit to the surviving widow equal to the benefit to be provided for the superannuitant, the cost of superannuation payments would increase steeply, because it would mean that two people were insured instead of one.

PRICE CONTROL

Mr. BROOMHILL: In a recent copy of the annual report of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures (which the chamber was good enough to forward to all members) a paragraph states:

> Representatives of this Chamber, the Chamber of Commerce, and the Retail Traders Association presented to the Government a detailed submission for the abolition of price control. Further discussions with the Minister will be held soon.

Can the Treasurer say whether the Government is seriously considering abolishing price control?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: From time to time representations are made to the Government on various matters, and the honourable member would know that the Government would receive representations on this matter. That is all I have to report at this stage.

BOOL LAGOON

Mr. RODDA: My question concerns Bool Lagoon and the intention to make it a holding basin. Although there has been quite a wet year, I believe the flow down Mosquito Creek from Lake Victoria this year has not exceeded 500 cusecs. Further, despite ponding and the engineering work that has been carried out at Bool Lagoon, it still is not the answer to a maiden's prayer, and additional work is necessary. Certain landholders in the district and members of the Field Naturalists Society are concerned that the work undertaken may interfere with the bird life in the area although, if the work is not done, the increased flow in Mosquito Creek may represent a safety hazard

in the district, because of the presence of a large area of ponded water. Can the Minister of Lands say what is intended in respect of extra engineering work at Bool Lagoon?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have a report from the Chairman of the South-Eastern Drainage Board and, as it is rather too long to read to the House, I will give a digest of it. The Drainage Board uses Bool Lagoon in the area's drainage system. In the north-eastern corner of the lagoon there is a spillway at about R.L. 267. There is a regulator on the western side, its purpose being to match the drain capacity, which will take about 700 cusecs. Anything greater than that is too much for the drain and will lead to trouble. The board consulted with the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department, and tried to keep the level at R.L. 266 last year. The flow of 550 cusecs was recorded and the regulator on the western side had to be used twice in order to prevent flooding. Mosquito Creek at times flows at well over 1,100 cusecs, and there have been problems in draining the lagoon, even when the regulator has been used. As a result, the board this year will have to lower the water level and do some survey work, and excavation work will be carried out during the summer. The Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation, who has been consulted on the matter, is in agreement with the position.

The water level will be lowered shortly when it is believed that most of the bird life will have hatched and the young birds will have reached the stage of being able to look after themselves. While everything possible is being done to preserve fauna, the necessary drainage works must be carried out and, in any case, the work will consolidate Bool Lagoon as a fauna and game reserve in the future. Perhaps I could ask leave to have the report inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Mr. HUDSON: No. It is not statistical information, is it? I refer to the Standing Order relating to the insertion of material in *Hansard,* which requires that material to be inserted with leave is to be material of a statistical nature. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to enforce that Standing Order.

The SPEAKER: As I take that as an objection, the report cannot be inserted.

Mr. RODDA: On a further point of order, this information is vital to my district and, if it is not inserted, I will ask that the Minister read it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister cannot read it at this stage.

BLOOD TESTS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about blood tests in affiliation cases?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It was in asking this question that the Leader made a confession (for the first time in my association with him) that he was wrong and had omitted to do something.

Mr. Corcoran: You're never wrong!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: He admitted that, when he was Minister, he omitted to do something which should have been done.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: You wouldn't admit that, would you?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I make those admissions freely. The ironical part is that in this case the Leader was not wrong, and it was an admission he need not have made. The proclamation of section 61a of the Social Welfare Act, which he asked should be made and said it should have been made when he was Minister, is not on my information from the Acting Director of Social Welfare really necessary. There are informal procedures now for the taking of blood tests, and the giving of evidence in respect of them to the court, which make it undesirable indeed that the proclamation should be made.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Why? It is the right of the juvenile to demand a blood test.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If the Leader is protesting now, I shall, for his information and that of other members, give him a full answer as I have received it from the Acting Director. The report states:

Section 61a of the Social Welfare Act, 1926-1965, which makes provision for courts of summary jurisdiction to order blood tests in affiliation cases, if the defendant so requests, is not yet proclaimed. There could be some difficulties about the formalized procedures required under the section. Subsection (5) provides that the court shall nominate a medical practitioner to take blood samples and a pathologist to make the blood tests. The pathologist so nominated must be a legally qualified medical practitioner whose name is on a panel of names prepared by the Minister on the recommendation of the Director-General of Public Health. I am informed that it is the practice in South Australia for all requests for blood tests of the type normally made in affiliation cases to be made to the Red Cross Blood Centre. The tests are made there by Mr. Edward Vincent, a Fellow of the Institute

of Blood Technology and Chief Medical Technologist at the centre. Although Mr. Vincent is not a qualified medical practitioner his findings are accepted by the courts.

The present arrangements for blood tests in affiliation cases are on a voluntary basis. In cases handled by the department arrangements are made for the mother, the child and the defendant to attend by appointment at the Red Cross Blood Centre. There, the Chief Medical Technologist personally takes blood samples, conducts the tests and furnishes the department with a written report showing the results of the tests. The information is then made known to both parties and where appropriate to the court. This procedure operates satisfactorily and at no cost to the parties or the department. In many cases after blood tests have been completed satisfactory arrangements can be made between the parties without court action. If court action is taken the written report of the Chief Medical Technologist on the results of the tests is submitted by the department as evidence and accepted by the courts. As there could be some disadvantages in substituting the formalized and more complicated procedures provided for in section 61a of the Act for the present arrangements no action has been initiated by the department to have the section proclaimed. Before this could be done it would be necessary—

(1) To have the Director-General of Public Health recommend to the Minister a panel of names of pathologists who are legally qualified medical practitioners. It is understood that two medical practitioners at the Red Cross Blood Centre could be included on the panel if they are agreeable to make the blood tests, furnish certificates of the results and, when ordered, attend court as witnesses.

(2) Regulations would need to be made for the carrying out of the section. Forms would need to be prescribed.

(3) Funds would have to be provided to meet the fees, costs and expenses to be paid, in the first instance, by the Minister as provided in subclause (8). In some cases, because of the likelihood of serious deterioration in the blood samples, it might be necessary to bring the parties to Adelaide or to some other centre from where the samples could be sent to the pathologist within the time prescribed. Costs and expenses to be paid, in the first instance, by the Minister would then include fares and accommodation as well as any fees and other costs. Subclause (10) provides for the reimbursement by the defendant of all moneys so paid by the Minister if the case against the defendant is proved.

That is the substance of the minute given to me by the Acting Director and, in view of that, as at present advised, I do not intend to initiate action to have the section proclaimed. However, if the Leader can give me any specific reasons why this should be done (if he can give me the details of any cases in which inconvenience or hardship has been caused by this not having come into operation), I shall be glad to re-examine the matter.

PARLIAMENTARY DRESS

Mr. HUDSON: I refer to the cartoon by Mr. Norman Mitchell in today's *News* showing you, Mr. Speaker, in bed, with your wig on, your toe out of the end of the bed, and your finger out of the window. The legend on the cartoon states, "Speaker to decide M.Ps. dress day to day; members advised to phone him on what to wear". You, Sir, are shown on the telephone, and the comment beneath the cartoon states, "Barometric pressure 29.37, wind s.s.w., and my corn aches; you will wear long fleecy-lined undies, pin-striped wool tie . . . ". I have been looking closely at one or two members and I have noticed that the Attorney-General is wearing something which might loosely be described as a pin-striped wool tie. Can you say, Sir, whether the cartoon is an accurate description of how the new Standing Orders will work? Do you, in fact, have a corn, as represented by the cartoon, or is the cartoonist slandering you? Is it a fact that the Attorney-General telephoned you about what to wear and that you told him to wear a pin-striped wool tie, and is he in fact wearing long fleecy-lined undies?

The SPEAKER: I appreciate the wit and humour of Mr. Mitchell's cartoon in the *News*. The honourable member asked whether I intended that members should telephone me about what they should wear. I think it was made perfectly clear, in the debate yesterday, by other members of the Standing Orders Committee that that was the opinion of the Attorney-General and not necessarily that of other members of the committee. However, regarding dress, I particularly ask members to read the general rule: it is that the traditional dress (shirt, tie, coat and long trousers) should be retained. As long as that remains the rule, while I am Speaker I intend to carry it out.

WILD TURNIP

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked some time ago about wild turnips growing alongside railway lines?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Reports indicate that there are two types of turnip weed growing on Eyre Peninsula, being described respectively as the short-fruited and long-fruited types. Neither of these two weeds has, as yet, been proclaimed a noxious weed, nor, so far as can be ascertained, has a concerted and determined effort been made to eradicate or control their spreading. It is further understood that several district councils are making approaches to have the short fruited variety declared a noxious weed. Should this be done and the Minister of Agriculture declare either one or both species as noxious, then concerted efforts on both sides would be taken to effect their eradication. It is understood that the short-fruited variety exists mainly on railway land, and action will be taken forthwith at least to check the spread by burning off, followed by chemical treatment next season. Control measures for the long-fruited variety, where there are heavy infestations both on and off railway land, call for more intensive control measures and, subject to adjacent landholders making a worthwhile effort to eradicate the weeds from their property, this department would do the same. Eradication on railway land, while no action is taken on adjacent land, only re-invites infestation of the railway property.

PACKAGING

Mr. RYAN: In 1967 the Weights and Measures Act was amended to bring it into line with legislation in the other States, the Act in this State not having been amended for some time. Included in the amending Bill was a provision relating to packaging that was designed to bring about some degree of uniformity with provisions in other States. Also included was a provision to prevent such terms as "king size" being used on packages. I understand this provision was to operate from January, 1969. Can the Minister of Lands say whether the Government still intends to have this provision operate from January, 1969, because articles marked "king size" are still freely advertised and it would take some time for them to disappear as intended by the provision?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Actually, the Act to which the honourable member is referring is the Packages Act of 1967. Probably the Weights and Measures Act was amended consequently, but the Packages Act was introduced to deal with the matters to which the honourable member has referred. That Act, having become law, is to be administered by me, and it will be administered in the way in which it was meant to be administered. A number of conferences have been held since the Act was passed that have been attended by officers of the department and the Minister (the former Minister of Lands attended at least one of those conferences). The provisions of the Act are coming into effect in stages. I cannot tell the honourable member the respective dates, because some parts of the Act will operate perhaps 12 months later than other parts. However, most of the Act has been proclaimed, even though some provisions in it will not take effect for some time. One part of the Act has not been proclaimed. This relates to labelling and, although this State was ready to proclaim the provision, the other States were not ready and uniformity was thought to be desirable. As the labelling system in this State was satisfactory, we were prepared to proclaim the provision but, at the request of the Commonwealth Minister, we withheld the proclamation until a conference could be held, and that conference was held last Monday. As a result of this conference we intend to make minor legislative changes in order to be even with the other States, which have virtually adopted our proposal, but there is a minor matter that must be dealt with to alter the Act. I hope that measures will be brought in shortly and, with that exception, the Packages Act will operate according to the programme laid down in the original schedule.

NATURAL GAS

Mr. FREEBAIRN: About eight weeks ago a constitutent of mine at Hamley Bridge requested me to ask the Minister of Roads and Transport why Brambles had gained a contract for the transport of pipes in preference to the Railways Department. A reply to a question on this subject by the member for Edwardstown took about six weeks to obtain. Will the Attorney-General ask his colleague why the Railways Department took so long to give him the information?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I have had inquiries made and the following is the position:

The member for Edwardstown asked the question on October 8, 1968, which was forwarded to the Railways Commissioner for report the following day. The Commisioner's report, which was received on October 16, 1968, indicated that it would be necessary to obtain additional information from the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority. This was referred to

the Treasurer, who obtained a report from the authority which was then received in the office of the Minister of Roads and Transport on about November 4, 1968. The reply to the member for Edwardstown was prepared on November 8, 1968, and subsequently forwarded to the Attorney-General. The member for Light referred to this question on November 12, 1968, when the answer apparently was not in the Attorney-General's bag. He did, however, answer the question on November 14, 1968.

From the time of asking the question to the time of answer is a period of five weeks and two days. This length of time is regretted, but there are occasions when, because questions may involve obtaining information from more than one authority, there will be some delay in obtaining an answer. In addition, some questions require considerable investigation to provide an answer. Parliamentary questions are treated by the Minister of Roads and Transport's department as urgent measures and every possible step is taken to obtain replies as expeditiously as possible. This portfolio has, however, been subjected to a considerable barrage of questions which the existing staff, among their other duties, are working under full pressure to handle. Since September 1, 1968, there have been 228 questions (not on notice) asked on roads and transport and local government matters. Of these, 188 have been answered within the following periods: one week, 27; two weeks, 106; three weeks, 37; four or more weeks, 18. As of this morning—

this report was prepared last Tuesday—

there were 40 questions unanswered that were asked within the following periods: within the last week, 13; within the last two weeks, 17; *within the last three weeks, six; *more than three weeks ago, 4.

* In all these cases the questions either concern other departments or are of a nature requiring substantial investigation. Eleven of these 40 questions outstanding are now available to be answered.

I have already this week answered most of them. The report further continues:

Officers with long association with Parliamentary matters have no doubt that it would be a very long time since so many questions have been asked of one Ministry in such a short space of time.

TOTALIZATOR AGENCY BOARD

Mr. CORCORAN: Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether any investigation has been made into the establishment of a Totalizator Agency Board office at Kingston in the South-East and, if no such investigation has been made, could it be made?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I will ask my colleague.

At 4 o'clock the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Electoral Act, 1929-1965, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Following consideration of the Millicent electoral petition by the Court of Disputed Returns it seemed desirable to examine the Electoral Act to see what modifications should be effected in the light of the judgment of the court and of the matters which arose during the hearing. In the hearing of the electoral petition and the cross-petition, the issue, in substance, resolved itself as to the question of the admission or rejection of the votes represented by 15 ballot-papers. Five of these turned on the question of whether or not the ballot-papers were posted before the close of poll. At section 86 the Electoral Act provides, in effect, that unless the returning officer is satisfied that a ballot-paper was in fact posted before the close of poll he must disallow the ballot-paper. In its judgment of May 2, 1968, the court, in a majority decision, held that it could admit certain evidence to assist it in the determination of the question as to when particular ballot-papers were posted; that is, evidence which in the nature of things could not be available to the returning officer at the time he had to consider the question.

After sittings extending over a number of days and after having a number of witnesses examined and cross-examined, the court came to the conclusion that two of the five votes should have been rejected and that the remaining three should have been admitted. As to the difficulty in reaching its decision, the following observations were made by the court:

In any appreciation of the evidence of an elector who seeks to uphold the validity of his vote and have it included in the count, substantial weight must be attached to the circumstances that, in the very nature of things, a respondent can have little or no means of controverting the assertion of such a witness by the introduction of destructive evidence. The negative is often incapable of proof and, speaking generally, in the ordinary case of a controverted election, it would be well-nigh impossible for a respondent to adduce evidence to impeach the affirmative evidence of a witness

who, for instance, deposes to the actual posting, prior to the close of poll, of an envelope containing a postal ballot-paper. (Supplementary reasons for judgment, p. 23, paragraph 4.)

As to the task of the returning officer, the court had this to say:

In actual practice the only evidence before the returning officer at the time of conducting the preliminary scrutiny would ordinarily be the application for the postal vote certificate, the envelope bearing the postal vote certificate and containing the postal ballot-paper, records of the names of postal voters and of the districts appearing in the postal vote certificates, advices of the transmission of envelopes containing postal votes and, no doubt, a certified list of voters. In coming to a decision the returning officer would commonly rely upon these documents, but so long as section 86 simply provides that if an envelope bearing the postal vote certificate has been posted or delivered prior to the close of poll the ballot paper shall be accepted for scrutiny, and so long as regulation 30 stands in its present form, it is difficult to conceive how, in some circumstances, an elector would be able to prove the due posting of the envelope without recourse to *ex parte* and perhaps, self-serving or partisan evidentiary materials. The returning officer cannot be expected to act in a judicial or *quasi*-judicial capacity; and to impose on him the task of deciding upon the accuracy, reliability and veracity of the supplementary evidence put before him with a view to his accepting a ballot-paper, is something which we do not think was really envisaged by Parliament. The problems which could thus fall for decision would be troublesome enough for this court let alone a returning officer who is called upon as a layman to exercise his statutory functions. (Supplementary reasons for judgment, page 27, paragraph 4.)

Thus, the Statute enjoins the returning officer to reach an *ad hoc* decision which will be upheld by a Court of Disputed Returns after days of deliberation. This is just not common sense! At least when the provision was first enacted the returning officer had the advantage of being able, in doubtful cases, to refer to a postmark on the envelope. Today this slight assistance is denied him: more and more post offices are closed on Saturdays, and bulk prefranked posting dispenses with postmarks. In these circumstances, he is unable to decide doubtful cases with certainty and as a result every close run election could be followed by an almost speculative appeal to the Court of Disputed Returns. In the past the difficulties inherent in this provision may have been justified if the absence of the provision would have the effect of depriving a person in a remote locality of his vote. However, it is suggested that this argument is no longer valid. In the last general election a potential postal voter would have had 19 days in which to receive his postal vote certificate and return his vote to the authorities. There must be few places in the world where a communication cannot be sent and returned within that period of time if the parties involved act with due expedition. Where such a communication cannot move within that period, it is unlikely the additional period of seven days allowed for its return (and I emphasize "its return") would make any difference.

To summarize, the provision relating to the late reception of postal ballot-papers should be removed, because (*a*) in doubtful cases it is frequently impossible for the returning officer to determine whether or not a ballot-paper should be admitted and as a corollary the results of close run elections are often unnecessarily clouded in doubt; and (*b*) the provision no longer serves its clearly intended purpose which was to ensure that persons in remote areas were not deprived of their votes.

A further five votes were disputed on what was, substantially, a single ground, that the witness did not fall or did not appear to fall within the class of authorized witnesses as enumerated in section 80. It was not suggested that the witness did otherwise than perform their function *qua* witnesses properly but merely that they did not appear to fall within the enumerated class. However, when the list is examined one finds that in fact it includes almost every adult in this State and a considerable number of mature infants. If the suggestion of the court was followed (supplementary reasons for judgment, page 26, paragraph 4) the enumeration would, in fact, include almost every adult in the Commonwealth and a large number of mature infants. It seems pointless to continue this enumeration *ad infinitum* and, accordingly, the qualifications of an authorized witness have been expresesd as being "over or apparently over the age of eighteen years".

Two further ballot-papers were disputed on the grounds that they were improperly marked. Both of these papers could have been considered by the Returning Officer for the State and that officer would have been expected to make, putting it no higher, a *quasi*-legal decision. It is felt that, as a layman, he is not entirely equipped to make such decisions and, accordingly, it is proposed that this duty will devolve on a legally qualified electoral referee of substantial experience. A further vote was challenged on the now notorious ground that it was cast by the returning officer in breach of section 125 of the Act. An

examination of this matter leads to the question of the desirability (*a*) of generally, effectively, disenfranchising the returning officer; and (*b*) on the rare occasions when he is permitted to vote compelling him to cast his vote in the full glare of attendant publicity.

The final two disputed votes arose in connection with an apparent duplication of votes. This surely is not justified. Finally, regard was had to the suitability of the Court of Disputed Returns, constituted as it was, to undertake the task imposed on it. The particular composition of the court reflects its unique position as an organ of the Legislature; it is, in effect, Parliament sitting in its judicial capacity. Historically the evolution of this sort of tribunal can be traced from the time when it was constituted by the whole House of Commons before 1770 (when the hearings had degenerated into mere trials of strength of contending factions) through the period up to 1868, during which period many attempts were made to ensure that trials of electoral petitions would be patently uninfluenced by other than the merits of the case. In 1868 this particular jurisdiction of Parliament was, in the United Kingdom, transferred by Statute to the courts of law. The same position obtains in the Commonwealth and every Australian State other than this State. While it is true there is no virtue in mere uniformity for uniformity's sake, it is equally true that such a radical departure from the norm as exists in this State does not, of itself, necessarily have any merit. The following reasons seem to justify the reconstitution of the court along what are now more traditional lines:

(*a*) the matters before it, particularly in the case of the recent election petition, are essentially matters of law and matters which are more and more reflected in the system of case law that is being built up, and such matters desirably should be dealt with by a judge;

(*b*) in the system of courts of Parliament the status of the court of this Parliament must suffer because of its majority of non-judicial members;

(*c*) while it is not suggested that the non-judicial members of the court took a narrow Party view, it was, I understand, widely said before and during the hearing, "The two Government members will be on one side, the two Opposition members on the other and the judge will decide. What's the good of having the politicians on it?";

(*d*) the procedure for setting up the court seems expensive and time consuming, with the necessity for a special meeting of the House. This seems unnecessarily cumbersome, and in operation could result in undue delay in the resolution of a disputed election.

All in all, the manifestly different position of this State does not seem to be justified. Finally, aside from the question of its constitution it proved necessary to clarify the jurisdiction of the court and make appropriate provision for it to function effectively. In broad terms, then, the Bill proposes: (*a*) that only postal votes actually in the hands of electoral officials at the close of poll will be counted at the scrutiny; (*b*) that a legally qualified electoral referee be appointed to determine questions as to the admission or rejection of ballot papers; (*c*) that the postal voting procedures be simplified; (*d*) that the Court of Disputed Returns be constituted by a single judge of the Supreme Court in lieu of the judge and four members of the House affected; (*e*) that the part of the Act relating to limitation on electoral expenses be repealed; and (*f*) that the need for the returning officer to give a casting vote in the event of a tie be done away with, and opportunity has also been taken to adjust penalties provided for offences against the Act.

To consider the Bill in some detail, clauses 1, 2 and 3 are formal. Clauses 4 and 5 provide a definition of the term referee and the means of appointment of such a referee, who, it will be noted, must have substantial experience in the law. Clause 6 amends section 18 of the principal Act to ensure that common form (computerized) rolls can be kept for both State and Commonwealth electoral purposes. Clause 7 amends section 38 of the principal Act to give the Returning Officer for the State further power to make formal amendments to the rolls. Clause 8 repeals section 39 of the principal Act relating to a form of alteration of the roll which was appropriate when rolls were altered by hand but which is not appropriate when rolls are printed by computer. Clauses 9 and 10 effect a decimal currency amendment.

Clause 11 amends section 51 of the Act by bringing the hour at which a writ for an election is deemed to be issued forward from 5 o'clock in the afternoon to 12 noon. This will effectively enable the print out of the computer roll to commence one day earlier than would otherwise be the case and thus save some time. Clause 12 is a drafting

amendment which should make the meaning of section 52 clearer. Clause 13 is, again, a drafting amendment. Clause 14 effects a decimal currency amendment. Clause 15 amends section 73 of the principal Act, which deals with applications for postal votes, by inserting a new ground upon which a person may apply for a postal vote certificate and ballot-paper. This ground closely follows a similar provision in the Commonwealth Act, and ensures a postal vote for persons in enclosed religious orders or persons who by reason of their religious convictions cannot travel to vote on a Saturday (which is the day on which under section 53 of the Act polling must take place in this State).

This clause also provides for the authentication of an application for a postal vote where the applicant is for any reason unable to write. It also enables people to apply for postal votes as soon as it is obvious that an election will be held. Previously, no application could be made until after the tenth day before the issue of a writ; this provision should be of considerable assistance to people in remote areas. We have made this amendment as a compensation for the loss of a day or so at the other end of the scale; that is, by virtue of the fact that postal votes must be in the electoral system by the close of the poll. In addition, the last hour for applications has been advanced from 6 o'clock to 5 o'clock. Finally, the penalty for making false statements in applications has been increased to $200.

Clause 16 amends section 74, which deals with the duty of witnesses, and is in consequence of the amendments made to section 73. Clause 17 amends section 75, which relates to the issue of ballot-papers and recognizes that the Returning Officer for the State can, under section 73 as amended, also issue postal ballot-papers. Clause 18 repeals section 77 of the principal Act, which provided for the noting of the issue of postal vote certificates against the certified list of voters if "there is time conveniently to do so". In fact, under the present system there is never time conveniently to do so and, accordingly, this provision is proposed to be repealed. Clause 19 amends section 80 of the principal Act, which relates to the descriptions of the classess of person who may be authorized witnesses under the Act. As has already been mentioned, year by year this list has grown longer, and the latest proposal before the Government would have had the effect of including just about every adult person in the Commonwealth of Australia and a good number more beside. Accordingly, it is intended that the only qualification necessary for an authorized witness is that they will be over, or apparently over, the age of 18 years. Candidates, however, may not be authorized witnesses.

Clause 20 is intended to simplify somewhat the postal voting procedure. Clause 21 effects a decimal currency amendment and, at the same time, doubles the penalty for a breach of duty by an authorized witness. Clauses 22, 23 and 24 are proposed in consequence of the simplification of the postal voting procedure. Clause 25 amends section 86, which deals with the reception of the postal ballot-papers, and amends that section to provide that only postal votes in official hands before the close of poll will be counted. Previously, a postal vote received up to seven days after the close of poll could be counted, provided the returning officer was satisfied that it was posted before the close of poll. As has already been mentioned, honourable members who followed the proceedings in the recent Court of Disputed Returns would be aware just what a field of speculation this provision gave rise to. It is suggested that in the circumstances of today such a provision is just not a practical one.

Clause 26 amends section 88 and ensures that the Returning Officer for the State is armed with the necessary powers to make arrangements for the conduct of the poll. Clause 27 effects a decimal currency amendment and also increases the penalty somewhat for a breach of section 99. Clause 28 clarifies section 105 of the Act without altering the principle involved. Clause 29 increases the penalty for an offence against the provisions relating to the marking of votes. Clause 30 is designed to enable members of Parliament, who by virtue of their residence are not enrolled for the district they represent, to vote for the district they represent as if they were so enrolled. This is a provision in the Commonwealth Act, and our Commonwealth colleagues have had the benefit of this for many years.

Clause 31 amends section 118a, which relates to compulsory voting by relieving the Returning Officer for the State of having to ask for reasons for non-voting when he is already satisfied that the non-voter had a valid and sufficient reason. This provision will result in the considerable saving of time and money. Clause 32 increases a penalty

for a breach of section 124, which relates to improper marking of ballot-papers by officers. Clause 33 does away with the casting vote of the returning officer and provides that ties will be resolved by lot. If this provision is accepted the returning officer will be able to vote like any other citizen. Clause 34 effects a drafting amendment to clarify the meaning of section 126 of the principal Act. Clause 35 re-enacts section 128 of the Act to make clear just what powers are given to the officer conducting the re-count.

Clause 36 provides for consideration of disputed ballot-papers by the referee appointed under proposed new section 6a. Clause 37 repeals entirely Part XIV, which deals with limitations on electoral expenditure. It is thought that this part of the Act is inappropriate where today much expenditure is actually related to the return of candidates of a particular party rather than particular candidates. Clause 38 increases somewhat steeply the monetary penalty for a "breach of official duty" provided for in section 145 of the Act. This sharp increase is necessary to bring it into line with the maximum term of imprisonment provided; that is, one year. Clauses 39 and 40 generally increase penalties. Clause 41 repeals section 155 of the Act, which restricted advertising in picture theatres. With the large amount of television advertising associated with electoral campaigning, it is thought that this restriction is no longer warranted.

Clause 42 increases the penalty for an offence against section 155a, which deals with false claims of support from organizations. Clause 43 brings section 155b of the Act, which deals with the size of electoral posters, into line with the equivalent legislation of the Commonwealth. The permitted size of a poster has been increased from 120 sq. in. to 1,200 sq. in. Clause 44 increases the penalty of a person who fails to forthwith transmit a claim for enrolment to the Returning Officer for the State.

Clauses 45 to 56 reconstitute the Court of Disputed Returns and are generally self-explanatory, the main changes being:

(*a*) the court will be constituted by a single judge of the Supreme Court, the senior puisne judge or the next available puisne judge in order of seniority;

(*b*) the court will be serviced by the facilities already available to service the Supreme Court;

(*c*) the procedure to be followed by parties before the court has been set out a little more clearly, as have the powers of the court; and

(*d*) the court can, in appropriate circumstances, order that all or portion of the costs of the petitioner be paid by the Crown. (Honourable members may recall that His Honour, the President of the Court of Disputed Returns, commented on the lack of such a provision previously).

The Government made an *ex gratia* payment to both sides, in the Millicent petition, of $2,500. This was not sufficient to cover the costs of either side, but it went some way to ameliorating the financial burden imposed on them, a burden that was caused in part at least because of deficiencies in the administration during the time of my predecessor. Clause 57 increases the maximum penalty for a breach of any of the regulations. Clause 58 repeals a Schedule rendered unnecessary by the repeal of Part XIV of the Act.

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

EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Evidence Act, 1929-1960. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

I am indebted to the House for allowing me to give this second reading explanation. The Bill is brought down in fulfilment of an undertaking given to the Leader of the Opposition when he withdrew an amendment to the Aboriginal Affairs Act Amendment Bill, which was recently before the House. The operative provision of the Bill (clause 2) removes from section 14 of the Evidence Act the provision for a public or private whipping which is utterly inappropriate in this day and age.

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

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 4)

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Licensing Act, 1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Again, I am indebted to the House for allowing me to give the second reading explanation.

The Bill makes a number of amendments to the Licensing Act, 1967, designed both to repair anomalies in the Act and to make a number of substantive alterations and additions to its provisions. The amendments are of a widely divergent character and I will deal with them as they arise under the Bill. Members will recall that one of the undertakings in the policy of our Party before the last election was that we would during this session of Parliament (although I do not think we actually referred to this) move to correct anomalies that had appeared in the working of the Act, and this Bill is in fulfilment of that undertaking.

Mr. Lawn: We've had a lot of Bills that haven't been mentioned as part of your policy.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is right, and they have been good ones, too. The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 makes two amendments to section 6 of the principal Act. The first of these empowers the Judge of the court to make Rules of Court prescribing and providing for the payment of fees for copies of evidence, judgments, and other documents supplied by the court. The second amendment provides that, if the members of the Full Bench of the court are divided in opinion as to the decision to be given on any question before them, the question shall be decided according to the opinion of the majority. This latter amendment is necessary because of a decision of the Full Court of the Supreme Court stating that judgments given by the Licensing Court must, in the absence of any statutory provision to the contrary, be unanimous. Clause 3 amends section 13 of the principal Act. This section of the Act deals with the exceptions to the application of the Act. The amendment inserts a new subsection (6) which exempts from the provisions of the Act wine sold or supplied for the purpose of sacramental or other like observances in the course of religious services.

Clause 4 amends section 15 of the principal Act. This provision deals with the proposal to establish premises in the Windy Point national pleasure resort from which liquor and other refreshments may be supplied to the public. In its amended form the clause will provide that a full publican's licence, a limited publican's licence or a restaurant licence may be granted to the proprietor or the lessee of premises situated upon the national pleasure resort at Windy Point or, with the approval of the Minister of Lands, to the proprietor or lessee of any premises situated upon lands that constitute a national pleasure resort or a national park. The present procedure existing under this clause, whereby the Governor has to declare by proclamation under the Licensing Act that certain lands constitute a national pleasure resort or a national park before a licence is granted in respect of premises upon those lands, is simplified by substituting for the proclamation the requirement that the Minister of Lands is to approve the grant of the licence. A new subsection (2) is also inserted empowering the Minister of Lands to declare by notice published in the *Government Gazette* that the holder of a licence granted under this section shall be exempt from the provisions of section 168 of the Act. This is the section that imposes an obligation upon the holder of a licence to supply food and lodging. The plans for Windy Point do not include provision for lodging and, consequently, if a full publican's licence is to be granted in respect of those premises, the holder of the licence will have to be exempted from the provisions of section 168.

Clause 5 inserts a new section 17a in the principal Act. This new section provides that a limited publican's licence may be granted to the Workers Educational Association in respect of the residential college under the control of the association and situated at Goolwa known as "Graham's Castle". This college is used for the purpose of tuition in a wide variety of subjects and the association feels that it will be able to carry out its educative functions in a more satisfactory and attractive manner if a licence can be granted in respect of the college premises. Subsection (2) of the new section provides that it shall be a condition of the licence that liquor shall not be sold or supplied pursuant thereto except to persons in residence at the college.

Clause 6 amends section 18 of the principal Act. A new subsection (2a) is inserted empowering the court to grant a licence once in every year to the Wine and Brandy Producers' Association of South Australia authorizing it to sell and supply liquor to the public at the Royal Show in the restaurant that the association has on the showgrounds. The association has in the past, before the enactment of the Licensing Act, 1967, exercised this privilege and the amendment restores the position to that formerly existing. Clause 7 amends section 19 of the principal Act. The purpose of this amendment is to enable a person, who has bought liquor during the hours within which liquor may be sold pursuant to a full publican's licence, to carry liquor

away from the licensed premises within 15 minutes of the termination of the licensed period. It is at present possible for a person to consume liquor during this grace period, and it is somewhat anomalous that a person cannot also carry liquor away during that period. This amendment therefore remedies this anomaly.

Clause 8 amends section 21 of the principal Act. A recent decision of the Supreme Court has held that the only criterion by which the character of business as wholesale or retail is to be determined is the quantity of liquor that is the subject of the sale. It was the intention of Parliament in enacting section 21 that a wholesale storekeeper's licence should not be granted except to a person whose business consisted substantially of sales to liquor merchants. Indeed, in the original Bill as introduced into the House of Assembly, clause 21 provided that a wholesale storekeeper's licence should authorize sales only to persons authorized to resell the liquor. This provision was amended because a number of wholesalers carried on a retail business that was subsidiary and ancillary to the wholesale trade which constituted the major part of their business. The amendment to section 21 provides that a wholesale storekeeper's licence shall not be granted or renewed unless the court is satisfied that a proportion of not less than 75 per cent of the moneys paid or to be paid to the holder of the licence in respect of the sale and disposal of liquor is or will be so paid in respect of the sale and disposal of liquor to persons licensed to sell liquor under the Act. This amendment thus clarifies the intention of Parliament that a wholesale storekeeper's licence should be granted only in respect of trade that is substantially of a wholesale character.

Clause 9 amends section 22 of the principal Act by inserting further subsections in that section. The purpose of these new subsections is to guarantee to the holders of storekeeper's Australian wine licences continued in force under section 3 (6) of the Act the right to apply for and be granted retail storekeeper's licences. However, the rights conferred by a retail storekeeper's licence are substantially more extensive than those conferred by a storekeeper's Australian wine licence, and consequently the amendments provide that, where a retail storekeeper's licence is granted to the holder of a storekeeper's Australian wine licence, the *status quo* with respect to the trading rights to be enjoyed by the holder of the licence is preserved. Thus new subsection (4) provides that a retail storekeeper's licence granted in these circumstances will be subject to such conditions, specified in the licence, as ensure in the opinion of the court, that the trading rights enjoyed under the retail storekeeper's licence will be substantially the same as, but not inferior to, those enjoyed under the storekeeper's Australian wine licence.

Clause 10 amends section 26 of the principal Act which deals with vigneron's licences. Paragraph (ii) of the proviso is struck out. This paragraph required that the holder of a licence had to make at least 70 per cent of the mead, wine, cider or perry sold in pursuance of the licence. This provision has caused some difficulty because it is not absolutely clear whether a person, who, for example, buys low quality wines and uses them for the purpose of making champagne, is making the wine or not. The section is further amended by inserting two further subsections. The first of these provides that a vigneron's licence should not be granted except to a person who satisfies the court that he uses in each year not less than 10 tons of grapes in the course of his business as a vigneron. The second of these new subsections provides that, if the vigneron uses not less than 100 tons of grapes in the course of his business, then he may sell and dispose of brandy in pursuance of the licence. This new subsection thus obviates the necessity for vignerons who carry on an extensive business and who manufacture brandy in the course of that business to seek a further licence in order to dispose of the brandy produced by them.

Clause 11 repeals and re-enacts section 29 of the principal Act. There are two signficant variations in the section as re-enacted. First, the licence is not to be granted in respect of specified premises. This amendment is made because holders of this kind of licence who previously conducted business pursuant to the proviso to section 161 of the old Licensing Act carry out sales and delivery from bulk tankers. It is thus inappropriate to require that liquor shall be sold and disposed of on specified premises. The amendment thus restores the rights existing under a five-gallon licence to those previously existing under the proviso to section 161 of the old Licensing Act. Secondly, the amendment provides that the holder of a five-gallon licence may sell and dispose of liquor to a person who is not licensed under the Act if that person purchases or acquires the liquor for the

purpose of sale or disposal to persons outside the State, and sells and disposes of it accordingly. Problems have arisen with respect to sales to interstate merchants who, in strict conformity with the Act, would have to be licensed under our Licensing Act before liquor could be sold to them pursuant to a five-gallon licence. The amendment therefore rectifies this situation.

Clause 12 amends section 31 of the principal Act. This amendment enables the court to grant a restaurant licence subject to conditions and, in particular, conditions limiting the types and kinds of liquor that may be sold and disposed of pursuant to the licence, and limiting the hours during which liquor may be sold and disposed of pursuant to the licence. Many persons holding permits originally granted under section 197a of the old Licensing Act and temporarily continued in force under the new Act have expressed concern because they have felt unable to provide the facilities necessary for a full restaurant licence, and in any case desire only to sell wines in the course of their business. The amendments thus provide for a restaurant licence limited by conditions which will cast a less onerous burden upon the holder of the licence and will thus enable many restaurateurs to carry on their present business. The court is also empowered to limit the hours during which liquor may be disposed of pursuant to the licence. At present a restaurateur is subject to a statutory duty under section 168 of the Act to provide meals for those who may resort to his restaurant. This provision has proved impracticable because, in fact, the trade that some restaurants are able to perform during some periods is so slight that the restaurateur is not justified, either by his financial returns or by the negligible public needs that he might possibly satisfy, in keeping his premises open during these periods.

Clause 13 amends section 33 of the principal Act which deals with theatre licences. The period during which liquor may be supplied pursuant to such a licence is altered from a period commencing at 7 p.m. and ending at 11 p.m. to a period commencing at 7.30 p.m. and ending at 11.30 p.m. This period conforms more closely to the needs of theatre business. The requirement that all the persons whose words and actions constitute this performance must be physically present in the theatre is altered to a requirement that most of such performers must be so present. Clause 14 is a consequential amendment to section 41 of the principal Act which deals with applications for licences. This amendment is consequential upon the fact that five-gallon licences are no longer to be granted in respect of specified premises.

Clause 15 amends section 48 of the principal Act. When the Act was passed in 1967, by error, certain words which had been inserted in the Act by the Legislative Council and disagreed to by the House of Assembly remained in the Act. This amendment removes these words thus restoring the text of the Act to the text that was passed by Parliament. Clause 16 inserts new section 48a in the principal Act. This new section provides that, where the holder of a licence applies for a variation of the conditions of his licence which could significantly affect the nature or extent of the business carried on in pursuance of the licence, the court may order notice of the application to be given in such manner as may be prescribed by the Rules of Court. Subclause (2) establishes a right of objection to the application.

Clause 17 amends section 55 of the principal Act. This section was transposed uncritically from the old Licensing Act. It is inappropriate in the context of the new Act and indeed the time limits that it prescribes for the performance of certain actions have proved impossible to comply with. The section deals with the transmission of licences and the amendment removes the requirement that a person entering upon the licensed premises upon the occurrence of certain events set out in the section should obtain a certificate from the court. The amendment generally simplifies the procedure under the section. Clause 18 makes a consequential amendment to section 56 of the principal Act. Clause 19 amends section 57 of the principal Act by removing from the Act words which were again not duly passed by Parliament.

Clause 20 makes an amendment to section 58 of the principal Act. The amendment is merely consequential on the amendment to section 55. Clause 21 amends section 65 of the principal Act by enabling the court to grant booth certificates under that section, subject to such terms and conditions as the court thinks fit. Clause 22 amends section 66 of the principal Act. The amendment inserts two new subsections. The first of these provides that, where an entertainment is to be held by a *bona fide* club, association, society or public body formed for certain purposes set out in the section, the court may grant a permit for the supply and consumption of liquor at the entertainment. Liquor may be

supplied in pursuance of the permit, but only if no charge is made for it or if the cost of the liquor is included in the cost of admission to the entertainment and no further charge is made for the liquor. New subsection (2b) is to some extent consequential on the insertion of new section 66a by the following clause of the Bill and this new subsection is considered in the context of that new section.

Clause 23 enacts new section 66a in the principal Act. This new section enables the proprietor of a reception house in which wedding receptions and other like social gatherings are conducted to apply for a permit permitting him to keep, sell and supply liquor on the premises. At present, these reception houses are in difficulties because the proprietors have no liquor trading rights, nor are they able to keep liquor on the premises of the reception house. This new section enables the proprietor of a reception house to obtain a supply of liquor and to sell the liquor to the holder of a permit under section 66. Section 66, as previously mentioned, has been amended to enable the holder of a permit under that section to supply the liquor to his guests, provided that no charge is made for the liquor or the cost of the liquor is included in the cost of admission to the entertainment. This amendment, in conjunction with new section 66a, will enable the proprietor of the reception house to exercise limited trading rights that are necessary for the sake of expediency and convenience and for liquor to be supplied subject to certain limitations in pursuance of the permit under section 66.

Clause 24 amends section 67 of the principal Act. This amendment establishes a right of objection to a club permit under the Act. Clause 25 inserts new section 67a in the Act. This new section enables certain clubs to apply for and be granted a permit permitting members of the club to keep liquor on the club premises and to consume the liquor on such portion of the club premises as is specified by the court. Several clubs do not want trading rights in pursuance of the permit but merely a right for their members to keep liquor on the club premises and to supply it to their guests. Clause 26 amends section 72 of the principal Act by enabling the court to grant a licensed auctioneer a permit to sell and dispose of liquor for such purposes, or in such circumstances, as justify, in the opinion of the court, the grant of a permit.

Clause 27 amends section 73 of the principal Act by inserting a new subsection that creates an offence if an applicant for a permit or a certificate makes a false statement in the course of his application for that permit or certificate. Clause 28 amends section 82 of the principal Act. There has been some doubt expressed whether a society registered under the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1923-1966, is competent to hold a licence under the Act. The amendment inserts a new subsection that removes these doubts by providing such a society shall, for the purposes of the Act, be deemed to be and at all times to have been a company incorporated under the laws of the State. Clause 29 inserts new section 86a in the principal Act. This new section establishes a right for the holder of a licence, with the approval of the court, to surrender his licence.

Clause 30 amends section 88 of the principal Act which deals with the rules of a club licensed under the Act. Some clubs are managed by a committee which is not elected by the general body of members but which is nevertheless elected in a perfectly regular and proper manner. This amendment enables the court to grant a licence to a club managed by a committee that is elected in a manner of which the court approves. Clause 31 amends section 118 of the principal Act. This section establishes a duty for every person holding a full publican's licence or a wine licence to keep his Christian names and his surname legibly painted on the front of his licensed premises. This provision is obviously inappropriate where the licensee is a company, and the provision is amended accordingly. Clause 32 amends section 131 of the principal Act. The effect of this amendment is that music can be provided to accompany the supply of meals or refreshments on Sunday, Good Friday or Christmas Day on licensed premises, provided that the music is not supplied by more than one live artist.

Clause 33 makes a drafting amendment to section 136 by striking out words that are meaningless in the context of that section. Clause 34 amends section 158 of the principal Act. This amendment limits the provisions relating to *bona fide* travellers to premises in respect of which a full publican's licence or a limited publican's licence is in force. Clauses 35 and 36 repeal sections 160 and 163 of the principal Act which are redundant. Clause 37 makes a drafting amendment to section 171 of the principal Act. Clause 38 repeals section 187 of the principal Act which is obsolete. Clause 39 extends the provisions of section 198 of the principal Act, relating to service of notices, to service on companies.

Clause 40 amends section 210 of the principal Act by providing that all actions, prosecutions and other proceedings against any person for anything done in pursuance of the Act shall be commenced within 12 months after the act, rather than three months as at present. This amendment brings section 210 into line with the corresponding provisions existing in other Acts. Members will see from the explanation I have given that, by and large, these amendments are of an administrative or machinery nature. Some few weeks ago I asked for suggestions from interested parties and from the general public for amendments to the Act. All those that came in (and there was a large response) have been considered, but not all of them have been included in the Act. I did not include in the Bill matters that effect any significant change in policy, because the general matter of licensing was thrashed out at considerable length in this Chamber and in another place not long ago, and it did not seem to me, or to the Government, to be appropriate yet to embark on any sweeping changes in policy. Therefore, some suggested amendments were not included.

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

PRISONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Prisons Act, 1936-1965. Read a first time.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The Bill's purpose is to remove a difficulty that has arisen in the interpretation of a provision of the Prisons Act. Members will recall that the Leader of the Opposition has several times questioned me on this and asked that the Government do something about the matter urgently and, in conformity with his request, the Government is taking urgent action to correct the position.

Mr. Broomhill: This will make two good pieces of legislation introduced in the last week at the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, but there have been many other good pieces of legislation introduced in the last week. Section 42 (1) of that Act provides that a prisoner may, "after he has completed not less than one half of his sentence, including any remission of his sentence granted pursuant to this Act or any regulation made thereunder", apply to the Comptroller of Prisons for a recommendation that he be released on probation. The regulations provide that a prisoner shall be discharged when he has served two-thirds of his sentence, and the prison authorities have always treated this provision as a remission of one-third of his sentence granted pursuant to a regulation made under the Act.

Accordingly, when prisoners have served one-third of their sentences (that is to say, half of two-thirds of their sentences after having deducted the one-third to be deducted pursuant to the regulations) the prison authorities have entertained applications from them for release on probation. The Crown Solicitor has expressed the view, however, that the remission of one-third of the sentence pursuant to the regulations cannot be earned or granted until a prisoner has served two-thirds of his actual sentence and therefore cannot be taken into account in calculating the time when the prisoner has completed "not less than one-half of his sentence, including any remission of his sentence granted pursuant to this Act or any regulation made thereunder". This means that applications by prisoners for release on probation cannot be entertained until they have served at least half of their actual sentence.

This Bill amends section 42 of the Prisons Act so that the provision will have the same effect as that erroneously attributed to it by the prison authorities. Their practice of entertaining applications from prisoners for release on probation after they have served one-third of their sentences will thus be able to continue. The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 42 of the principal Act to provide that a prisoner may, after he has completed not less than one-third of his sentence, apply to the comptroller for a recommendation to be released pursuant to the provisions of that section. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I see no reason to delay the House on this Bill. In fact, I think the sooner it is passed the better. Numbers of people have been held up concerning this matter, and I know that they are extremely anxious for the Bill to be passed. I have daily inquiries about the matter. I therefore support the Bill.

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): I, too, support the Bill. As the Attorney-General knows, I inquired about an individual in my district. I am very pleased to see that this action is being taken.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I am glad that the Opposition is not delaying this matter, and I agree heartily with its view that the Bill should be passed quickly. I did not know that it was going to pass so quickly, and when I moved the suspension of Standing Orders I did so merely so that I could give the second reading explanation.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2—"Release of prisoners on probation."

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Would it be fair to ask how many copies of the Bill are in the Chamber? We are debating something that is not before us.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I regret that there are only two copies of the Bill. However, the member for Light is welcome to have a look at my copy now. I have shown it to the Leader, and apparently he is happy with it. However, as I have said, I did not expect the debate to go on today, and unfortunately the Government Printer has not yet printed the Bill.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

TATIARA DRAINAGE TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Works) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

THE REPORT

The Select Committee to which the House of Assembly referred the Tatiara Drainage Trust Act Amendment Bill, 1968, has the honour to report:

1. In the course of its inquiry, your committee met on two occasions and took evidence from the following witnesses:

Mr. D. H. Dinning, Chairman of the Tatiara Drainage Trust:

Mr. L. S. Dempsey, Secretary of the Tatiara Drainage Trust:

Mr. G. A. Hackett-Jones, Legal Officer, Crown Law Department, Adelaide.

Correspondence from the Chairman of the South-Eastern Drainage Board to the Minister of Irrigation, dealing with the proposals contained in the Bill, was also made available and included in the evidence of the committee.

2. Advertisements were inserted in the *Advertiser* and the *Border Chronicle* (Bordertown) inviting persons desirous of submitting evidence on the Bill to appear before the committee. There was no response to these advertisements.

3. The representatives of the Tatiara Drainage Trust who appeared before the committee indicated by evidence that the Bill gave the trust the additional powers it required for the control of drainage in the area under its jurisdiction. The Chairman of the South-Eastern Drainage Board, in correspondence, had stated that that board was "of the opinion that the Tatiara Drainage Trust should have control over all drainage works within its district, also that the power of the trust should include the control of drainage works constructed in the district prior to 1949".

4. Your committee considers that there is no objection to the Bill, and recommends that it be passed without amendment.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Licences for drainage work."

Mr. NANKIVELL: As a member of the committee, I naturally support its recommendations, but as member for the district I also wish to endorse the action taken by the Tatiara Drainage Trust in acquiring additional powers to enable it adequately to control the drainage within the boundaries of its defined area. They are the hundreds of Wirrega, Shaugh, Cannawigara and Tatiara. Previously the trust has had jurisdiction only over drainage with respect to the creeks (that is, Bordertown Creek and Nalang Creek) that drain into this area. However, certain drainage works carried out have caused some embarrassment, and will do so in future if we have further wet years and flooding of the two creeks in question. Therefore, I consider it proper that the trust should seek these powers so that it can effectively carry out the function of drainage in the prescribed areas over which it has jurisdiction. I support this clause.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's suggested amendment:

Clause 9, page 7—After line 14 insert—

8. Certificate of insurance where the application in relation to which the certificate is lodged is made by a person who satisfies the Registrar of Motor Vehicles—

(*a*) that he is the owner of the motor vehicle;
(*b*) that he is in receipt of a pension paid or payable under any Act or law of the Commonwealth;
and
(*c*) that he is, by virtue of being in receipt of such a pension, entitled to travel in any public transport in South Australia at concession fares under any Act, regulation or by-law for the time being in force.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I move:

That the suggested amendment be agreed to.

I do not object to the amendment, although I accept it with reservation, because people in the group that will benefit have widely differing circumstances. True, all these people are pensioners, and the amendment provides that they will receive a concession on public transport. Some pensioners are in extremely difficult circumstances, and I do not object to the amendment so far as it benefits that group. However, I consider it to be the responsibility of the Commonwealth Government to meet the needs of pensioners.

States should not be expected to extend concessions to them in a general way. We extend substantial concessions that will help people in this group, but the more assistance the State gives to pensioners, the less is the impact on the Commonwealth Budget, where the impact should rest. In addition, many people eligible for age pensions are able to manage comfortably, and possibly are better off than some people who may not fall within the qualification requirements. I think all members agree with what I have said. However, I do not see any way of differentiating between those who may be better off and those who may be in economic difficulty. Therefore, in order to ensure that those who need help get the benefit of the suggested amendment, I accept it.

Mr. CORCORAN: I am pleased that the Treasurer accepts the amendment. As he has said, members generally would agree with him. Persons in receipt of age pensions or part pensions who can supplement their pension with income from other sources are better off than pensioners who must rely solely on an age pension. However, in order to cater for those struggling to exist on a paltry Commonwealth pension, we have to have a general cover. The State should not have to do the things that should be done by the Commonwealth Government in this field, but we all recognize the lack of support given by the Commonwealth Government and that we have to make concessions in some cases. I hope that pensioners will be relieved of some of their burdens by this legislation.

Suggested amendment agreed to.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 20. Page 2621.)

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): We on this side have given mature consideration to this Bill and, after analysing it, we find that its main purposes are to rectify a clerical error made in drafting the original legislation, to remedy an oversight, and to increase the penalties, which officers of the department do not consider are high enough to deter people from continuing to breach the provisions of the Code. We do not object to this short Bill, and have pleasure in supporting it.

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

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS BOARD BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

PRICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 21. Page 2690.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): The Attorney-General, after introducing this measure, gave a cryptic explanation of its purposes. I am not one bit happy with the provisions of the Bill as they stand but, in order to achieve clarity and a precise form of title for the Registrar-General, I support the second reading. However, if the Bill emerges from Committee in its present form I will be involved in the most bitter

opposition to its provisions. The Bill provides that, in making the proclamation for the transfer of land to the Aboriginal Lands Trust, the Governor may proclaim transfer on an asset in fee simple to a lesser estate prescribed in the proclamation. If that was to pass, it could completely destroy the whole basis of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act. The purpose of passing that Act was to assure the Aborigines of South Australia, through the trust that was created on their behalf, that they would have a clear, separate and independent title. That was absolutely essential and was the foundation of the whole measure. If the Government was to have power by proclamation simply to assign to them a lesser estate or interest—a mere licence—we would then be back in exactly the position in which we now are and which the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act was designed to avoid: the Governor could proclaim, in transferring land to the trust, that he was granting a licence, which could be removed by proclamation. What certainty of title then would the Aborigines of South Australia have? I do not think that was the intention of the Government. I am not here ascribing to the Minister any evil intent to destroy the principles of the Aboriginal Lands Trust, because I do not believe that that is his view—

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: No, it is not.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I thought so—but I do plead with him that what can occur here and what can appear to occur here is that the Government is given the right simply to dispose of the land in less than the title that the Aborigines believe they are getting.

This could be dealt with in another way. Undoubtedly, when this measure passed the House it was the intention of the House that, in the reserve lands being transferred to the Aboriginal Lands Trust and in any new lands that were acquired, it would be getting the fee simple. I have been told that the reason why these further words are in the Bill is that there are a few trusts of less than fee simple for Aborigines relating to small parcels of house properties and the like, and it is desirable to do something to clear those up. I think they should be provided for specifically and that there should be no suggestion that, in relation to those lands, of which clearly it was intended the trust should get the fee simple, the Government has power to say that they should get a lesser estate or interest—a lease or a licence.

I hope the Bill can be amended in Committee to accord with the original intention of the Act. I hope, too, that the Minister, having listened to me, will assist in working out a compromise that will achieve what I think is a desirable amendment—that the Registrar-General should have it made clear to him exactly what is the nature of the estate being transferred. I personally seem to remember giving the opinion that I did not think it was necessary as far as he was concerned if we could prescribe it by a grant of a prerogative right. I think that is still the case, but sometimes people get a little difficult about these things so, if it will make things easier, I will go along with that. But I want to make certain that we are preserving the basic principles of this Act.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

POLICE PENSIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 2736.)

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I indicate on behalf of the Opposition my support for the Bill, which has come forward mainly through the efforts of the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader, only as late as November 20, asked a question about certain discrepancies existing in the Police Pensions Fund, so I am pleased that the Government is taking notice of the views expressed by the Leader and that it has introduced the Bill.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I appreciate the support the honourable member has given to the Bill. However, in case he is under a misapprehension, I point out that a copy of the Bill and the second reading explanation were in my bag for several weeks prior to the measure's introduction into the House, and I was waiting for the number of items on the Notice Paper to be reduced somewhat so that time could be allocated to the Bill. While it would be proper for the honourable member to draw the attention of members to his own support for the measure, it would be fruitless for him to try to have the House

believe that the Bill was hurriedly put together following a question asked by the Leader in the House, because I assure him that, in fact, the Bill had been in my bag for four or five weeks before the Leader asked his question.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier) moved:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): I think that something should be said. The Police Association made representations to the Government on this matter, as it made representations to me. In view of the Premier's statement that he had the Bill in his bag for five weeks before he introduced it, I remind him of his reply to me on November 20. I then asked him about this measure and whether we could be assured that the Bill would be introduced this year. Although the Premier now says he had it in his bag for some time, he said, in reply to my question:

The Leader is correct in saying that it will be impossible to legislate this year for all matters before Ministers at present. However, I will obtain from my colleague a progress report on the drafting, if that is the case, of any legislation he is considering in relation to this matter.

The Premier gave that reply on November 20!

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I have a reply to the Leader's statements.

The SPEAKER: If the Premier speaks he closes the debate.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no right of reply on third reading, in my submission.

The SPEAKER: I point out to the Leader that he has had much experience in the House. I remember that there was a case some years ago when we altered the Standing Orders. Standing Order 142 provides:

A reply shall be allowed to a member who has made a substantive motion to the House, or moved the second or third reading of a Bill, but not to any member who has moved an Order of the Day (not being the second or third reading of a Bill), an amendment, or instruction to a Committee.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I do not want to offend anyone by speaking at the wrong time. I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, your drawing the Leader's attention to Standing Orders. As the Leader will remember, documents have to be marked "Bill to be drafted". I so marked this docket much earlier this year and I must say that it has become a common topic in Cabinet to discuss when we can introduce necessary legislation. I assure members that some Bills have yet to be brought in; they have not yet been brought in because there has been insufficient time. It has been the concern of Cabinet to get time on the Notice Paper for the essential Bills that have to be brought in, and notice was given some time ago that this Bill was to be drafted. When I inquired where this Bill was, so that we could see whether we had time to bring it in, I was told that it was in my bag. That is where it had been for some weeks. I have asked members of Cabinet to list the essential Bills they have so that we can sort out those that are the more important in the group we have. In fact, we have already decided that certain matters must be postponed until next session, for it is certain that we shall not be able to bring in all the Bills we would desire to bring in and have them passed by the end of the early session next year. I hope this explanation satisfies the Leader as to why this matter was in my bag: it was there while I waited to get it on the Notice Paper. I am afraid some Bills will not get on to the Notice Paper this session.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HARBORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 27. Page 2800.)

Mr. RYAN (Port Adelaide): This is an amazing Bill. Although it does not contain anything of great consequence, it has 17 drafting amendments, and I have never seen anything like it since I have been a member.

Mr. Hurst: How long have you had to check this?

Mr. RYAN: Since yesterday. At the beginning of this session, just after the Government came into office, the Attorney-General gave a great eulogy of a certain person.

Mr. Hudson: We haven't got the Bill on the file.

Mr. RYAN: I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, December 3, at 2 p.m.