

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, July 13, 1966.

The PRESIDENT (Hon. L. H. Densley) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

OPAL.

The Hon. Sir LYELL McEWIN: My question is directed to the Minister of Mines and relates to a paragraph in the Lieutenant-Governor's Speech that stated that legislation would be introduced for the control of opal sales. Can the Minister say whether that legislation is likely to be introduced in this Chamber?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The legislation mentioned by the honourable member is under review at the moment, and I expect that the legislation will be introduced in this Chamber. There is only one question that could perhaps come into it, and that is finance, which would be in relation to, perhaps, a registration fee. At this stage I am not sure whether that would debar me from introducing the legislation here, but I do not think so. It would be my intention to have the legislation introduced early.

ROSEWORTHY CROSSING.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question refers to a matter that has been raised previously in this Chamber, particularly when the Hon. Sir Norman Jude held the portfolio that the Hon. Mr. Bevan now holds. It refers to the railway crossing immediately north of Roseworthy. I have brought the matter forward on previous occasions. As honourable members know, the line crosses the road at an awkward angle and the crossing is also in something of a dip or hollow, which would preclude "stop" signs being effective. My attention has again been drawn to this matter by the fact that recently an accident on the crossing was narrowly averted. I understand that a semi-trailer, in averting a head-on crash, was immobilized on the side of the road for some time. Will the Minister again examine the matter of the provision of warning lights there? I have been informed previously that the frequency of trains on that line does not warrant the provision of these lights but I submit that the frequency of traffic, as well as

the frequency of trains, should be considered, and there is certainly a heavy incidence of traffic on the Main North Road. The fact that people are required to approach the crossing without having full view of it should be taken into consideration, too. In view of the latest mishap and the surrounding circumstances, will the Minister again consider the matter and, possibly, take it up with the Minister of Transport?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes, I shall do as the honourable member requests.

ROAD PROGRAMME.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Minister of Roads say whether it is likely that the road programme recently announced by the Highways Department will have to be curtailed because of the recent increase in the basic wage?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The programme referred to by the honourable member is a proposed programme for the current financial year and I voice the opinion that there will be no curtailment of that programme as a result of the basic wage increase.

LIQUOR LEGISLATION.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: On Monday the Premier opened a new hotel at Penola and the following report of that opening appeared in the *Border Watch*:

The Premier, speaking at Penola yesterday, said that he hoped the Royal Commission on liquor would make no recommendation to enable the big organizations to sell ale or spirits over the counter.

The statement continues in that vein. Can the Minister, as Leader of the Government in this Council, say whether the statement means that the Government intends to draw up liquor legislation independent of the findings of the Royal Commission, or are there any other comments he would like to make on the statement?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: As the statement has not been attributed to me, I am not responsible for it. I do not think any honourable member would request that I elaborate on a statement that has been made by the Premier himself at Penola on Monday last. I could not at this stage give any information on what was in the Premier's mind when he made the statement. However, I shall refer the question to the Premier and obtain a reply.

TOWN PLANNING.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Will the Minister of Local Government say whether it is quite definite that the South Australian State Planning Office is to remain under the control of the Attorney-General rather than of the Minister of Local Government, or is a change still being considered?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: No consideration is being given to a change. The town planning legislation is under the jurisdiction of the Attorney-General, and as far as I am concerned it will stay there.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Will the Minister say whether Cabinet has considered the motion passed in this Chamber almost unanimously last year that the administration of the Town Planning Act should be placed under the control of the Minister of Local Government?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Cabinet has considered the resolution of this Chamber, but it still considers that the Act should remain under the jurisdiction of the Attorney-General, and I agree wholeheartedly.

MOUNT BARKER ROAD.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Has the Minister of Roads a reply to my recent question about hieroglyphics on the Mount Barker Road between Stirling and Aldgate?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I called for a report on this matter previously, but apparently that was not satisfactory to the honourable member. Following his further question on this matter, I have obtained the following report from the Chairman of the Road Traffic Board:

The area striped with diagonal road markings constitutes the sealed shoulder area of the road. In view of the expense in using contrasting road material, the Highways Department decided to experiment with edge lining and striping. This method has been used extensively overseas and is a simple and cheap method of delineating the shoulder area to discourage its use as a traffic lane. Observation of traffic movement on this section of road indicates that motorists are aware of the markings and use the striped area only in an emergency.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Some weeks ago, in reply to a question I asked, the Minister said it was not intended to widen the road further on the up-grade because it had already been widened on the down-grade as a result of the Highways Department's technical advice. As it seems extraordinary that this widened portion is not to be driven on, will the Minister obtain a further report on the matter?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I will refer the question to the Highways Department and obtain a further report.

PUBLIC RELATIONS OFFICER.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I ask leave to make a statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Local Government, who is acting Leader of the House.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Last week each of the two daily newspapers contained a report that a second public relations officer had been appointed to the Premier's Department and also a statement by the Premier that the position was only temporary. Would the Minister of Local Government care to explain the necessity for the appointment and say why it is of a temporary nature?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: This matter was discussed at length by Cabinet, which found that an appointment was necessary at this stage. However, it is considered that it may not be necessary to have a permanent officer at once but that a temporary officer could be appointed for a period of six months for the purpose of seeing whether the appointment of a permanent officer was justified. I have nothing further to add at this stage.

POTATO REJECTION.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Local Government, representing the Minister of Agriculture, a reply to a question I asked some few days ago about potatoes?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. My colleague the Minister of Agriculture has obtained the following report from the Chairman of the South Australian Potato Board:

Potatoes delivered for re-sorting or for washing because of claimed low quality would be only the small quantity rejected by the Agriculture Department inspector. The figures were given previously. In all instances of these rejections, the grower himself is given the choice of regrading or delivery to a washing plant for re-sorting and washing, in which latter instance he is paid on packout. It is thought that the honourable member may be referring to losses due to sorting at the washing plants. The grade standards for washed potatoes are the same as for unwashed and the rejections by inspectors are negligible.

The main supply to washers is delivered especially for washing by growers. Nowadays many growers themselves do little effective grading preferring to leave it to the washer. The process of washing, which has been promoted strongly by many growers, unfortunately causes many lines of potatoes to show unsightly markings not considered serious on the unwashed product. Because of consumer demand, many of these marked potatoes are

removed by the washers. The grower has the choice of taking back the marked potatoes or having them sold for stock feed. This loss is a problem of great concern to the Potato Board and other industry leaders.

BETTING CONTROL BOARD RULES.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern):

I move:

That the rules relating to betting made by the Betting Control Board pursuant to the Lottery and Gaming Act, 1936-1965, on January 27, 1966, and laid on the table of this Council on February 15, 1966, be disallowed.

I have taken this unusual step because, as previously stated elsewhere, this is the only means I have of drawing the attention of this Chamber and the public to what I term improper administrative procedure in the matter of odds that a bookmaker may offer to his clients. Let us first examine the history of this regulation. On January 12 the Betting Control Board wrote to the Secretary of the South Australian Jockey Club, the administrative club of the State. I shall quote the relevant part of this letter, which is the first paragraph. I hope honourable members will accept that this has not been taken out of context; there are other matters referred to in the letter, which reads:

Dear Sir, In view of the altered form in which betting odds will be exhibited and expressed on the changeover to decimal currency, the board is anxious that the betting public should be properly informed of the values of the new betting odds as compared with the old betting odds.

In the meantime the Bookmakers League had suggested that odds appropriate to the decimal currency should be introduced, but they were by no means unanimous, particularly the grandstand bookmakers, as any racegoer is fully aware. Also, I have been given to understand that they were in agreement (and this was from the Chairman of the Bookmakers League) with the board that the system should be given a trial of, say, three months, to which the board was agreeable. But only a few weeks later they were informed (out of the blue, so to speak) that their betting boards were to be altered forthwith. The secretary of the board, who was called to give evidence before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, said that it would cost bookmakers somewhere between \$60 and \$80 each to have it done. The Chairman of the Bookmakers League told me last Saturday that it had cost its members over \$10,000 as a group to change over.

The regulation was laid on the table of this Chamber on February 15, 1966, and had to see out some 14 sitting days. Obviously, this would mean it would be some months before a regulation costing a comparatively small group of people some \$10,000 could be disallowed. No-one gained by this autocratic decision to alter their boards forthwith until the regulation was approved or remained law. Nobody paid any additional tax to the Government; on the other hand, the drastic rate of the changeover resulted in an adverse effect on turnover, which meant less tax for the Government, less rebate to the clubs, and less profit to the bookmaker. I quote a letter dated April 6, 1966, addressed to the Betting Control Board from the Secretary of the South Australian Jockey Club:

At recent meetings of my committee the matter of the new betting odds introduced with the changeover to decimal currency has been considered. I am now directed to write to your board in the form of a protest against the new system. The committee are of the opinion that the new odds are somewhat confusing and are certainly having a very adverse effect on bookmakers' turnover. The committee finds it hard to understand why the decimal odds were introduced in this State and have not been introduced anywhere else in the Commonwealth.

Now I quote the Betting Control Board's reply of April 21, 1966, to the above letter:

I advise that your letter of the 6th April was considered by the board on the 19th April. It had been noticed that betting turnover had fallen, and it was intended to compile figures and submit them for your consideration. However, the full figures have not yet been completed but what did emerge was—

- (a) that, compared with 1964, the betting turnover began to fall in December, 1965;
- (b) that the decrease gained momentum and continued into February and March, 1966.

The decrease in turnover was attributed to—

- (i) economic factors;
- (ii) decimal currency (*e.g.*, backers who bet £x began to bet \$x);
- (iii) possibly the new scale of odds.

The new scale of odds was introduced at the direction of the Hon. the Treasurer. It is therefore impracticable to attend further to your letter at present and it is intended to submit it to the Treasurer on his return to South Australia.

I emphasize the point that it was introduced at the direction of the Premier. The previous letter clearly indicated that the board had some doubts about the matter and the rapidity of change, and yet this board, which has been approved by Parliament to handle these matters, was overridden at a moment's notice,

not, as one might expect, for gaining additional revenue in the rather parlous conditions we have at the moment, but apparently because of some whim or other that is quite beyond me to understand.

Having given the history of this unfortunate regulation, I wish to advance my argument in favour of my protest. First, I point out, as was done by the South Australian Jockey Club, that none of the other States that have a far greater number of investors and bookmakers has introduced this system. It appears, as in many other cases, that South Australia must be different. The clubs protested against it, the punters certainly did, and the bookmakers were divided over the matter. I think that is a very fair statement of the position. Then a compromise was suggested that was acceptable to the board and those directly interested, and yet the Premier, according to the letter I have read, overrode the experienced board, with no gain to the Treasury but, possibly, a small psychological gain to the bookmakers, although certainly not a gain to the general run of the race-going public known as the punter. The punter is always the poor fellow who is the proverbial meat within the sandwich, and the meat, I can assure honourable members, is fast disappearing.

If this regulation is disallowed, who is going to reimburse the bookmakers for the \$10,000 outlay that they have incurred? Obviously, it is the moral and proper responsibility of the Government, as it ordered this to be done. However, I am afraid the Government appears to be broke, so that the bookmakers will have to get it—but from whom? They will have to get it from the punter; it cannot come from anywhere else but the poor old punter, the person who keeps racing going. My protest in this Council is not against decimal odds in betting. In the long run, as they become more clearly understood they will be accepted, and the pencillers who do the accounting for the bookmakers and have to work very fast to calculate winnings tax, etc., will find it more simple.

My protest, as I have surely already indicated, is based on the flagrant abuse of regulating powers with no advantage to anyone. My final protest—and probably the most important—as a citizen who is associated with racing, is that this regulation states, and I quote:

The following new rule is inserted after 48—48A. No bookmaker shall offer or exhibit betting odds other than those specified in Schedule III to these rules, etc.

It goes on to say that he shall not offer or exhibit betting odds other than those in the

decimal table as shown. Honourable members will see, even if they are not racing men that this means that it is illegal for any bookmaker to offer any other odds apart from those he sets up on the board. I point out that the bookmaker is licensed; he pays a fee; he pays turnover tax; and the punter pays winnings tax, and the tax on the stake.

However, if the bookmaker gives some bedevilled punter odds of 100 to eight instead of 100 to 10, he commits an illegal act and, once again, because of this direction, we find the law being observed in the breach, which will be done every time racing and trotting take place. That is highly objectionable to Parliament when it is supported by regulations such as these.

I maintain that it is the bookmaker's business what odds he lays as long as he fills in his forms and pays his tax, and as long as the punter pays his tax if he wins. Who are we to interfere and push people around all the time? If a man wants to bet 100 peanuts to four, well and good. That may not be provided for on the forms but any unusual bet can be converted to dollars and cents if the bookmaker so desires. Why should the race-going public be pushed around, particularly when no-one benefits? It is a matter of no tax increase, no benefit to anyone.

I can only hope that such a malproposition will not occur again without first being considered by Parliament. On this occasion it is not my intention to embarrass the Government for a mere \$10,000 but, speaking for myself, if repetitions of this kind occur, they will receive more than ordinary censure, not only from myself but also from other members of the Council. In the circumstances I ask leave to withdraw my motion.

Leave granted; motion withdrawn.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from July 12. Page 382.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the motion for the adoption for the Address in Reply but perhaps in doing so I should exercise some political caution, in view of what I have read in the press recently, by saying that I do this without prejudice. In the political columns of the *Advertiser* of Saturday last, the Labor Party, in its column, laid much emphasis on the fact that all Opposition members who had spoken in this debate in this Council and in another place had finished up by saying that they supported the

motion. I think that statement indicates just how hard put the Government is to feel any degree of confidence in what was presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor for delivery as the Speech with which to open this particular session. When one looks at it objectively, one sees that it is a totally uninspiring address, appearing to say much when, really, there was nothing to say.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Much has been said about it.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: It was studied, for instance, with repeated statements that the Government was giving consideration and attention to this and that but there was complete silence concerning increased taxation, which is inevitable, and electoral reform, which is imperative. However apathetic we may be concerning the content of the Speech, I assure you, Mr. President, that no honourable member (indeed, no voter in this State) is unconcerned about the deterioration in the Government's finances.

We finished the financial year \$8,000,000 in the red and, indeed, as the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill said yesterday, the Government has really overspent by \$9,200,000. This means that the increased revenue that the State will derive from the Commonwealth in the financial year 1966-67 has all been spent in advance. That is disturbing enough but, when one reflects on the fact that we stand on the threshold of a new financial year with the Government's biggest commitments still to come, one wonders what kind of policies this Government is following. I refer to matters such as free school books, equal pay for the sexes, higher Parliamentary salaries, new boards and commissions that have just started and three big and costly inquiries on matters that are political hot potatoes.

I suggest that the Government's policies are the kind that one might expect to find in *Alice in Wonderland*. Of course, the matters I have referred to are only ones that have actually started. I have said nothing of the tremendous costs involved in setting up State lotteries and now a State insurance corporation before the money for one ticket or one policy is taken across the counter. One might ask what is the reason for this deficit of \$8,000,000 and see why bigger ones will inevitably follow. I remember a shrewd observer saying to me after the last election, "You know, one of the troubles with the Playford Government was that it nearly always said 'No' to certain reforms and changes." If that be a true criticism of the last Govern-

ment, then grievously has my Party answered for it, but the present Government displays a much worse tendency, because it cannot say "No" to anything at all, particularly anything put up to it by the "faceless men" of the Trades Hall.

It seems quite clear to me from certain attitudes that have been expressed, particularly in the last session of the Parliament, that everything must be sublimated to Labor policy, even the financial soundness of the Treasury. Grievously, I say, will the people of this State answer for that kind of administration. One of the principal causes of its financial trouble is not the drought or the economic slowing down (and these matters were dealt with adequately yesterday by Sir Arthur Rymill), but a simple everyday home truth that the Government will not face, namely, that the revenue is slowly but surely being frittered away, a little here and a little there. An ill-considered service pay hand-out started it off.

We now have costly Royal Commissions, new Industrial Commissioners and other such officers, the appointment of public relations officers, changes in office accommodation to house the new recruits, new Ministerial offices and trips overseas. The cost of some of these items themselves is not enormously high and some may serve a useful purpose but, collectively, the costs add up to a big amount.

I should like to deal now with a matter raised in His Excellency's Speech that will involve heavy expenditure in the present financial year. I refer to paragraph 10, in which His Excellency said:

My Government continues to pursue an active and progressive policy in connection with educational services.

Later in this paragraph, His Excellency said:

The Government has approved provision of school books without charge to the parents of children in primary schools, both State and private, and the scheme will operate from the beginning of 1967.

It is interesting to note that private schools can participate in this scheme if they so desire, although the Labor Party in South Australia is opposed to State aid for private schools. The Minister of Education, in a statement which was printed in the South Australian Institute of Teachers journal and which, I think, was referred to earlier in this Council in a question, made some lengthy points about this new free books scheme. I do not want to weary honourable members by reading again what the Minister said, but I will summarize his points, although not necessarily in the direct

order that he gave them. The Minister mentioned these points: (a) the scheme will retain any good features of the old scheme (the present situation); (b) there will be no alternative for books such as atlases and dictionaries, but there will be alternatives for books such as English readers, and headmasters will have a discretion similar to that which they now have in choosing from certain approved titles; (c) courses will be kept up to date because books will be changed as often as the curriculum committees consider desirable; (d) the Government desires to avoid undue dislocation of the business of booksellers who now supply books to schools; (e) contracts for the supply of books will be awarded to publishers who represent in the main a normal cross-section of those who previously handled the business; and (f) headmasters will be responsible for recovering the books from the children at the end of the year and for charging parents for those which are unduly damaged, and the returned books, if in reasonable order, will be re-issued. Although the Minister's statement does not refer to the period over which the books will be re-issued, I have read elsewhere that it is intended that they shall be re-issued for at least a three-year or a four-year period. I think that is a fair summing up of the Minister's points, and I should like to examine some of them closely.

The first point he has made is that the new system will retain any good features of the old system, but if one is familiar with the old system (the present situation) one is hard put to find what features have been retained at all. The present position is that supplies to South Australian primary schools have come from South Australian firms engaged primarily in the retail book trade. Those book firms have been long established in South Australia and they maintain large book shops in the city of Adelaide. For many years they have employed representatives, who have made calls on schools and have drawn the attention of headmasters and teachers to all the books on the market and have offered friendly and skilled advice as to suitable text books available for the coming year. Orders have been taken from the various schools, the books having been purchased at the discretion of the headmaster after consultation with the teachers in the various subjects. In due course distribution has been made by the book firms to the various schools, and the headmaster has attended to the sale of books to the students. He has, of course, been responsible for the collection of money for the books, but the schools themselves have enjoyed a 10 per cent

commission on the books purchased. This commission has gone towards school funds. If one realizes that funds raised for school purposes are subsidized 100 per cent by the Government, this represents a 20 per cent subsidy to schools, which they will no longer receive.

True, as a result of the introduction of the new scheme, the Government, this year, has by tender obtained many cheap books. The Minister has said that as a result of calling tenders contracts have been awarded to publishers who in the main have represented a normal cross-section of those who had previously handled the books. I repeat that the word he used was "publishers"; he did not say that the old-established South Australian booksellers who previously handled 100 per cent of this business had got a normal cross-section of the tenders. I have been told that 50 per cent of the money that will be spent by the Government will go to firms outside this State. Even the 50 per cent of the money that will go to South Australian booksellers will not be evenly distributed, for one particular firm has missed out altogether.

When tenders were first called by the Government, it was feared by the South Australian booksellers that they would be the victims of severe competition from firms in other States and, indeed, in some instances the publishers themselves might have been tempted to quote direct. To ensure that they still retained a reasonable chance of sharing in this large Government contract, practically all South Australian booksellers cut their tender prices to the bone, but, despite this, they secured only 50 per cent of the orders. This is just not good enough for our South Australian businesses. From the situation where they enjoyed 100 per cent of the trade, which is a valued and substantial part of their business, they are now reduced to cut-throat competition to receive only 50 per cent of the orders.

As I have said, these firms are long established, and it is important that their value to book lovers and readers be not lost sight of. Indeed, only yesterday I read in the *Advertiser* a report from Mr. Colin Thiele, the Principal of Wattle Park Teachers College, of the extreme importance to children of reading, and of how many authors of children's books had received letters from children showing how deeply they had become involved in the books they had read. By their being deprived of a substantial share of the primary school trade, South Australian booksellers are not being helped to maintain their retail outlets. It would be a great shame if in South Australia

we had a situation developing that has developed in some large cities, particularly overseas, where cut-throat competition and very low retail margins have practically caused the disappearance of large book shops. In New York, for instance, there is only one large book shop in the whole of that great metropolis.

The Minister has referred to the fact that curriculum committees have been set up to deal with the list of books to be purchased. These committees have been drawn from headmasters and senior masters in various schools. In fact, their personnel changes for each particular subject involved. Honourable members will note from what the Minister said that these various committees had to send in their orders no later than February this year for the 1967 school year. This is the first year of the scheme and an extension of time was granted in this instance; but in a normal year under this scheme it will be essential that decisions on what books are to be ordered must be made by the curriculum committee nearly two years before the time when the books will actually be required. Rapid changes are taking place in books from month to month, and it is extremely regrettable that under the Government's scheme decisions will have to be made nearly two years ahead, so that the benefit of considering new books coming on to the market is lost. No more representatives will be calling on the various schools and giving that constant service that has been so valuable in the past. As a result, headmasters and teachers of the various subjects will be completely in the hands of the curriculum committees and, unless those committees have some special knowledge, they will not be aware of new or better text books that may be available to them for their particular subjects.

The Minister said that alternatives would be offered in books such as English readers. Under the old scheme, the one now in operation, there were in each class no fewer than four supplementary readers recommended for English; consequently, children and teachers had a choice that was real and adequate. However, under the Government scheme there will be no choice except in English and Social Studies, and the sole opportunity will be to choose one out of two books that are available in those subjects. In other words, there will be, as the Minister says, alternatives offered for books. Yes—in two subjects; one takes either this book or that book. That is the only alternative that will be available under

the Government scheme. Whereas in the past schools could change books from year to year and keep pace with development in their subject and the books concerning it, now there will be a very limited choice indeed, and it will be three or four years before any changes are made in the curriculum books. This, surely, is putting education into a strait jacket. And, what is more, the teachers themselves know and fear it. In their journal they have set out their reasons in support of their proposal for a monetary grant to parents of primary schoolchildren to assist them in the purchase of text books that will be the very latest available and will remain the child's own property. I support wholeheartedly the suggestion made by the Institute of Teachers and regret that the Government has been so carried away by its own ideas that it has turned down the teachers' suggestions.

The Minister in reply to questions asked in this Chamber says that the Government's scheme will be less costly and easier to administer, although a similar scheme introduced by the Labor Government in New South Wales some years ago proved a complete failure. The Government in its delight in initially securing a cheap lot of books seems to have entirely overlooked other cost factors which will have to operate and which were not previously involved. I mention these because they are important. First, the books that the Government will get will not be delivered to the schools but will all be dumped in huge quantities at Mile End. The Government will have the headache of sorting and delivering at its expense.

Secondly, the headmasters will have an easy job of distribution to scholars once the books arrive at the schools, but what a headache they will face at the end of the school year. They will be required to assess whether a book is returnable or not and, if not, the money therefor must be collected from an indignant parent. What will happen? Headmasters are only human and I predict that they will do what any normal man or woman would do in the circumstances: rather than waste time and temper in dealing with the recovery of money from parents, they will take all the books back willy-nilly, irrespective of condition. Once this happens, as it will, the Government can forget about its annual bill for books being greatly reduced, because many books will not be in a fit condition to hand out again and will inevitably have to be replaced.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: The Government will have to provide storage space for these books, too.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Exactly. Such replacements will probably be costly, because tenders will not then be possible. It may even be impossible to get the books through their being out of print, a situation that very frequently occurs in the book trade.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: When will the first bills be going out for changing the books?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: That will be at the end of 1967, if they go out at all. As I said earlier, I shall be surprised if any bills go out at all. I think the books will all be taken back, to avoid argument.

The Hon. H. K. Kemp: What about the quality and accuracy of the books, and their being out of date?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: As I said earlier, I think the schools will be largely in the hands of the different curriculum committees, which will not have the full up-to-date information necessary. Furthermore, they can make mistakes as anybody else can. This is a great pity. Whereas previously the very latest material was available under the existing scheme, now we shall have to make decisions two years ahead. I think the Government will come to

regret the way it has elected to carry out its policy of providing free books, but time will provide the necessary proof one way or the other. The Institute of Teachers has put forward an alternative scheme that sounds to me eminently sensible and has many desirable features.

Speaking, as I am, very late in this debate on the adoption of the Address in Reply, I should like to close by saying that I associate myself with the sentiments expressed by other honourable members in this debate about those in this place and in another place who have died in the last 12 months. I should like to pay a particular tribute to the late Sir Frank Perry, a former member of this Chamber, who was of great assistance to me personally when I came into this Council as a young member in 1959, and I am sure that all honourable members will remember his invaluable work as a legislator as well as in other fields. I have pleasure in supporting the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

At 3.17 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, July 19, at 2.15 p.m.