

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, February 20, 1969

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin) took the Chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

QUESTIONS

TATTOOING

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: A few days ago I asked the Chief Secretary a question regarding the problem of children having their bodies tattooed. Has he a reply?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think when this question was asked earlier I said that I did not fully understand the legal situation. There is no South Australian legislation covering tattooing on a minor, but such legislation is proposed in the United Kingdom and also in New South Wales. As the situation in South Australia does not appear to demand urgent action, Cabinet had previously decided to take no action at present, but it will observe the effect of the proposals in the United Kingdom and New South Wales.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: May I point out to the Chief Secretary the situation in which a surgeon finds himself if he operates on a minor for the benefit of that minor's health. Unless it is an extreme emergency, the surgeon must seek the consent of the parent or guardian. Surely at least that degree of protection should be given to minors who are exposed to the risk of mutilation of their body and their mind as a result of this practice of tattooing. Would not the Government urgently consider a measure, at least to that extent?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I fully appreciate the validity of the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Springett. I will make sure that Cabinet is fully informed of his views and raise the matter again in Cabinet to see whether legislation can be introduced to protect minors against the tattooing of their bodies.

PENSIONERS' CONCESSIONS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport any further information about concessions to pensioners using road lines that have taken the place of railway services?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The application by Wadmore's Coach Lines to operate the road passenger service to the Barossa Valley made provision for concession fares for aged pensioners only. Company employees, however, incorrectly granted concession fares to invalid pensioners who produced their pension entitlement cards and this continued until it was brought to the notice of the management. The Manager of Wadmore's Coach Lines returned to Adelaide earlier than was expected and, in view of all the circumstances, has agreed forthwith to extend pensioners' concession fares to include invalid pensioners.

GRAIN STORAGE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: No doubt the Minister is well aware of the problems besetting farmers this season with the delivery of their grain to silos, and the problem of sales overseas. A statement appeared in the press recently suggesting that the State Government extend a loan of about \$1,000,000 to South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Ltd., apparently with the idea of giving it additional capital for future silo construction. Can the Minister advise me whether Cabinet has considered lending money to that company and, if so, is he aware of what extra silos will be built in the foreseeable future, bearing in mind the problems of the storage of grain left as a carryover and not sold?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member's question is in two parts. First, let me deal with the suggestion that the State Government provide \$1,000,000 for the bulk handling company to increase its building of silos in the next 12 months. The income of the bulk handling company is provided for by the tolls it is able to collect from the use of its silos. At present it has a credit of \$5,000,000 as well as money in reserve.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: That is growers' money?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. That is about normal spending for the bulk handling company. In my opinion, the suggestion that the State Government should give the company assistance is not valid because, pursuant to the provisions of the Act, the Government provides guarantees to the Commonwealth Bank. It would, therefore, be a pretty futile

operation to take \$1,000,000 out of the State's meagre Budget when the company could borrow that money without interest.

Regarding the programme for 1969, the company expects to build 18 new silos which will have a total capacity of nearly 8,000,000 bushels (in addition to what we have at present) and which will cost \$5,000,000. In addition, the directors have asked the Commonwealth Bank for an additional \$2,000,000 loan money to enable it to speed up its programme there in expectation of its not being able to get all of the wheat out of South Australia and of there being a carryover. That \$2,000,000 will be used to erect new installations at selected terminal ports, the whole object being to rail the wheat away from the inland to get it to the seaboard. The whole of the wheat will then be marshalled in an area from which it can be readily shipped. In addition to the information I have given the honourable member, it is of some interest to note that in its crash programme, which has gone on since September or October, 23 new large structural sheds have been built. This has alleviated the position by enabling almost 5,000,000 bushels of wheat to be stored during the present harvest delivery period. If the honourable member would like more information on this subject, I will obtain it for him.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Has the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Works, a reply to the question I asked yesterday regarding the progress being made on the new Government Printing Office?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: My colleague informs me that on November 12, 1968, the Public Works Standing Committee recommended the construction at Netley of a new Government Printing Office and accommodation for the Mapping Branch, Lands Department, at an estimated cost of \$4,548,020. Planning is proceeding on the basis that documents will be ready for calling of tenders early in 1970. It is expected that work on the site will take about two years to complete following the letting of a contract.

BIRDSVILLE TRACK

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Lands.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Most people who have travelled on the Birdsville Track realize that the flowing bores on that track are at about boiling point, or just a few degrees less. The Birdsville Track has become some sort of tourist attraction, but some people have not been aware that the water is as hot as it is. Recently, a gentleman travelling along the track had an unfortunate experience; his dog ran ahead of him and jumped into the boiling water. It was most unfortunate for the dog and for the owner, who tried to rescue the dog. Will the Minister ask his colleague, under whose jurisdiction this matter comes, to see that notices warning that it is boiling water are posted?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: This is a hot subject, but I will certainly take it up with my colleague and let the honourable member have a reply.

MEASLES VACCINE

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Can the Minister of Health give the Council any information regarding the Government's attitude towards the use of measles vaccine and its distribution?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The new measles vaccine is being made available by the Commonwealth Government and will be available for distribution in South Australia on May 1, I think. Several problems are involved in its distribution. The Public Health Department has circularized all local boards of health asking their views on the matter and asking whether they are interested in conducting immunization campaigns using the new vaccine. When these replies have been received the Government hopes to mount a campaign in connection with the vaccine.

TELEVISION SETS

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Has the Minister of Local Government obtained from the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the maintenance of television sets in schools?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: My colleague reports:

Approval was given in November, 1968, that the Education Department accept responsibility for maintenance on television receivers in schools, irrespective of whether they were purchased on subsidy or at full cost to the schools. As in the case of repairs to radio equipment, schools may make arrangements for minor repairs. If extensive repairs are needed a quote has to be submitted to the Education Department and approval obtained before the work can be carried out. All accounts for maintenance and repair have to be endorsed by the head of the school.

HOSPITAL CARE

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT: Two or three nights ago there appeared in the "Stop press" section of one of our newspapers the following announcement:

South Australia "unable to afford" sound hospital care. A five-year projected expenditure survey showed clearly that the State would be unable to afford the net expenditure involved in providing sound public hospital care.

This claim was made in submissions to the Senate Select Committee on medical and hospital costs. The next day the newspaper (and I think I am correct in saying this) in an editorial, or certainly somewhere in the paper, suggested that the Commonwealth Government may have to take over the care of hospitals in this State. Will the Minister comment upon and clarify this statement?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I could make a very long reply to the question. The position is that officers of the Hospitals Department in South Australia gave evidence before the Senate Select Committee, which honourable members know is taking evidence on questions of health throughout Australia. In that evidence a departmental representative put to the Select Committee that over the last few years the State Government contributions to hospitals in South Australia have been increasing while the relative contributions by the Commonwealth Government had decreased.

The final summary of that evidence was that, if this is projected into the future (if the trend is allowed to continue) then in five years' time it will be impossible for the State Government to maintain the present very high standard of hospital and health care in the community without a large increase in hospital charges or in taxation in South Australia. In giving this evidence, it was not intended to imply that the State Government had any intention of handing over responsibility for hospital or health administration to the Commonwealth Government. However, it was made clear to the Select Committee that over the last four or five years the Commonwealth Government's contribution towards the total amount of money being spent on health was, percentage-wise, declining, and that if such a trend continued for the next five-year period the State Government would be in a difficult situation in maintaining the high standards of health care

now being demanded. I also make the point (and I am certain the Leader will agree with me) that even with pensioners the State Government makes a heavy contribution.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The Commonwealth Government does not pay its fair share.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is so, and we have a greater number of pensioners in the community these days, once again placing a heavy load on the State Government in attending to health matters. The two points I make are: first, the article in the stop press of the *News* referred to a projected five-year period ahead if this disparity in financing health services is allowed to continue, and, secondly, there is no intention of handing over any powers to the Commonwealth Government in connection with hospital management or maintenance or with health matters.

COPPER MINING

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: In view of all the exploration carried out by the Department of Mines in the northern areas of the State, as well as that carried out by private companies in those areas in a search for minerals, can the Minister tell this Council of the position as it relates to the possibility of correct mining of copper from the Burra area or from any other area in the north of the State?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I think I have already given a number of replies with regard to Burra. The situation there is that there is a serious metallurgical problem to be overcome. This is being taken up at present both by laboratories overseas and our own laboratories at Amdel. These experiments will be continued, and we hope that we shall be able to overcome the difficulty.

I had the honour of visiting Mount Gunson with the Hon. Mr. Geddes quite recently. There are very grave difficulties, too, in the development of this mine, but I hope that very soon some statement will be made in regard to its future. I pay full credit to the company operating Mount Gunson for the tenacity with which it has pursued the development of this area, and I know that the previous Minister of Mines would share that view with me. I hope that within the next week some firm statement can be made on the future of Mount Gunson.

FRUIT CROPS

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: As I think the Council is aware, this year has been disastrous to many sections of the fruit industry. The most serious disaster is the rain of two weeks ago, the effects of which are only just now beginning to show. I have a report that at least some of the peach growers in the river districts have lost 100 per cent of the crops that were ripening at that time. As the trouble is brown rot, it is likely that there can be no prospect other than that of equally serious losses in the later maturing varieties.

In the Hills, we have lost 100 per cent of some of the potato crops and similar losses have occurred in vegetable crops, which are rotting as a result of the rain. There must be serious difficulties in the marketing and the canning industries. Has the Minister yet had surveys made of the position?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes, I have had surveys made. I have been constantly in touch with the situation regarding potatoes, citrus and canned fruits, and I can say that the honourable member has not exaggerated in any way the seriousness of the situation. Starting from the apricot season, severe losses have been caused by Rutherglen bug, followed in more recent times by the same pest attacking the early clingstone peaches. Brown rot broke out in the garden variety, and this has caused severe losses, amounting to 90 per cent to some growers. However, the overall picture would be a loss of about 30 per cent or 40 per cent.

The rain damaged the currant crop severely, and mould has set it. Regarding the potato situation, in the South-East and Virginia areas very little damage was sustained. However, in many of the Hills areas the loss could be up to 90 per cent in some water-logged areas. The position, generally speaking, is that whilst it was thought there would be quite a big surplus of potatoes this year we shall probably become an importing State later in the year.

I do not know whether I have given the honourable member all the answers he wants. I can tell him that a committee comprising the Assistant Under Treasurer (as Chairman), Mr. Jack Howe (a growers' representative, of Lyrup), and Mr. Walker of the Agriculture Department, has been set up to collate all

these reports that we are getting, and at the same time to prepare a case that I can take to the Agricultural Council and also the Commonwealth Government to see whether there are some means of assisting, particularly in the canned deciduous fruits field, because that industry has been particularly badly hit by the effect of the Kennedy Round and also the devaluation of currency in the United Kingdom. Another complication has arisen through the United States of America objecting to our promotional levy, in which regard the industry was doing very good work. That fund is overspent and, of course, has to be recouped, and we have not got the machinery to do that at the moment. I am afraid I cannot be more cheerful about the situation.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT VEHICLES

The Hon. L. R. HART: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Section 13 of the Motor Vehicles Act sets out a list of vehicles that are exempted from registration. These vehicles are mainly vehicles used by local government authorities for roadmaking and the destruction of noxious weeds. Section 31 of the same Act sets out a list of vehicles, including those that would be used for local government work, that may be registered without fee.

Local government work involves activities associated with various Acts of Parliament. It is necessary for a good deal of inspection work to be done in relation to the Weeds Act, the Health Act, the Vermin Act, and also the Building Act, and the vehicles used for this inspection work do not come under the category of those that may be registered without fee. Will the Minister look into this matter to see whether it will be possible, when bringing down further amendments to the Motor Vehicles Act, to include also the category I have just mentioned?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: First, I would just make the general comment that the time is coming when we must seriously consider the question of not permitting the exemption from registration of further vehicles. I am sure honourable members will appreciate that such a policy can drift on and on, and of course the objective of obtaining the actual money under this heading is that the money finds its way back into the Highways Fund for maintenance and construction of roads. That need

is ever increasing, and any vehicle that uses the roads, irrespective of the purpose of its use or its ownership, causes wear and tear to the roads. Therefore, I think it is quite reasonable to say that some contribution should be made by the owner towards that general wear and tear.

Over the years there have been exemptions and some of them have been referred to today by the Hon. Mr. Hart. I recall that a few months ago the Government considered and made some concession in this respect for weeds officers—one of the matters mentioned, I think, by the honourable member. Also, the actual ownership of the vehicle has to be considered because in some cases, where the services of officers are retained by local government, the ownership of the vehicle is in the name of the officer, who sometimes is retained on only a part-time basis. However, I will take up the matter in respect of which the honourable member has asked that a review be made, and bring down a reply for him. If I cannot do so in this Chamber, I shall forward a letter to him.

OVERSEA TRIP

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I believe the Chief Secretary will be able to make an overseas trip next week. No doubt, he has some objects in mind and some avenues to explore for the benefit of South Australia. All honourable members, I am sure, will agree that any overseas trips that can be arranged for honourable members, and particularly for Ministers, benefits not only those who go but also the State. Will the Chief Secretary indicate some of the objects of his trip?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Perhaps first I should say how grateful I am to the British Government for its generosity in enabling me to make the trip. I believe the Hon. Mr. Kneebone unfortunately could not avail himself of a similar invitation while he was a Minister, but I am able to accept this invitation. The main interest for me on this trip will be modern teaching hospitals. When I was approached by the British High Commissioner in Adelaide, he asked me what I would be interested in seeing in Great Britain, and I told him that that would be the main purpose of my visit. As honourable members appreciate, we are in the throes of planning a new teaching

hospital that will cost the State a large sum, and I shall be chiefly interested in seeing what has occurred in Britain in the last few years in the design and equipping of a modern teaching hospital.

Also, we shall be looking at the approach to domiciliary care, the treatment and care of geriatric patients and modern prison reform. We shall pay a brief visit to the companies that supply much hospital equipment to Australia and South Australia. I hope the visit will be of some benefit to South Australia; indeed, I am certain it will be of some benefit, anyway, to the Hospitals Department and the Public Health Department in this State.

RAILWAY SAFETY

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Last week I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport a question about driver safety controls on the locomotives hauling the Overland express between Adelaide and Melbourne. The Minister gave me a reply relating to locomotives operated by the South Australian Railways and to exit doors on carriages, but he has not given me a reply about whether there are any driver safety features on the Victorian locomotives hauling the Overland. Has he a reply to that question?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I have not the specific reply the honourable member seeks. I recall that the uncertain part of the answer given last time dealt with the Victorian locomotives which, as honourable members know, haul the Overland from Melbourne to Serviceton. Locomotives from Victoria are used for that section of the route, and at that point South Australian locomotives hook up to the train. Also, the fireman, driver and guard change, so our own staff serves on this side of the border and Victorian employees operate on the section between Serviceton and Melbourne.

The South Australian Railways Commissioner has been seeking information, at my request, but apparently has not so far received a reply. It may well be that it is prudent for the Victorian Railways Department to finalize its inquiries into and reports on the unfortunate tragedy that occurred when the Southern Aurora crashed at Violet Town. Perhaps it wishes to conclude its inquiry into that accident before it replies to the request from the South Australian Railways Commissioner. I assure the honourable member, however, that the South Australian Railways Commissioner is satisfied with the position as he knows it on the Victorian section between Serviceton and

Melbourne, so that passengers going from South Australia need have no concern. So far I have not been able to obtain actual details, but as soon as the information comes to hand I will let the honourable member have it.

HOOLIGANISM

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Last weekend there was an ugly incident at a dance at Echungu where a young man attempting to stop a fight was attacked by a gang of young men, rabbit-punched and kicked to the ground. Rumour has it this morning that the man has since died. We are having a lot of this kind of trouble of disturbances at dances by lads who seem to be mobile in cars and who are likely to turn up at any dances at the sub-metropolitan townships. Police supervision in these towns is good. We all appreciate the work they do, but naturally they cannot be in attendance at these places the whole time. There seems to be some need for a crime squad to try to protect young people from these miscreants who travel quickly and make worrying nuisances of themselves. I have no doubt the Chief Secretary has this matter in hand but it will greatly reassure people if he can make a statement on just what is being done.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Unfortunately, this is the first I have heard of this incident. I agree with the honourable member that this sort of action appears to be increasing in our community. Regarding what the honourable member referred to as a crime squad, I can assure him that it has been and it is the policy of the Police Department to increase the number of mobile police patrols. In some cases this will mean that some smaller police stations will be forced to close down but it is believed that, if this policy is followed, a better coverage can be provided with the available police.

WEEDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

PUBLIC PARKS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

WILLS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 3)

Read a third time and passed.

WHYALLA HOSPITAL (VESTING) BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

As honourable members may be aware, certain administrative difficulties have occurred in relation to the hospital at Whyalla. Since these difficulties appeared in the circumstances to be insoluble, the previous Government decided that the hospital, which is being operated by an association known as the Whyalla Hospital Incorporated, should be taken over by the Government and operated as a public hospital under the Hospitals Act. On its assumption of office the present Government, after examining the situation, decided to give effect to the decision of the previous Government.

To effect this transfer of responsibility, the Government has been advised that an Act of this Parliament is necessary. Accordingly, honourable members are now asked to consider this Bill. Clause 1 is quite formal. Clause 2 sets out the definitions of expressions used in the Bill. Clause 3 provides for the fixing of a "vesting day", that is, the day on which the transfer will actually take place. The determination of the actual day will depend on the progress of the administrative and financial arrangements necessary to ensure a smooth changeover. Clause 4 sets out the legal effect of the transfer that will take place on the vesting day.

Clause 5 is intended to ensure that the rights of any creditor of the hospital or of any person having an actual or prospective claim against the association will be substantially unaffected by the changeover. A corporation is created to stand in the place of the association and (as a corollary) to sue or take any other proceedings on behalf of the association. Sub-clauses (3) and (4) make appropriate provision to meet successful claims against the corporation. Clause 6 specifically empowers the corporation to assume the obligation of the association with regard to the repayment of moneys loaned by the Whyalla Town Commission. In fact, the Government has undertaken this obligation of repayment since the inception of the borrowing programme but only *vis-a-vis* the association. The obligation will now be related specifically to the commission. Clause 7 empowers the Registrar-General to make any necessary alteration to his records.

Clause 8 institutes the hospital as a public hospital within the meaning of the Hospitals Act. Clause 9 ensures that an opportunity exists for hospital staff who on the vesting day obtain employment with the Government otherwise than as officers under the Public Service Act to count their previous service with the hospital for the purposes of leave of absence. A similar provision already exists to cover the case of persons who become officers under the Public Service Act. However, this section does not confer any right or entitlement to future employment with the Government. Clause 10 is generally self-explanatory, and is designed to ensure that no unforeseen circumstances will inhibit the transfer of control. I commend the Bill to honourable members.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): With much pleasure, I support the Bill. It is said that when one leaves one's stamp it remains for some time afterwards. I do not want to go into all the troubles and problems of the Whyalla Hospital, but in my opinion it has come to the time when a subsidized hospital such as that at Whyalla grows so large that it should become a public hospital for the benefit of the community it serves. When I had the honour to be Chief Secretary, thought was being given to what should be done in relation to this hospital, and, because of the troublesome times experienced there, the taking over of the hospital by the State was accepted on my recommendation to the Labor Government.

The Whyalla Hospital is up to date, it is a fine building and, generally speaking, it has provided a fine service to the Whyalla people, despite all the trouble experienced with staff and doctors. However, I do not want to labour that point. I only hope that when it becomes a public hospital the administrator and matron, whoever they may be, as well as the staff will co-operate and work for the benefit of the community. I have said previously (and I believe it to be true) that a hospital can have the best possible building, equipment, beds and everything else but, unless the people working within that building and with that machinery and equipment are working in complete harmony, they will not obtain the best results.

Clause 9 has been improved by an amendment moved in another place by the Hon. Mr. Loveday, which Mr. Riches and I examined, to safeguard the interests of the executive employees as well as the rest of the staff.

Some work went on, in which my friend, the Hon. R. R. Loveday, participated, and an amendment was inserted in the Bill in another place; clause 9 (2) provides for preference for the executive staff. Whilst it does not give these staff members any right to their jobs, it does give them preference if all other things are equal.

This is a very good provision, because most of the people I am referring to have served the hospital very well, and I hope something can be done to retain their services. I realize that, when the hospital becomes a public hospital, these positions will have to be advertised in accordance with the Public Service Act. If someone with far superior qualifications applies, the Government or the board is duty-bound to appoint him. However, I think the Chief Secretary and the Director-General of Medical Services agree with me that, all other things being equal, the present employees should receive preference.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The procedure in this provision was the procedure that the Government intended to follow.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes, but it is better to have it in the Bill. The provision is fair and reasonable. If some of these officers are superseded by officers with better qualifications I hope the Chief Secretary and the Director-General of Medical Services will be considerate toward those displaced and try to place them in jobs that fit their qualifications. I realize the legal and other difficulties associated with this matter.

It is only 18 months since a decision was made in this matter. I would have liked to introduce this Bill myself. I am very pleased that the decision made on my recommendation to a previous Cabinet has been endorsed by the present Government. I hope that, after the vesting day, the hospital functions as it should—in the very best interests of the people of Whyalla and surrounding districts.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I support the Bill, which provides for the transitional period before the Whyalla Hospital becomes a Government hospital. I believe that South Australia is indeed fortunate in the standard of its medical services which, under the present Minister, are moving forward. His predecessor also took a keen interest in this matter and you, Mr. President, from your long years as Chief Secretary and Minister of Health, must take much of the credit for the way in which the health services of the State function. We have a system

of Government hospitals in the large centres and of subsidized hospitals in the smaller centres, as well as the community and private hospitals, each playing its part. I believe the system of subsidizing hospitals in this State is excellent and has meant efficient hospital services at one of the cheapest costs in Australia.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Due to the community effort.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I agree. It is this involvement in the hospital by the community that is valuable. Any institution, whether it be a hospital, a school, or anything else, does better if the community is involved in it. Circumstances in Whyalla are different from those in many other communities, because it was the fastest growing town and is now the fastest growing city in the State. Those who have knowledge of subsidized hospitals in a stable community of an average size know that there has to be a drive for money to meet expanding needs necessitated not only by the expansion but also by increased medical knowledge, so new buildings and equipment are often necessary. The average-size community finds that, with the assistance of the \$2 for \$1 Government subsidy, help from local rating and from the community, these hospitals provide a good service, although financing them is near the limit of what the community can afford to pay.

A city growing as quickly as Whyalla causes an added drain on the community because of a rapidly expanding population, which needs a corresponding increase in the number of hospital beds available. Whyalla is an industrial town and most of the population is not Australian-born: they have come here to establish themselves and build a life within this community and, therefore, most of their energies and financial resources are directed towards that end. This causes a slightly different problem in this city. It is to the credit of the Minister, the department, the hospital administration and the people in Whyalla that the present facilities are available, because a great effort has been made by all concerned. We have the precedent of having Government hospitals, after the community has reached a certain size, at Port Lincoln, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, and Mount Gambier.

I hope this legislation will be in the best interests of Whyalla, but I point out that, although the hospital will become a Government hospital with the Government taking the

main responsibility of providing medical facilities, hospitals in country communities still require support from auxiliary organizations in order that extra amenities are provided to make the stay of patients more pleasant. From what I have heard this Bill meets the wishes of most of those involved, and I have much pleasure in supporting it.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support the Bill. The Hon. Mr. Gilfillan made some pertinent remarks, but I believe, without reflecting in any way on the Minister, that it is a shame that there is to be this change from a community hospital to one controlled by the Minister. The principle of community self-help is becoming harder and harder to foster. It was through observing this principle that Australia grew, and I wish South Australia would continue to follow it. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

Certain administrative difficulties have occurred in relation to the hospital at Whyalla. Since these difficulties appeared in the circumstances to be insoluble, the previous Government decided that the hospital, which is being operated by an association known as the Whyalla Hospital Incorporated, should be taken over by the Government and operated as a public hospital under the Hospitals Act.

This confirms the point I have just made. I believe in freedom of enterprise and initiative, but here we have a group of people who have been unable to be free in their thinking and have got themselves bogged down.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You don't mind their being free, but you do not want them to be dictators.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: I do not want the people to be dictated to. Once the Government takes over it does a certain amount of dictating.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It does not. Everyone is made to work according to the plans, and some of the people at Whyalla had to have this done to make them work according to the plans.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: This is my theme: where does the community go next? What a shame it is that we have to get the Government to do this. I am referring not only to Whyalla but to the community as a whole. Whenever people want help they say, "Let us go to the Government." The final result is frightening. People will have no initiative, no freedom, no rights of their own. This is not a criticism of Whyalla: it is criticism of modern thinking generally and of the permissiveness going on in the community.

Since 1932 I have frequently visited Whyalla. The tug boat *Yaaka* used to draw barges carrying concentrates from Whyalla to Port Pirie to be shipped to other ports. During school holidays I was a frequent passenger on that tug boat to a place called Hummocky Hill. The water for human consumption there was collected as a result of rain water running into gutters and thence into underground tanks. I am sure you, Mr. President, remember those days quite well.

This township has grown and grown with the massive help and generosity of the Broken Hill Proprietary Company Limited, which has done so much for the town—not only the hospital but also sporting areas and the many facets of life at Whyalla. The town owes a great debt to this huge company. The hospital, which had humble beginnings, has grown and is now a fine multi-storey building, with air-conditioning; it is one of the finest hospitals for many miles around. The fact that the Government will now control its operation brings me to my next point, the employment of the senior executive staff. I fully appreciate the amendment moved by Mr. Loveday in another place, for that is what I, too, had in mind—something to effect complete fairness so that the staff needing help and re-employment, provided they had the qualifications, could get it. The difficulty that the society of the future will face is this: the more control society asks for and gets the less freedom it has. This is another instance of that happening. I support the second reading.

The Hon. V. G. SPRINGETT (Southern): In rising to support this Bill, I am conscious of the fact that I am not a member of this Council for the district in which Whyalla stands. Nevertheless, I have a keen interest in the circumstances of the development of any hospital in South Australia. My early knowledge of Whyalla was not gained in this State at all: it was gained on the other side of the world when I read in papers accounts of the development of places like Whyalla and Elizabeth. Those two names are very well known to anyone interested in reading about and learning of South Australia. Vast numbers of people from the other side of the world, and particularly the British Isles, have come here. Those arriving from Britain in recent years have come from a medical system somewhat different from our own. Reference was made by the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan to community services, community effort and community involvement.

In this State those things have a great part to play. In Britain they have a lesser part to play because these services and facilities are provided through taxes.

Whyalla, following the passing of this Bill, will now be taking the next step towards having a public-controlled Government hospital. People should not make the mistake of thinking that they do not have to pay for these services. When a service is provided to members of the public they often think it is a free service, but it is only free at the time the service is received; it must be paid for come what may.

The Whyalla Hospital is fortunate in serving a large community, because it can draw upon a large number of people to serve in its various facets. Plenty of girls are available for nursing, and there are folk to fill domestic and other ancillary services. This augurs well for the future development of the hospital. At Whyalla there are prospects of development that will allow it to offer the best medical services to the community provided, first, that the local people do not lose sight of their responsibilities to the community regarding the various extra services that a hospital needs; and, secondly, that they do not forget that they must pay for what they want. Granted this, a Government hospital can offer as much service to the community as a subsidized hospital can. As a representative of a district other than Northern, I wish well to all those associated with the development of the Whyalla Hospital. I support the Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I, too, support the Bill. Whyalla is close to my home town and I have had much to do with the town, its medical officers and its splendid hospital, which has always been run well. Although it has experienced some internal difficulties in the past, I do not think any patients have suffered as a result. I would not be doing the Whyalla people justice if I said their hospital was big enough at present. Although it is well laid out (and I have heard that it is one of the best-designed hospitals in the State), sooner or later additions will be necessary because of the tremendous increase in the town's population. I hope the Minister notes what I have said in this respect. Of course, the Bill has nothing to do with that; it concerns the transition of this hospital to a Government hospital. Despite any internal strife that may have taken place there, I think a Government hospital would have been necessary in any case. I commend the

Government and the previous Minister, who set this machinery in operation, as I believe it was necessary to overcome Whyalla's problems. The Whyalla Hospital Incorporated will have representation during the interim period. Clause 9 ensures that no injustice will be done to any of the present employees. The Bill is well designed, covers all aspects, and I commend it to honourable members.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I, too, support the Bill, although, like the Hon. Mr. Springett, I do not represent the area in which Whyalla is situated. However, in this Chamber we do not stick to the parish pump but are here to consider the good of the whole State. The Bill seeks to transfer the hospital from the present association and vest it in the Crown, for the reasons given by the Chief Secretary in his second reading explanation. The hospital is to be managed by a corporation in place of the present association. I commend the Government for this necessary step, which was initiated in the first instance by the former Minister.

I have not visited Whyalla many times, but I am aware of its great importance to the State and know that it is a fast-growing city. Having regard to its present size and its potential for growth, I realize that it is appropriate that the hospital be vested in the name of Her Majesty the Queen and become a Government-controlled hospital. By and large, a good job has been done in this State by succeeding Governments in providing hospital facilities, and the voluntary efforts of people working for Government-subsidized hospitals and for smaller hospitals, which are necessary but do not have the benefit of Government subsidy, are to be commended. I commend the hospitals in this State and the work of the public in constantly increasing the generally high standards of our hospitals. However, the rising standards and the rising costs that are being, and will be, incurred highlight the need for more assistance from the Commonwealth Government for facilities of this nature. The vesting of the Whyalla Hospital in the Government is a necessary step, but I do not favour hospitals being vested in the Government, generally. Many of the community hospitals, aided by Government assistance, are being well conducted, but in this case this is a correct move, and I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Rights of certain employees."

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: This clause contains certain provisions that we have questioned when considering other legislation. I realize that we have a different situation here in that the power given to the Government under this clause relates to an institution for which the Government itself is responsible. However, will the Chief Secretary explain why this clause is necessary?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): This clause, on the face of it, contains provision for the resolution of doubts and difficulties; it is in a form not unlike provisions that honourable members have seen fit to reject on previous occasions. The Bill authorizes the Government to take over the Whyalla Hospital, which is at present operated by an incorporated association that draws its support from the people of Whyalla. Whilst the Government, with the agreement of all the parties, is anxious to secure control of the physical structure of the hospital, it is even more concerned to see that it does no more than this. That which can be left to the people of the area is to be so left.

For instance, during the negotiations with the association, it was noted that certain moneys had been given by a benefactor on a loose term of trust for the benefit of the nurses and for equipment. It may well be claimed that these funds should have passed to the Government, but in this instance the Government thought (and, I think, rightly) that the better course would be to leave these funds and their disbursement with a trustee who was a representative of the Whyalla citizens. Similarly, there may be other funds, property or interests, particularly by way of testamentary disposition but also by way of intended gifts.

After the vesting day there will be no association able to take such funds or property, as the winding up of the association is a necessary consequence of the transfer of control to the Government. In this particular case these gifts may fail, depending on the precise terms of the testamentary dispositions or gifts. However, it may be that such dispositions can be preserved either for the people of Whyalla or for the hospital, as circumstances dictate, by a proclamation that can be made under the terms of clause 10 of the Bill. This is just an example of a situation that renders such a provision as appears in clause 10 desirable. I draw honourable members' attention to the comparatively narrow objects of this Bill,

which are to vest the hospital in the Government. I remind them that the only use to which clause 10 can be put is the better to effect these objects. I hope this explanation of the clause is satisfactory.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 3685.)

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): This Bill, which deals with the operations of the Totalizator Agency Board, is highly desirable. As on previous occasions of this kind, I am in considerable agreement with the Hon. Mr. Shard, who has a practical approach to matters of this sort. On consulting *Hansard* I find that three years ago we were in considerable agreement on several points when the honourable member (as Chief Secretary and on behalf of the then Government) introduced a Bill in connection with T.A.B.

This Bill permits the T.A.B. to operate on virtually any race meeting or trotting meeting in the world. I do not see much harm in it beyond the fact that it does provide a precedent for more and more betting and gambling. I recall that, when the original Bill providing for T.A.B. was before this Council, not only the Chief Secretary of the day (the Hon. Mr. Shard) but also a few other honourable members and I said that we hoped the introduction of the T.A.B. would not mean that T.A.B. agencies would be open for betting on every day of the week. We believed we could not afford the wastage of time by many people who would not waste their time if betting facilities were not available. At that time I made a point in connection with paying out by T.A.B. agencies. It was on my suggestion that the Chairman of the Queensland T.A.B. visited this State to give various racing men who were likely to be associated with T.A.B. some very helpful advice. He told me that one problem that had to be faced was that of the fantastic number of uncollected tickets at such places as Surfers Paradise that had to be checked and indexed. (Of course, if payouts are made on the day of the race meeting, the procedure is fairly similar to that followed by betting shops.)

If T.A.B. agencies paid out after the last race, particularly on Saturdays, it would be to everyone's benefit and it would be a matter of

common sense. I discussed this point with the Chairman of the South Australian T.A.B. shortly after he was appointed and he said it would mean that the T.A.B. staff, at least in country towns, would have to remain in the agencies late in the afternoon at enhanced rates of pay. I understand—I do not want to misquote him—that nowadays the Chairman has somewhat different views and realizes the need for this point to be considered. From my own viewpoint, I believe that the T.A.B. should pay out on Saturday afternoons after the last race.

This brings me to my old bone of contention: what has Port Pirie got that Mount Gambier has not got? We did eventually agree that Port Pirie should keep its bookmakers. It was suggested at the time that we should at least let them continue, but that their licences should not be renewed. Now, the matter has become almost farcical. A T.A.B. agency has been established in Port Pirie in competition (rightly, I believe) with the betting shops. However, the betting shops pay out after every race whilst the T.A.B. does not pay out until the following Monday. It is beyond my comprehension how the T.A.B. can compete with the betting shops on this basis.

This situation is farcical and not worthy of the Government or the board. It may not be the board's fault, because it appears to be controlled when it comes to such matters. Now that the board is well established and working satisfactorily it should be given the necessary authority to decide when it will pay out, to the satisfaction of the people in a particular district.

I am still prepared to go along with not paying out after the individual race (although I think it has its disadvantages) because I do not want to see the old-fashioned betting shop coming back with young people with babies in prams hanging around the betting shop all the afternoon. At the same time it should not be forgotten that, if the illegal bookmaker is to be curbed, he must be met on equal terms; whether people like it or not, that is a fact of life.

I believe the T.A.B. is working pretty well throughout the State. I am naturally glad, as a punter, to see that the winning bets tax will be removed shortly. I also imagine that bookmakers' clerks will be glad. It will give racing people a lot more satisfaction than many non-racing people think, as they will not have to fossick about in their pockets for change to pay an amount of, say, 70c or so

in exchange on \$15 or \$20. Nothing annoys people more than that type of thing. I remember collecting £10 in Melbourne and a chap wanted a shilling for the ticket. That type of thing irks people when they pay tax on what they consider a bit of sport with money they have saved up after paying their own income tax. As I said before, the racing game is still taxed too heavily in comparison with other sports. We still "gild the lilly" by talking about money from racing going to hospitals; we all know that that is so much mumbo-jumbo and that the money goes to the Treasury. You can call it what you like; sometimes the hospitals get a reasonable amount, but at other times they do not collect very much. There is no question that it is the punter who keeps the game going, plus, I suppose, a limited number of comparatively wealthy men who attend to the breeding side, which at times can be costly and, at other times may be profitable.

The fact remains that racing cannot go ahead without the punter. It seems to me that all Governments, regardless of colour, do not pay enough attention to the fact that unless racing in the State prospers, eventually the Government of the day will tend to kill the goose instead of fattening it so that it will lay more eggs, both for the Government and for the general public.

The Hon. C. R. Story: They do not really lay as well when they are fat you know.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Is that so? Then they are probably good to eat in that case.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Are you coming to the question of how it benefits everybody if there is a pay-out after the last race?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: By interjection, the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill has mentioned how it will benefit everybody.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I hope you notice that the emphasis was on the word "everybody".

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Do you think that the Government will not benefit from it as well as everybody else?

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: I don't see how it would benefit me.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think that paying at the T.A.B. after the last race would have any effect on those attending a racecourse in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: In my remarks I stressed that I was referring to paying out in the country after the last race. As to paying out in the city, I am not prepared to dispute that point at the moment. However, I say emphatically that the T.A.B. should pay out in the country after the last race. All the people who bet on T.A.B. on a Saturday afternoon have to go in on a Monday afternoon and collect. Compare this with a man paying out in, say, Lucindale from about 2 to 4 o'clock on the Saturday afternoon, and a man having to travel 100-odd miles to come in on the Monday to collect \$20 or \$30. I think we can agree that the comparison is farcical.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: It would not be profitable for a man to chase his money.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: No. I want to see the T.A.B. authorized to pay out, at least in the country, after the last race. One further point before I close: since 1964 we have had seven amendments to the Lottery and Gaming Act. It may be all right if one has a good "terrier" (as some lawyers have), but for the layman to get hold of the annual amending Acts and tie them in with the Lottery and Gaming Act as amended (and I think we are on the No. 3 amending Bill this session) things are getting rather complicated.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is very difficult.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Yes. I suggest to the Minister that he takes this up in the proper quarters; that is, to have the Act consolidated once again. It is not a huge Act as is the Local Government Act, and it will assist honourable members who have to deal with it. Having said that, I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

The Hon. L. R. HART (Midland): I only wish to make one or two general observations in relation to the Bill, which sets out to permit the T.A.B. to operate at the Globe Derby Trotting Course at trotting meetings to be held in the day time. It also sets out to extend the scope under which the T.A.B. may operate, including all meetings in Australia and overseas.

The other facility it extends is that enabling the T.A.B. to operate as an agent for on-course betting for racing clubs. I do not wish to go into details in relation to these matters, but there are one or two things I wish to say about racing in general. Several Bills have been introduced dealing with the

Lottery and Gaming Act, and their main purpose has been to produce revenue from betting facilities for the benefit of the racing and trotting industry. There is continual pressure today to extend betting facilities beyond racing and trotting; no doubt within a short time we shall have pressure from the dog racing people for an extension of betting facilities to that sport for mechanical lure coursing.

There is also considerable discussion on the desirability or otherwise of having football pools, another form of gambling that will attract a considerable amount of money. In addition, we have the State lottery. So the greater number of participants brought into the field the lesser amount of money that will be available for trotting and racing clubs. Therefore, although we are expanding these facilities to enable racing and trotting clubs to improve their facilities and provide better amenities to the racing fraternity, I believe that, if we are to expand still further those betting facilities, these clubs will be no better off. I think the time has come when the racing industry should have a close look at itself. I believe the industry should be able to engage expert consultants to report on its efficiency.

We have three racecourses within the metropolitan area not very far apart, and not so very far away we have a course at Gawler. Today, with modern transport and modern facilities, it is no great problem for people to attend any one of these courses. In fact, the same people no doubt attend the meetings at Victoria Park, Cheltenham and Morphettville, so the question of travel does not come into the issue at all.

The upkeep of these courses is enormous, and it is this upkeep and the provision of facilities that is no doubt keeping many racing clubs poor. The Gawler Racing Club used to be regarded as a metropolitan club and it raced on Saturdays, but now it regards itself largely as a country club and it holds mid-week meetings. In addition to this, we have a number of country clubs, all of them battling financially, all of them hoping to get a bigger slice out of the T.A.B. cake, and all of them faced with this same problem of maintenance and upkeep of their courses. Here again, one could find the situation, particularly in the South-East of this State, where possibly the same class of people attend most of the race meetings irrespective of where they are held.

I think if we looked into the efficiency of the industry itself we would undoubtedly find the answer to be that the number of courses is in excess of present-day needs, having regard to transport facilities that are available today.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude raised a very pertinent point when he posed the question: where are we going with the provision of gambling facilities today? I would say: if we are going to increase betting facilities continually, just where is the money to come from? Admittedly, we have betting with us in relation to trotting and racing, and we must provide the facilities for it, but I think that when we start to think about expanding the facilities beyond the scope of the present needs we should look very closely at the matter.

I have no objection to the Bill, and I do not intend to deal with it in detail. At this stage I will conclude my remarks by saying that I support the second reading of the Bill but will have a closer look at it in Committee.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES (Northern): I support the Bill. I listened to the debate with a great deal of interest, particularly to Sir Norman Jude's remarks in relation to the payment of T.A.B. winning bets in the country. I think it is fair comment that not only in the country is there a case on some occasions for the payment at the end of the day's racing in respect of winning bets on the T.A.B. but that there could equally be a case for this to apply to people who live in the metropolitan area and have difficulty in collecting their winnings on the Monday following the Saturday meeting.

Be that as it may, those who have been in Parliament longer than I must have many memories of the problems associated with trying to get T.A.B. established in South Australia. Over many years there had been suggestions and counter-suggestions, claims and counter-claims, South Australia's ideas of T.A.B. and also screams of, "Why don't we have the type of T.A.B. that Victoria has?"

Since T.A.B. became operative, during the life of the Labor Government, I have been most interested in the way it seems to have succeeded. I guess one measures success in many things by the profit made. The other point that impresses me is the orderliness with which people can make their bets. Also, the orderliness and efficiency of the people who operate in the various shops and agencies has impressed me very much indeed. I can still remember the days of my youth at Port Pirie during the depression, with the betting shops

and the prams and the kiddies outside and the mothers and fathers inside the betting shop spending their meagre money on the luck of the draw of the horses.

Although I do not remember the hardship that may have come from it, history has told us only too vividly that this type of wagering, which seems to be so characteristically Australian, was not good for the general morale and the general welfare of the community. Therefore, this changed look that T.A.B. has produced and the way it is operating is very pleasing to me. I think it is something that can be of benefit to those in the community who find an interest in wagering on horses.

This Bill amends the Lottery and Gaming Act in several respects. Clause 4 deals with permits to hold trotting races, while clause 5 provides for the mode of dealing with moneys paid into a totalizator used by a club. Clause 6 amends section 29 of the principal Act, mainly by inserting new subsection (1a) providing that clubs shall render accounts. Part IIIa of the principal Act is amended by clause 7, and clause 8 amends section 31a. Other clauses make various amendments to the principal Act, but they are not important amendments. However, the principal features of the Bill have been explained to the Council by the Chief Secretary.

The idea of allowing totalizator betting on racing or trotting events overseas is a new and worthy departure, especially when we remember the migrants in our population who have ties with their homelands. To be able to bet through the totalizator in this way will afford those who indulge in this sort of thing some satisfaction. They are not nation-rocking amendments in the Bill but I imagine the Government has had representations asking for this type of legislation.

I am reminded of a gripping story told us by Banjo Patterson of the disqualified jockey, which I think has some connection with the Totalizator Agency Board. If we do not have a horse we cannot run a race; if we do not have a jockey we cannot run a race. We need horse, jockey, public, racecourse, and so on for the T.A.B. to operate at all. It may interest honourable members to hear what Banjo Patterson said about a jockey who became disqualified from the racing game. He said this:

A DISQUALIFIED JOCKEY'S STORY

You see, the thing was this way—there was me,
That rode Panoppoly, the Splendor mare,
And Ikey Chambers on the Iron Dook,

And Smith, the half-caste rider, on Regret,
And that long bloke from Wagga—him what rode
Veronikew, the Snowy River horse,
Well, none of them had chances—not a chance
Among the lot, unless the rest fell dead
Or wasn't trying—for a blind man's dog
Could see Enchantress was a certain cop,
And all the books was layin' six to four.

They brought her out to show our lot the road,
Or so they said but, then, Gord's truth!
You know,
You can't believe 'em, though they took an oath
On forty Bibles that they'd tell the truth,
But anyhow, an amateur was up
On this Enchantress; and so Ike and me,
We thought that we might frighten him a bit
By asking if he minded riding rough—
"Oh, not at all," says he, "oh, not at all!
I learnt at Robbo Park, and if it comes
To bumping I'm your Moses! Strike me blue!"

Says he, "I'll bump you over either rail,
The inside rail or outside—which you choose
Is good enough for me"—which settled Ike.
For he was shaky since he near got killed
From being sent a buster on the rail,
When some chap bumped his horse and
fetched him down
At Stoney Bridge; so Ikey thought it best
To leave this bloke alone, and I agreed.

So all the books was layin' six to four
Against the favourite, and the amateur
Was walking this Enchantress up and down,
And me and Smithy backed him; for we thought
We might as well get something for ourselves,
Because we knew our horses couldn't win.
But Ikey wouldn't back him for a bob;
Because he said he reckoned he was stiff,
And all the books was layin' six to four.

Well, anyhow, before the start the news
Got round that this here amateur was stiff,
And our good stuff was blueed, and all the books
Was in it, and the prices lengthened out,
And every book was bustin' of his throat,
And layin' five to one the favourite.
So there was we that couldn't win ourselves,
And this here amateur that wouldn't try,
And all the books was layin' five to one.

So Smithy says to me, "You take a hold
Of that there moke of yours, and round the turn
Come up behind Enchantress with the whip
And let her have it; that long bloke and me

Will wait ahead, and when she comes to us
 We'll pass her on and belt her down the
 straight,
 And Ikey'll flog her home—because his
 boss
 Is judge and steward and the Lord knows
 what,
 And so he won't be touched; and, as for
 us,
 We'll swear we only hit her by mistake!"
 And all the books was layin' five to one.

Well, off we went, and comin' to the turn
 I saw the amateur was holding back
 And poking into every hole he could
 To get her blocked; and so I pulled behind
 And drew the whip and dropped it on the
 mare.
 I let her have it twice, and then she shot
 Ahead of me, and Smithy opened out
 And let her up beside him on the rails,
 And kept her there a-beltin' her like smoke
 Until she struggled past him, pullin' hard.

And came to Ike; but Ikey drew his whip
 And hit her on the nose, and sent her
 back
 And won the race himself—for, after all,
 It seems he had a fiver on The Dook
 And never told us—so our stuff was lost.
 And then they had us up for ridin' foul,
 And warned us off the tracks for twelve
 months each
 To get our livin' any way we could;
 But Ikey wasn't touched, because his boss
 Was judge and steward and the Lord knows
 what.

But Mister—if you'll lend us half-a-crown,
 I know three certain winners at the Park—
 Three certain cops as no one knows but
 me;
 And—thank you, Mister, come an' have a
 beer
 (I always like a beer about this time) . . .
 Well, so long, Mister, till we meet again.

The horse was hit on the nose and then it
 went to the rear of the field. This upset the
 whole system of betting on the horses, and
 the wrong horse won. Of course, there
 seemed to be a deal of conniving because
 the father of the jockey who rode the horse
 was not only the judge but also the steward.
 One can see, therefore, that racing has
 improved considerably since those days. I
 support the second reading of the Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I,
 too, support the Bill. I notice that the Lottery
 and Gaming Act has been amended 11 times
 since 1964. Any improvement to this Act is
 worth supporting. Country clubs generally
 can do with any assistance that is given to
 them by the well-established metropolitan
 racing clubs, and unless country clubs receive
 more support they could quite easily be
 phased out altogether.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Do you think
 there are too many country racing clubs?

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: No, I do not.
 However, I believe that the country clubs do
 not receive sufficient support from the racing
 fraternity to make them worth while. One
 could sum up the position by saying that
 racehorses are not bred in Rundle Street and
 that the racing industry is patronized by and
 fed from the country areas. For this reason
 I believe country clubs should receive more
 assistance than they do receive.

Clause 4 is interesting, as it appears that
 the draftsmen were not told initially that
 Bolivar meetings would have to be held in the
 daytime. Of course, section 22 of the principal
 Act has to be amended to allow that club to
 hold its meetings. The first 10 meetings
 of the club will have to be held in the day-
 time even though the club operates within the
 metropolitan area. Clause 10 amends section
 31j of the principal Act extending the
 powers of the board to enable it to conduct
 both on-course and off-course totalizator bet-
 ting on any event scheduled to be held within
 or outside of Australia. That clause is of
 paramount interest to us all.

As the Hon. Mr. Geddes said, there has
 been some agitation by oversea people at
 present resident in Australia, who have
 retained their interest principally in British
 racing, to be able to bet on the main events
 throughout the British Isles. This provision
 gives the Totalizator Agency Board the
 right to accept bets on races either inside
 or outside Australia. Particular races are not
 specified and, therefore, I understand that one
 could bet on any race in the world. Clauses
 4 and 10 are the main clauses of the Bill.
 They are quite necessary and should help the
 finances of the racing clubs. In turn, I hope
 that the country clubs will receive some fillip.
 I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central
 No. 2): We have heard several speeches on
 this Bill. We heard the Chief Secretary's
 second reading explanation yesterday. I
 should like to say a few words about the
 funny old word "gaming". Murray's Oxford
 Dictionary defines it as follows:

The action or habit of playing at games of
 chance for stakes; gambling.

It gives several examples of the use of this
 word in various literary treatises. One such
 treatise was written in 1510, so it is a very
 old word. A secondary meaning is as follows:

The celebration of games; an athletic or
 musical contest.

The Chief Secretary, in his second reading explanation, said that the Bill's main object was to extend the powers of the T.A.B. to enable it to conduct totalizator betting on any event scheduled to be held within or outside Australia. The Chief Secretary enlarged on this point by referring to events such as the English Derby. I have wondered how much interest there is in South Australia in an event like the English Derby. Undoubtedly there is much interest in interstate racing, but I wonder how much interest there is in oversea racing.

I refer to the point that betting will be permitted on events held outside Australia. Does this mean that the events may be anywhere in the world, or on the moon for that matter? The Chief Secretary's second reading explanation does not make this point clear. I wonder where the suggestion that the T.A.B. should conduct operations on events outside Australia came from. We must remember that such events would include the English Grand National, the Irish Derby, the French Grand Prix and races all over Asia. One wonders where the interest in these events lies and whether it is necessary for the T.A.B. to have this power or, indeed, whether it wants it. The second reading explanation does not state the aim of this extension of the board's powers. In his speech the Leader of the Opposition said:

I thought the board was introduced to give the people of South Australia an opportunity to wager at race and trotting meetings within their own State.

I think that is a reasonable assumption on his part, and I think that is what most of us thought. The Leader continued:

I doubt the wisdom of permitting the T.A.B. to conduct a totalizator on races anywhere it decides to do so. Personally, I do not think that is good. However, it is the Government's decision, and I can appreciate it.

I find myself partly in accord with his opinion because I think there is a definite demand in this State from quite a large section of the community for facilities for betting on racing events conducted not only in South Australia but in Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane and even Perth. The Hon. Mr. Shard was on even firmer ground when he said he did not want T.A.B. to develop into anything like the old betting shops. I think many of the older members especially would remember betting shops, and I would hate to see anything of that nature come back because I think they were particularly degrading. One used to see

women with children and perambulators outside a betting shop, and tickets scattered all over the place. Betting shops were stark buildings with no reasonable furnishings and no floor-coverings; altogether I think they were most undesirable. I would not like to see anything like that recurring in South Australia.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude said it was to everybody's advantage that the T.A.B. pay out after the last race. I believe that would be a step towards the re-establishment of betting shops; that fear was expressed by the Leader, and it is a fear I share with him. I am not suggesting that, in itself, it would do anything like this. However, if that is permitted, the next step would surely be that T.A.B. would pay out twice in an afternoon, and the next step that it would pay out after every race. If it pays out after every race (and I would not like to compare T.A.B. with betting shops) I believe it would be getting perilously close to the old type betting shops. People have pointed out that something like this is liable to occur in other States.

The Leader then went on to say, "I am not a sanctimonious type of person." I do not know what he meant by saying this. I think I would rather say, "I am not a spoil sport." I am sure he is not, because his Government introduced T.A.B., the State Lottery, and one or two other gambling measures.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: All to the advantage of the people of South Australia.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I do not know whether I agree completely with that statement. However, I would agree if the honourable member said, "To meet the wishes of a very large number of people."

The Hon. A. J. Shard: The large majority of people.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I agree with the Leader, because a referendum was held concerning the lottery and the resultant vote was overwhelmingly in favour of having a State lottery. When the people say that sort of thing, naturally a Government inclines to fulfil their wishes. The Leader also said, "When this social legislation was introduced we were challenged from several quarters to the effect that we were helping to foster the gambling habits of the people of this State." I do not think that was why the former Government introduced the Bill, but naturally that could have been a partial effect of it. However, it was obvious that the people wanted these things and the Government, of which the Leader was a leading member, introduced

such legislation to meet the wishes of the people and in doing so was supported by a large majority of this Council, because we agreed this was what people wanted. I believe if a large proportion of the people want something then one must take heed of them. I do not think this legislation is an unreasonable extension of the principal Act, so I do not propose to oppose the Bill. However, I find my ideas very much in accord with the Leader's because I am a little lukewarm about parts of the Bill, particularly the conducting of T.A.B. on events outside Australia.

The Hon. G. J. Gilfillan: This could mean we could bet without having local race meetings.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: Yes, because people could satiate their gambling desires on events completely outside the State, although I do not think that would happen. I think the part of the Bill to which I have referred is the most important part so I do not find it necessary to deal in detail with the rest of the Bill, most of which is machinery. The Hon. Mr. Shard said he supported the Bill but with no pride; I support the Bill but with no great enthusiasm.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP (Southern): This matter being debated has been the subject of three Bills this session. I was brought up to believe that betting was practised and should be tolerated but not encouraged, and to most people betting has an element of sin in it. This simple matter has necessitated the preparation of three Bills, one of which has been debated at length this afternoon. Think of the time and cost involved in the preparation of three Bills!

When T.A.B. was first introduced to this State, the idea was that it would stimulate country racing, which appeared to be dying and in need of assistance. I do not think it is sufficiently realized that racing in the country will continue to die. At race meetings today, even at picnic race meetings, it is remarkable how few young people attend. Most of the younger generation have no interest in racing today: they go out and actively participate in sport. How often do we see youngsters driving about with a surfboard on top of a car? There are many types of sport for them to indulge in.

Racing is slowly dying—there is no longer a demand for it by the rising generation. T.A.B. will not attract people back to racing. The comparatively small amount of betting done these days indicates a creditable intelligence on the part of our young people. Most

people who bet with bookmakers or on the T.A.B. system are not young people, for the young have better things to do with their money. They have enough intelligence to know that they would be at the losing end if they indulged in betting. There are many ways in which they can spend their money, even though some of them are expensive.

So this legislation for promoting racing fails in its object, which is to spread and promote the so-called racing industry. It is about time the large vested interests in racing appreciated the real reason for the gradual decay and did something about it themselves instead of asking for legislation. After all, what benefit is there to the racing industry in the State in permitting T.A.B. to operate its books on any event in the world? I see no advantage to the racing industry in South Australia. It is merely a diversion of money that could be spent locally.

I do not mind people spending their money as they wish. It would be presumptuous of anybody to attempt to stipulate how a person's spare money should be spent. However, when it comes to completely unproductive spending, as is the case with betting, surely the best should be got out of the money spent.

Money can be invested on the Irish sweepstakes or the Calcutta Handicap—although horse racing is not specified; it could be something else. For all these reasons, I see no purpose in supporting this Bill. It is not a world-shaking piece of legislation. It could have been consolidated with the other two Bills and the legions of others that have preceded it. I do not know what it costs the State to prepare a Bill of this nature, but it would certainly be considerable. By the time the Bill has been fully processed and has passed through both Houses of Parliament, the cost would be even greater, and by the time it reaches the administration stage the cost would by no means be a small item.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It will cost a lot more for producing *Hansard* this afternoon.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Unfortunately, yes, but it is necessary. There is no purpose in my reiterating the points I have already made. The unimportance of this legislation to this State is reason enough not to support it with acclamation and for saying that it is not worth while.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I take this opportunity of thanking honourable members for their close attention to this measure.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Are you going to reply to all the points that have been raised?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, I intend to do that. Honourable members have directed their attention to three or four matters, with which I shall deal at some length. It was said that the Lottery and Gaming Act had been amended 11 times over a short period and it was suggested that the Act should be consolidated. I entirely agree with that point of view. I had the task, not only as a Minister but also as a backbencher, of trying to analyse just what some amendments meant. When one has to plough through amendment after amendment it becomes very difficult to understand the Act. However, I shall take up this matter with my Cabinet colleagues to see whether some progress can be made in the consolidation of the Act.

The Bill does only two things of major importance. First, it allows totalizator betting on any event scheduled to be held within or outside Australia. The English Derby was given as an example of a race on which people here might like to bet. I think all members appreciate that there is a demand in South Australia for T.A.B. facilities on certain important events held overseas.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What about having betting on football pools?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No, that is hardly the situation. There is a demand among many English migrants and some Australian people for T.A.B. facilities to be extended to the English Derby and the Grand National. Indeed, the board has requested this. I assure the Council that this will not go beyond the point where there is a public demand in relation to and an interest in the events on which T.A.B. will operate.

It is not intended by this amendment to allow T.A.B. to become a wide-open gambling casino or to have a situation where people gamble on a race in which they have no interest whatsoever. I think we all must admit that even on racing within this State a certain percentage of people, which may be larger than we think, wager on the totalizator not really knowing one horse from another.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That is right; they wager on numbers.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes. The percentage of people who desire to bet on special races such as the English Derby and the Grand

National would not be higher than the number of people in South Australia who wager merely on numbers. It is not intended to extend T.A.B. facilities on races being conducted outside Australia on which there is no real interest in South Australia; indeed, I would not be a party to it.

The Hon. Sir Norman Jude raised the question of pay-outs from the T.A.B. I believe there is much merit in the suggestion that the T.A.B. pay-outs in country areas should be at the conclusion of the day's racing. It has been established that the pay-outs after the races in New South Wales have affected attendances at the courses. I believe the Hon. Sir Norman Jude has made a fair and reasonable point regarding pay-outs in country areas, and I believe the matter should be carefully considered. No-one seemed to be concerned about another clause in the Bill enabling the board, as the agent for any club licensed to operate a totalizator, to conduct and operate that totalizator on a racecourse.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: That might assist a lot of small clubs. No-one wants to do anything to hinder them.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: That is right. Many matters are contained in the Bill, but it is not intended to enlarge the scope of events on which the T.A.B. will operate, beyond important overseas events in which there is much interest by people in South Australia.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Conduct of totalizator betting by the Board."

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: This clause relates to the conduct of T.A.B. betting by the board. I refer to the Hon. Mr. Shard's second reading speech in this respect where he said that he was not a sanctimonious type of person. I am indebted to one of his colleagues for giving me the dictionary meaning of "sanctimonious". It means: "Possessing sanctity, holy, sacred, saintly." So when the Leader says, "I am not a sanctimonious person", I am not so sure that he is not a sanctimonious type of person.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (11 to 19) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL
(No. 3)**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 3688.)

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I support the second reading. This is quite a lengthy Bill to achieve a comparatively small but important adjustment to the constitution of the Industrial Commission of this State. As honourable members can see, it takes 39 clauses to achieve that result, and most of them merely insert in the appropriate places in the principal Act provisions for the appointment of a Deputy President of the commission. In one or two places the Bill provides that he is to undertake certain responsibilities. Until the previous Labor Government made a comprehensive alteration to the Industrial Code we had always had provision in the Code for the appointment of a Deputy President and, in fact, that office was filled for a number of years. The old Full Court of the Industrial Court was constituted by the President and the Deputy President; this occurred before the appointment of industrial commissioners. Now, we are re-establishing the office of Deputy President.

I think this is a good policy and, naturally, because of the office he holds, it is right that he should be part of the appeal section of the commission. These provisions will undoubtedly add considerably to the expense of the Government, not so much in respect of the Deputy President's salary (because, after all, he acts, too, as Public Service Arbitrator) but in respect of the inevitable additional staff that will need to be found when these appointments are made. I read with interest that the Attorney-General is apparently struggling with the problem of altering our minor judicial set-up, and I have no doubt that one of the big problems there will be the greatly increased expense involved when any radical changes are made.

I support the new provision inserted by another place for the appointment of an industrial magistrate who, in the first instance, is to be Mr. Hilton, the present Industrial Registrar. It is important, as the Hon. Mr. Kneebone said, that we should have a person who will act as a magistrate in connection with prosecutions and other questions arising under industrial awards and under the Code. Not too many of the magistrates who sit in summary jurisdiction courts at present understand a great deal about the industrial awards

issued by the commission, nor do they understand a great deal of the background of the industrial law that has been built up. It is a rather peculiar branch of the law in many respects. As honourable members know, I have always taken a very personal interest in this branch of the law, and I realize that not too many of my colleagues in the profession have anything other than a very cursory knowledge of that jurisdiction.

Mr. Hilton, the Industrial Registrar, certainly possesses the qualifications that will make him an appropriate person to be appointed an industrial magistrate and I think anyone who has read his judgments (they regularly appear in the Law Society's reports issued to members of the profession) realizes he has done an excellent job as Industrial Registrar. I think that not only will he be able to do this particular job but he could do the job of a special magistrate in any jurisdiction. This Bill will make an important alteration to the whole set-up of the Industrial Commission. We shall watch future developments with interest.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I rise to support this Bill, which has become necessary because of industrial development in South Australia and the necessity of trying to keep our industrial legislation on a basis that will properly meet the requirements of employers and employees. It is important that we do all we can to keep South Australia in the forefront in the Australian industrial scene in relation to freedom from industrial turmoil. Some years ago it was said that the average employee in South Australia could expect to lose only half a day in every seven years through industrial trouble; I know that is a much better figure than in other parts of Australia.

During the life of the previous Government the Industrial Code was re-written fairly considerably; this Bill is a further amendment providing for the appointment of a Deputy President and updating other matters. There seems to be tremendous scope for a young lawyer wishing to follow a career in the industrial sphere. If I were a young man in the profession today I would seriously consider specializing in that branch of law because I know great opportunities exist there.

I realize the tendency is for employer and employee organizations to employ their own barristers for this type of work, and the number of private firms and individuals who retain solicitors in the industrial field is not great;

nevertheless, with the development of the rights of employees and the efforts made today to see they are adequately protected, there must be an expanding sphere of this work for lawyers. I commend this to the serious consideration of any young barrister or solicitor who is interested in this branch of the profession.

After all, a judge of the Supreme Court may deliver a judgment affecting one or two individuals—a limited number of people—but a President or Deputy President of an industrial court may vitally affect the whole of an industry in this State when giving a decision. In addition, such a decision may affect the whole economy of the State. Consequently, I believe a much greater responsibility rests on these people in the industrial sphere, and therefore, I am in favour of trying to keep industrial legislation up to date, thus ensuring that it will meet the requirements of the day. I have pleasure in supporting the Bill.

[*Sitting suspended from 4.55 to 8 p.m.*]

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 34 passed.

Clause 35—"Industrial magistrate."

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I am pleased to see that the Government has decided to appoint an industrial magistrate, but there is one point I cannot understand. In his second reading explanation the Minister said:

Many cases under the Industrial Code have been conducted before a normal magistrate in courts of summary jurisdiction, but because industrial jurisdiction is foreign to some of these magistrates, who are not conversant with industrial matters of this type, delays have been caused.

I am worried about the word "normal" because of an incident that occurred some time ago. Unfortunately, I had to bring proceedings in connection with an industrial matter before a court of summary jurisdiction. During the hearing the magistrate and our solicitor appeared to be in complete agreement, because the magistrate was telling the solicitor all the terrible things that could happen if this offence was allowed to continue, with the result that, when the day for the judgment came, the defendant's solicitor said to our solicitor, "How much do you think it will cost us?" He was convinced that we had right on our side and he was wondering what it would cost the defendant. However, when judgment was given it went against the union simply

because one of these "normal" magistrates (the term used here) knew nothing about industrial matters.

The appointment of an industrial magistrate will be a big improvement for the industrial movement. I agree with what the Hon. Mr. Potter said this afternoon in respect of the Minister's saying that he thought Mr. Hilton would be appointed to this position. He would be the ideal man for the job. It would be a bad thing if after Mr. Hilton was incapable of continuing in that position we reverted to appointing somebody who knew nothing about industrial matters. I support the clause.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Minister of Agriculture): I take it the honourable member was looking for abnormalities rather than normalities, because a normal magistrate apparently did not give him the treatment he wanted. Perhaps the honourable member was quoting from some other second reading.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It was in the *Advertiser*.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I said "the Minister". I didn't say "in this House".

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I want to make it clear that I said nothing about Mr. Hilton. I was surprised that the honourable member took his point on this matter of normality or abnormality. I thought it was quite clear. I cannot see why he took that point.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: No-one in the trade union movement is looking for abnormality: we are looking for normality, and I am sure the Hon. Mr. Banfield was referring to the unfortunate choice of words in the second reading explanation, which mentioned normality. We feel that abnormality has happened in the past and we look forward to normality in the future.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: "Normal" was not my word. I assume that when the magistrate was appointed at any time he would be a normal magistrate. Apparently, there are some abnormal magistrates. The Minister is now admitting the possibility, by the use of this word, that some abnormal magistrates have been appointed. This is what is in the second reading explanation. If there are abnormal magistrates they have to be looked at. One can understand why people wonder whether they receive justice from the courts, when the Minister admits such a possibility.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: You meant in the mental sense and not the physical sense, didn't you?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I didn't use this word: the Minister did. He is now casting a reflection on the magistracy when he says there is a possibility of abnormality amongst them.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: That is not true.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I ask the Minister not to cast such a reflection on the magistracy. I cannot see the necessity for including the word "normal" because I assume they would be normal magistrates.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: The honourable member's glib tongue has got him into trouble again because, as I said initially, he has cast the reflection by taking the words completely out of context. He is referring to the word "normal" in connection with the brain and has inferred that certain people who are not normal may have been appointed in the past. However, the honourable member knows as well as I do what "normal" means. Perhaps I am not sure about that, but I did not want him to get away with implying that appointees to positions in the past may have been abnormal people. In this situation the word has nothing to do with a person's being normal or abnormal mentally.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: At no time did I use the words "abnormal" or "mental" in my first speech on this matter. The fact remains that those words were used by the Minister, and he should tell the truth right from the start and not attempt to put into my mouth words that I did not use. Those two words "abnormal" and "normal" were used entirely by him, so if any reflection was cast on magistrates, it was cast by the Minister himself.

The Hon. C. R. Story: I think I have made my point.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (36 to 39) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly with the following amendment:

Clause 26, page 14, after line 31—Insert—
and

(f) by inserting after subsection (2) the following subsection:

(3) A person who has at any time during an election—

(a) canvassed or solicited votes for a candidate in that election;

(b) acted as agent for a candidate in that election;

(c) been a member of the election committee of a candidate in that election,

shall not act as an authorized witness at that election.

Penalty: Two hundred dollars.

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. C. M. HILL (Minister of Local Government): I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

This paragraph was originally included in the Bill when it was discussed in this Chamber but was removed before the Bill went to another place. It has been reinserted there. I trust that honourable members can follow the amendment; I remind them, first, that we are dealing only with local government elections. Because of honourable members' experience in State elections, it is easy to confuse the postal voting procedures required for State elections with those required for local government elections.

This amendment means that we are limiting canvassers acting on behalf of candidates and we are limiting agents for candidates and we are limiting members of an election committee of a candidate to electioneering only. If this amendment is included there is nothing whatever to stop a canvasser from seeking an elector's support for that canvasser's candidate. In other words, it is quite proper that a canvasser should go out into the field and approach people who are eligible to vote and promote his particular candidate to that potential voter. So, this does not in any way inhibit electioneering.

More and more, of course, the real issue lies with the procedure occurring after the voter says he will support the canvasser's candidate but, in addition, says he will not be able to get to the polling booth. In this case the canvasser's part is limited. The canvasser cannot produce an application form for a postal vote and act as a witness. Similarly, when the postal vote certificate arrives he cannot act as a signatory.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Can he leave an application form with the man?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No. Elsewhere in this Bill we have restricted the issue of application forms. If any honourable member thinks this amendment is making it difficult for a genuine voter to carry on with his wish to vote by post, I point out that we have widened

the scope of authorized witnesses in this Bill. Any ratepayer is entitled to act as an authorized witness; of course, he cannot be a canvasser.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Do the canvassers have to be registered?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Then how do we know they are canvassers?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That would come out later if it was thought that this provision had been contravened.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: If a man said, "Joe Blow is a good man", would that make him a canvasser?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yes.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: So he could not open his mouth?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: No. This does not restrict the electioneering by candidates.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: But, if a man said, "Joe Blow is a good man", and that was all he said in the campaign, he would be a canvasser?

The Hon. F. J. Potter: The canvasser must make a personal approach.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The principle involved is that a man can still say, as the Hon. Mrs. Cooper suggests, "The candidate is a very good person. Will you support him?" He can say, "I am working for him; I am a member of his committee." He can mention all his good qualities to secure support for him.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: That is not what I meant. If a person happened to say that and then was a witness, he could be caught?

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: He would not be a canvasser.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: He could be.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: How can you tell what a canvasser is?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It could depend on how many people a man spoke to.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: No. He only has to canvass one person.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: If he goes down a road and goes into each farmhouse and says what the Hon. Mrs. Cooper suggested, he is a canvasser.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: All I am instancing is one person speaking to one other person.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: That may be so; I am not denying it. The important point is that, if the person whom that person has contacted for support wishes to vote by post, the

canvasser at that point of time must withdraw from the proceedings, and the voter makes his own arrangements concerning the actual application for a postal vote to have it witnessed, for instance by any ratepayer.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That was the position, but that provision was taken out.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Government's view is that, whilst it would have preferred this clause not to be in the Bill, because of the importance of the Bill and the way in which it will help local government and in which it is being sought in many fields of local government, it is prepared to support the inclusion of the clause. I spoke of visiting a farmhouse; I now instance visiting a hospital. If a canvasser goes to a hospital to gain support for a candidate, some other ratepayer (who may well be another patient or the matron or someone on the staff) must act as a witness for both the application and the actual vote.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: He could take another ratepayer along with him.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The voter must turn away from the canvasser at that point. The reason why this procedure was recommended by the Local Government Act Revision Committee was that there were cases, as the Hon. Mr. Bevan has pointed out, where malpractice occurred and undue pressure was placed upon some voters by some canvassers. It was an unfortunate set of circumstances that was investigated in the last few years. I do not think this provision will restrict voters from voting by post, but it will ensure that malpractices, which have occurred in the past, will not recur. For those reasons, I urge the Committee to accept the motion.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I cannot follow what the Minister has said about how one decides whether or not a person is a canvasser.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I agree with the Hon. Mr. Whyte. If this clause is reinserted no candidate, whether honest or dishonest, will be safe, because how could he prove or disprove whether or not someone was acting as a canvasser or agent on his behalf? This is so wide open that it is a most dangerous provision to have in the Bill. I cannot support it.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I cannot support the reinsertion of this clause, as I think the problem has already been covered by section 834 of the principal Act. The Minister said he would have to leave it to the judgment of honourable members to decide who was or was

not a canvasser, but this provision leaves the clause open to a wide interpretation. One has only to say that a certain person is a good candidate and he may be taken to be a canvasser and, therefore, he would be unable to act as an authorized witness.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Voting for local government is voluntary, and malpractices can easily occur. When I was Minister of Local Government, I ordered an investigation on one occasion when it was alleged that a canvasser had witnessed a postal vote, but I would not order action to be taken. He had handed out an application for a postal vote, and followed up the vote. In one instance it was found that the canvasser did the voting. As Minister I could have taken action against the candidate, but that would have involved taking action also against an innocent victim, so I refused to take action. The Bill places the onus on the individual to make a personal application so that canvassers cannot go from door to door handing out applications for postal votes.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: That is the effective change being made.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Yes. It must be a personal application, but there is nothing to stop a canvasser from finding out whether a voter will not be present at the polling booth and suggesting that he apply for a postal vote if he will not be present.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: Or urging him to.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If this amendment is deleted, the malpractices that have been common to council elections for years will continue, and they must be stopped. Parliament is saying that it is wrong that these things should go on (which it is saying in clause 22) and that something must be done to stop them, but then in clause 24 it says that it is going to leave the door wide open.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill said that I was attempting to cut out postal voting in municipal elections, but what I am really attempting to do—and will continue to do—is to stamp out malpractices. If a candidate, through his canvassers, must resort to these tactics to be able to win a seat on a council, he is not a fit and proper person to be a councillor, as local government is too important. Such malpractices will not encourage ratepayers to have confidence in local government.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: And the right type of candidate will not be encouraged to come forward.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: That is so. We want people to take much more interest in local government and we want the right type of person to offer his services which, after all, are voluntary. The Hon. Mrs. Cooper asked, "If Joe Blow says to another ratepayer that he thinks Bill Smith is a good bloke, is he canvassing?" All he is doing is expressing his own opinion to another ratepayer. If he continues to go around the district giving this opinion, however, it is a different proposition.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Where do we draw the line?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: If I say to my neighbour that I think Joe Blow is a good bloke—

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: You are canvassing for him.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I cannot see any court in South Australia in those circumstances deciding that this person was a canvasser. If he repeated his actions, that would be different.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: But he would not come into this, anyway, unless he witnessed the vote.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Exactly. We are dealing with this person only as a witness to the signature on a postal vote. The people who can be witnesses are increased in number by this Bill. Why should we allow a canvasser for a candidate to act also as a witness to a vote? Does not that leave the result wide open to being influenced? Of course it does. This has happened, and not only in one district but in many, both inside and outside the metropolitan area.

I had these things investigated when I was the Minister. Had the Labor Party been returned to Government after the last election, some of these amendments, which were already on the way, would have been introduced by me. I asked the Local Government Act Revision Committee to look into this matter. I believe these clauses have arisen from a recommendation of that committee, following an investigation I requested when I was in office.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: The honourable member is adopting a "holier than thou" attitude. Is he prepared to support this attitude when it comes to a Parliamentary election? That is the same thing. There is exactly the same situation—a person saying that somebody is a good candidate, and then there is a postal vote.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I inform the honourable member that in no circumstances since I have been in this Chamber—

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN: It is not a point of order.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: If people abuse the law there is a penalty for making a false declaration. We do not have to legislate for that: that would be nonsensical, and the honourable member knows it. Where does one start? If a person witnesses a postal vote someone might say, "He has said that so and so is a good man." Is he canvassing? The Minister has said he is, and that is the most dangerous concept of the whole matter.

The Hon. L. R. HART: This clause amends section 840, which has been amended four times in the last 30 years. On each occasion we have extended the category of "authorized witness", and in this Bill we have extended it even further by adding two further authorized witnesses. Paragraph (f) cancels practically all previous authorized witnesses, in certain circumstances. Where malpractices take place they should be stamped out but not to the extent that creates difficulty in obtaining an authorized witness needed to witness the application for a postal vote or the postal vote itself.

On some occasions in country areas there could be an election for a particular ward. One of the candidates for that ward could obtain all the votes, the other receiving none. Therefore, at some stage every person who voted for that candidate could have said something that would have identified him as a canvasser or agent of that candidate. When a person in hospital is fairly ill or incapacitated, he can apply in writing for a postal vote. If no-one is able to take an application form to the patient, he would have to write one out himself, as it does not have to be on a printed form, but the application must be witnessed. But where does such a person obtain a witness? He could ask another patient but, of course, such a person could already have voted for the successful candidate and could thereby be considered to be an agent or canvasser of the candidate. The matron could be in the same position, so could someone tell me how a legitimate voter is able to get an application for a postal vote witnessed in those circumstances?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Not only the word "canvass" is used; the words "or solicit" are also used. I think they mean the same. Solicitation is dealt with in the Electoral Act under section 151, which deals with bribery and undue influence, and the question of personal solicitation by a candidate also falls under that section. Soliciting the vote of an elector is also specified in the table of offences in the Electoral Act. However, the offence must be proved. The Local Government Act Revision Committee, which recommended this amendment, is a responsible and representative body, and its consultant is Mr. Gifford, Q.C., who is recognized as a leading exponent of the law on council activity in Australia. If there is any risk of a person being accused of canvassing, he should not witness the application form. The voter should call another ratepayer to witness his signature.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: This is not a simple matter, and that is why we are not voting for it.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: It is a relatively simple matter and one of common sense. The charges, if laid, must be proved. This provision is to prevent a member of a committee campaigning for a candidate witnessing a signature on an application for a postal vote or on the postal vote. There is much difference between this person and the casual acquaintance.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Hon. Mr. Bevan said that, when he was a Minister, if it were not for the innocence of people who were involved in canvassing for an election he would dearly have loved to take action against the candidate.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: I never used the term at all.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Well, he said he would have liked to take action against the candidate. When the Hon. Mr. Bevan was Minister he was trying to help those people who had innocently signed these papers. He did not want to bring charges against these people, yet he would have liked to bring the real culprits to heel.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Now you are nearer the mark.

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The Minister has said that, to show that the canvasser has witnessed the signature of a prospective voter, a charge must be proved. This seems to be an extremely difficult problem in view of the fact that we must bring an innocent party

back into the case to prove that the canvasser, the witness, suggested a name. So, the same set of circumstances could occur in the future as occurred in the past. We have voluntary voting, but the only people who can act as witnesses are members of the Commonwealth Public Service, members of the State Public Service and ratepayers. This restricts the whole matter. How do we define a canvasser? Must he be registered?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Would you be happy about that?

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: If a person put his signature to a pledge that he was a canvasser for Joe Blow, the Minister would be able to put his case. The court would be able to decide the matter without having to go back to the innocent person who had signed his name on the absentee voting form in ignorance but in sincerity as a result of statements made to him at the back door by a canvasser. I would like to support the whole principle, but this provision does not spell it out adequately. The Hon. Mr. Bevan said that he was no lawyer; nor am I. However, one must examine the difficulty of the law as a layman and try to spell it out to help other laymen.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: May I suggest a solution to this *contretemps*? The Minister gave me the idea when he mentioned the prohibition of "solicitation by a candidate of the vote of any elector", which appears in the Act. I find it difficult to believe that any court of law would call a conversation over the back fence "canvassing". The whole trouble here stems from the word "canvass", which is difficult to define precisely. "Solicit" is a clearer word. It is mentioned in the Act and is a normally understood word in its legal sense. Therefore, I suggest as an alternative to the Minister's motion that we agree to the amendments inserted by another place but that we make a further amendment by deleting "canvassed or" in new subsection (3) (a). If that was done, we would be much further along the road to solving this problem. I am prepared to foreshadow that as an amendment if the Minister cares to withdraw his motion or he might withdraw his motion and substitute a fresh one.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is proposing to move an amendment to what the Minister has moved. There is no need for the Minister to withdraw his motion. If the honourable member's proposed amendment is defeated, the Minister's motion stands.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER moved:

That the House of Assembly amendments be agreed to but that a further amendment be made thereto by striking out "canvassed or" in new subsection (3) (a).

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Postal votes were designed to assist people, to give them the right to vote for a candidate when they themselves were perhaps indisposed or away from their district at the time of the poll. The malpractices that the Hon. Mr. Bevan spoke of we are attempting to eliminate, but let us not get to the point where a person has to prove in a court of law that he was not guilty of an infringement when he took a postal vote to some person in a hospital. He would have the threat hanging over his head that he might have to prove whether or not he had been soliciting, and I am sure that more malpractices will occur if a person has to prove this one way or the other. I do not believe this clause should be re-inserted.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I am against the amendment because it is splitting hairs and is not worth a cracker. The *Oxford Dictionary* defines the word "solicit" as meaning "invite, make appeals or requests to, importune". The first meaning of "canvass" is given as "discuss thoroughly"; the second meaning is "solicit votes, solicit votes from (constituency), ascertain sentiments of". Therefore, there is no differentiation between them; it all means the same thing.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: It appears that honourable members are confused about this matter. Indeed, I am sure that the Hon. Mr. Geddes was totally confused because when he spoke he was miles away from the intention of the clause, which deals with persons in this category acting as an authorized witness. The Hon. Mr. Whyte thinks that a person will no longer be able to canvass for a particular candidate, but that has nothing to do with it at all: a person can canvass for a candidate or candidates until he is black in the face, as long as he does not witness a vote or an application for a vote. Although the clause stops these people from acting as a witness, it does not interfere with their right to canvass.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: Who would one get for a witness?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The scope of "authorized witness" has been extended. Every elector entitled to be enrolled or who is enrolled, excluding a person who has canvassed or, as the Hon. Mr. Potter suggested, a person who has solicited, is an authorized witness.

The effect of this amendment concerns the witnessing of an application, and is not associated with canvassing or soliciting. I hope the Committee will carry the motion.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: It was suggested that people would not be able to witness a postal vote, but I draw the attention of the Committee to clause 25 and no attempt has been made to remove this from the Bill.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That has gone out.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: If that is so, the more reason for the House of Assembly's amendment to be replaced in the Bill in order to stop current malpractices. A person soliciting votes can place undue pressure on a voter who uses a postal vote.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: This amendment is a bad one and does not assist people to use postal votes. In many areas a poll in a ward may involve only 50 or 100 ratepayers. We do not want malpractices in council elections, but the Hon. Mr. Bevan referred to an election in which they had occurred and said that he did not prosecute, for certain reasons. He did not say he did not have the necessary power to prosecute; the power was there. Many ratepayers wish to use a postal vote, but this amendment would make it more difficult for them to obtain a properly authorized witness. In council or Parliamentary elections if a person wants assistance from a witness and is interested enough to apply for a postal vote he will usually approach someone known to him who is supporting the candidate in whom he is interested. We are interfering with the proper process of postal voting if this amendment is accepted. Paragraph (a) is the most obnoxious part of this provision, and I cannot support it.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: In reply to the point raised by the Hon. Mrs. Cooper, I point out that I did not split a hair here: the person who did so was the draftsman, because he put both of these expressions in—canvass or solicit. The *Oxford Dictionary* has been quoted, but I should like to remind honourable members that the primary meaning of "to canvass" is "to discuss thoroughly", whereas the primary meaning of "to solicit" is "to make appeals or requests" or "to importune". So, there is a shade of difference.

The Hon. Jessie Cooper: They are alternatives.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Are you saying this as a solicitor or as a canvasser?

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: The whole point of my amendment is this: whatever the difference may be, however bound up they are, the word "solicitation" is used in the principal Act. The word "canvass" apparently is not used there, and the House of Assembly's amendment brings it in. So, the whole purpose of my amendment is to tie the thing in with the Act if we want the provision in the Bill at all.

The Hon. L. R. HART: I think the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan must have anticipated my thoughts, because earlier in the debate I was going to suggest that we look at the question of striking out paragraph (a). We could have a confrontation with the other place and then we could finish up with a conference, at which we might have to compromise. Rather than face this situation, perhaps it would be as well to see whether a compromise could be arrived at now. Therefore, as much as I do not like this provision, I realize it has been inserted for a specific purpose, to try to combat malpractices that are occurring, particularly in the metropolitan area. I would be prepared to consider supporting the Minister if he suggested that paragraph (a) be struck out.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: If the honourable member looks at paragraph (b) he will see the words "acted as agent". What is the meaning of that? I think all the words that have been referred to mean roughly the same thing. Who is going to determine what is what?

The Hon. F. J. Potter: "Agent" would imply some direct employment by the candidate.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I do not think so. Under the Local Government Act candidates are bound by acts of agents. It would be most dangerous to pass this clause. How would honourable members like to have their hands tied in their own elections for this Council if they had this sort of provision?

The Hon. C. M. Hill: We are not talking about elections for this Chamber or any other State elections.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: That is the weakest argument I have heard this session, because this to me is a matter of principle. If the principle applies to local government elections, it applies to any elections. No-one can tell me that what is fair for one election is not fair for another. I do not propose to press it any further.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Two different Acts are involved. The Hon. Mr. Hart has tried to find some way around the problem but, even

if paragraph (a) was taken out, the problem would still arise because it would still be a canvasser or one who solicited votes. Although I should like to assist the honourable member in his effort to find some compromise, I do not think this would be an effective change.

The Hon. L. R. HART: A hypothetical case was mentioned earlier this evening. An agent visits a hospital and takes along an application form, which he is permitted to do. The applicant for a postal vote signs it in the presence of the matron or some other person if paragraph (a) is taken out. It is not the agent who will necessarily witness the postal vote: all he will do is make it possible for the postal vote to be delivered.

The Hon. F. J. Potter's amendment negatived.

The Committee divided on the Hon. C. M. Hill's motion:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, R. C. DeGaris, C. M. Hill (teller), Sir Norman Jude, A. F. Kneebone, F. J. Potter, A. J. Shard, V. G. Springett, and C. R. Story.

Noes (8)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill (teller), and A. M. Whyte.

Majority of 2 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 19. Page 3680.)

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern) moved:

That the debate on this Bill be further adjourned.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That the debate be adjourned on motion.

Motion carried.

Later:

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition) moved:

That the adjourned debate on the second reading be now resumed.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (4)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, S. C. Bevan, A. F. Kneebone, and A. J. Shard (teller).

Noes (15)—The Hons. Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins, R. C. DeGaris (teller), R. A. Geddes, G. J. Gilfillan, L. R. Hart, C. M. Hill, Sir Norman Jude, H. K. Kemp, F. J. Potter, C. D. Rowe, Sir Arthur Rymill, V. G. Springett, C. R. Story, and A. M. Whyte.

Majority of 11 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

MENTAL HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly with the following amendment:

Page 2, lines 1 to 6 (clause 3). Leave out paragraph (b) and insert—

(b) providing for the payment by and recovery from—

(i) a person who has received or is receiving such treatment or service;

(ii) a person liable or responsible for the maintenance of a person referred to in subparagraph (i) of this paragraph;

or

(iii) a person who is in possession or control of the property of a person referred to in subparagraph (i) of this paragraph (such payment and recovery being made out of such property),

of any amounts payable for such accommodation or maintenance provided or such treatment or service rendered at any institution or class of institution;

Consideration in Committee.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Minister of Health): I move:

That the amendment of the House of Assembly be agreed to.

When the Bill was debated in another place it was claimed that proposed new section 166 (1) (b), the section prescribing persons or classes of person from whom an amount could be recovered, was too wide. The amendment inserted by the House of Assembly spells out more clearly the persons from whom charges are recoverable. As honourable members can see, it has placed them in three categories.

Motion carried.

PROROGATION

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I move:

That the Council at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, March 18, at 2.15 p.m.

When moving this motion it is usual to make the normal valedictory speech in relation to the closing night of a session of Parliament. I thank all members of this Council for their ready co-operation during this session. I think every member realizes that in any session there are many stresses and strains on members, but there is still much fellowship and comradeship existing between all members here, irrespective of their Party. I thank the Hon. Mr. Shard, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Hon. Mr. Potter, Chairman of the L.C.L. in this Council.

Also, I thank you, Sir, as President. Your wide experience in all matters concerning this Council has been an important factor and has been of great benefit to the management of this Chamber. During the period of about 120 years since this Council has existed, there have been many who have experienced a long Parliamentary career and who have made a great contribution to the Parliamentary life of this State. With your long length of service, the different roles you have filled in this House, and now, Sir, your service as President, your record compares favourably with any other person's in the history of this Parliament.

I thank the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan who, whilst the Hon. Mr. Potter was away, acted as the Leader of the Liberal and Country Party and as Whip, and did a particularly good job. I would like, too, to extend my thanks to all the officers serving in this Council. I realize that on every occasion we should express our thanks to the officers for the dedication with which they perform their duties. Their dedication and service very often go beyond the call of duty.

We are singularly fortunate in the standard of officer serving in this Council. I include the messenger staff in these remarks, because they serve us particularly well. The members of the *Hansard* staff perform their task exceptionally well, although I believe they are not pressed quite so heavily in this Council as they are in the other place. To all the members of the staff of Parliament I, on behalf of all honourable members, once again extend my thanks for the services they have rendered to honourable members. I trust that the next session will be as fruitful, as productive and as co-operative as this session has been.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Leader of the Opposition): In the main, I support what the Chief Secretary has said, particularly his remarks in connection with the officers and staff and you, Mr. President. I had the

pleasure of nominating you, Mr. President, as President of this Council; the words I expressed at that time have been borne out. I am quite content that you were appointed, and I think all honourable members agree with me. The co-operation that has existed in this Council over a number of years has been of a very high standard. I do not want to reiterate what the Chief Secretary has said along those lines, but I think I would be failing in my duty if I did not express a word of thanks to my three colleagues. I could not wish to have three colleagues who are as prepared to share the burden equally and to assist me at all times as they are, and I thank them sincerely. I thank other honourable members, too, for their co-operation.

There have been two developments in procedure during this session, one of which I think is quite admirable and one of which I think is not to the advantage of this Parliament, for a tradition that existed previously has been broken during this session. Some time ago honourable members knew I was in difficulties and perhaps not in the best of health. I read every word of *Hansard* when I returned from overseas, and I appreciated very much the fact that honourable members were prepared to grant me a pair while I was away, and it was in the best interests of Parliament that that should be done.

I am not so happy about the second development that has occurred during this session: it has done as much disservice to this Council as the other development has done good to the Council. I refer to private members' business. It is not in my nature to be vindictive, nor is it in my nature to upset a Government. During this session it was insisted that private members' business could be dealt with only on Wednesdays. This was not in the best interests of this Council, nor did it make for harmony and smooth working.

When a motion was carried in previous Parliaments that a private member's motion be adjourned until the next day of sitting, if Government business was heavy on that day or if it was late in the afternoon before Government business was finished, the private member's motion was not dealt with. That was accepted, but to insist that we deal with private members' business on only one day of the week, despite the fact that on a couple of days each week we may finish fairly early in the afternoon, is not in the best interests

of Parliament. I urge (and say this most sincerely, with all the deep thought I have given it) on those honourable members of this Council who insisted on that course of action this session that it is not in the best interests of the working of the Council. I hope that next session, irrespective of Party, private members' business will be more reasonably dealt with. I hope everybody has had a happy Christmas and a good start to the New Year. Above all, I wish all honourable members very good health for the future and that when we reassemble we shall all be in our respective places.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2): I should like briefly to associate myself, on behalf of the Liberal members of this Council, with the remarks of the Chief Secretary and the Leader of the Opposition, especially about you, Mr. President, and the excellent way in which you have presided over this Council this session. We appreciate the length of your association with it and know it functions well under your firm guidance.

I should also like to thank all my Liberal colleagues for the help they have given me. They have worked very well this session. In particular, I thank the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan for filling the office of Chairman of the Liberal Party during my absence overseas. I thank, too, the Hon. Mrs. Cooper for occupying the positions of Secretary and Whip in the Party while the Hon. Mr. Gilfillan was acting as Chairman. I thank her for performing her task so well.

I congratulate the three Ministers in this Council. This is their first term in the Ministry, and they have all acquitted themselves well. From time to time they have had controversial matters to deal with but have quickly shown their ability to hold their posts and to steer through this Council the legislation for which they were responsible. We are all pleased to know that the Chief Secretary has been invited to be a guest of the British Government on an overseas trip; he will be leaving next week. We all wish him well on that trip. It will not, of course, be a holiday, for he will be doing important work for the Government. We hope he has a safe journey and a happy time while is away. In conclusion, I should like to associate myself with the remarks that have been made about the officers of this Council. They serve us well and we are grateful for the work they have done for us all.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to associate myself with the remarks made by the Chief Secretary, the Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Mr. Potter about the session's work and the work of the officers and those associated with Parliament. This has been what one might call a heavy session. Indeed, the number of messages between the two Houses has reached three figures. It has also been a heavy session for the Ministers, who have had to handle much controversial legislation in their first period of office. This has made me appreciate all the more the Council's having been able to maintain a standard of debate and decorum well up to the standard and reputation it has earned over the years.

I am speaking mainly because people who have been mentioned in the remarks of previous speakers are unable to answer for themselves. Indeed, some have not even had an opportunity of hearing what has been said, but we will see that the remarks that have been made here are conveyed to them. We are indeed fortunate in having the personnel that we have in this Chamber. One could enumerate, but the Chief Secretary has already done that. There have been some changes in the staff assisting the Parliament; we have practically a new team of Parliamentary Draftsmen with the exception of the principal draftsman. The others have not been with us long but they have assisted members in every possible way. I have heard of nothing but compliments regarding their work, which is so important to members.

I also mention the staff that is out of sight (I cannot call them the back-room boys) such as the librarians, who are remarkably efficient in obtaining information promptly for members, and the messengers, with whom I have probably a closer association than most honourable members have. I have therefore had an opportunity of judging their excellent work. I do not know what the Clerk, the Black Rod and Mr. Mertin think of me, because I am probably a bit of a worry to them at times, but they are certainly of great assistance to me.

One could also refer to the catering staff, who are always obliging and who provide a service to members that is generally appreciated. I could mention others that have not been named. The caretakers are efficient in the work of caring for the premises here. To all of these officers I express my appreciation.

I also wish the Chief Secretary *bon voyage* and the best of health during his coming trip abroad. A number of members have had the experience of travelling overseas and know that what appears to some people to be a holiday is not just that. When one has a particular function to perform, travelling can be exhausting, and I hope the Chief Secretary will make sure he does not overdo it. I hope he can absorb the information he is seeking without knocking himself about.

I wish all honourable members good health, and may they return to the next session fit and well, ready to carry on with their work.

Motion carried.

At 10.40 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, March 18, at 2.15 p.m.

Honourable members rose in their places and sang the first verse of the National Anthem.