LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, October 29, 1969.

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

QUESTIONS

ISLINGTON CROSSING

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: On October 14 I directed a question to the Minister of Roads and Transport regarding the Islington railway crossing. Has he a reply?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The over-pass at the Islington railway crossing is one of those approved in principle by Parliament. This over-pass will be in close proximity to another over-pass to be provided over the Salisbury Freeway.

The current investigations are basically concerned with an assessment whether it is technically feasible and economically justified to construct the railway over-pass ahead of the construction of the Salisbury Freeway. Consideration is also being given to the fact that road traffic using Regency Road would be seriously inconvenienced if the construction of these two over-passes was not carried out simultaneously.

Since discussions with other authorities are involved, it is not possible at this stage to estimate the time required for these investigations to be completed.

AGED DRIVERS

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Recently I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport a question regarding the possibility of automatically re-testing aged drivers involved in accidents. Has he a reply?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: All persons over 69 years of age are required to undertake an annual driving test, and testing officers are on the lookout during such tests for any apparent disability. Similarly, the possibility of physical or other defects is always considered when accidents are reported or investigated. It is not unusual for cases to be referred for further inquiry and possible suspension or restriction of licence.

All drivers over 74 years of age are required to submit to an eyesight test each year. Thus, whilst the Registrar of Motor Vehicles does not automatically re-test all elderly drivers who are involved in reportable accidents, it would appear that reasonable steps are taken to detect disabilities.

SPEED LIMITS

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek 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: Earlier this year a joint advisory committee on motor transport appointed by the Government recommended increased speed limits for commercial motor vehicles. Honourable members will recall visiting an area near Elizabeth and witnessing demonstrations in the braking of these vehicles at the new recommended speeds. I am not sure whether these recommendations are to come into force through an amendment to the Road Traffic Act or through regulation. I would assume that the speed requirements would have to be covered by an amendment to the Act, whilst probably the braking provisions could be handled by regulation.

Many motor vehicle owners are having difficulty in obtaining the accessories necessary to fit trailers with brakes as required in the proposals. Can the Minister say whether a period of grace will be allowed to enable owners to equip their vehicles so that they comply with the new regulations?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I agree that there is at present some confusion in people's minds regarding if and when these new maximum speed limits will be introduced and how they will affect the question of braking on trucks. True, in August the Joint Advisory Committee on Motor Transport presented what it termed stage 1 of its report.

Cabinet considered the report in early September and approved my recommendation that the Road Traffic Act, 1961-1967, be amended to allow all commercial motor vehicles to travel under new speed limits. The committee's recommendations with regard to the new speed limits in South Australia have been approved by the Government and are as follows:

Gross vehicle weight (includes trailer)	Speed limit miles an hour
Up to 3 tons	60
Over 3 tons and up to 11 tons	50
Over 11 tons	40

These speed limits are to apply except where a speed limit or zone establishes a lower speed limit (for example, 35 miles an hour in a municipality, town or township).

These new speeds will apply to all commercial motor vehicles irrespective of the date of the first registration, but the Government recognizes that the adoption of higher commercial vehicle speed limits must be accompanied by amendments to the South Australian

braking requirements, which will bring them into line with the Australian Motor Vehicle Standards Committee's regulations.

It is necessary to link the operative dates of new commercial vehicle speed limits with alterations to the braking requirements, but I find that it is necessary to amend the Road Traffic Act in respect of speed limits whereas the introduction of the braking requirements is a matter for amendment to regulations under the Road Traffic Act; this is what the honourable member thought.

The Government is most anxious to introduce these new speed limits, but recognizes that it is necessary to amend the regulations and allow time for them to be considered by the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation before going on with any amendments to the Act. The regulations are at present being considered by the Solicitor-General, and it is expected that they will be placed before the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in the near future. When these are approved, action will be taken to introduce the necessary amending legislation to vary the maximum speeds of commercial vehicles as set out.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of last week about speed limits in small townships?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The Road Traffic Board is aware of the incidence of low speed limits through some South Australian townships. This is essentially the result of the present definition of township, which requires motorists to travel at 35 m.p.h. regardless of variables such as road alignment, pavement widths, sight distances, and type of roadside development. In an effort to take into consideration these factors, the board has an active policy of speed zoning above the normal township speed limit where environment safely permits motorists to do higher speeds. It is pointed out that the matter of speed limits is not covered by the Motor Vehicles Act but is provided for in the Road Traffic Act.

APPRENTICES

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: In this morning's *Advertiser* the President of the Master Builders Association (Mr. J. W. Weeks) is reported as having said that only a handful of entrants had started on trades school courses concerned with the building industry. He said that only five apprentice bricklayers had started, compared with the 18 who started five years ago. This year 97 apprentice carpenters and joiners had started, compared with 133 five years ago. He said that the reduced number of apprentices was associated with labour-only contracts in the building industry today.

In my discussions with both employers and employees in the building industry I have always been told that the best way to train people to work in the industry is through the apprenticeship scheme. We see newspaper reports about the shoddy work that has gone into some buildings, and I agree with these reports. The Government has stated that the building industry is flourishing and that more people are employed in it now than were employed some years ago, but the figures I have quoted do not substantiate the Government's statements. Will the Minister ascertain what the Government intends to do to bring about some change in the industry, either in regard to labour-only contracts or in some other way, so that more people are encouraged to become apprentices and thereby raise the standards in the building industry?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will obtain a report from the relevant Minister.

TRACTORS

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: My question relates to mudguards on tractors, a matter which I have been discussing with the Minister for some time. Yesterday I received a reply in relation to this question stating that mudguards must be fitted to wheels on the front axles and not the rear axles of tractors, which seemed to be incorrect. However, on checking one finds that the answer given by the Minister is correct, namely, that mudguards are required on the front wheels of tractors and not on the rear wheels which, as every honourable member knows, is contrary to common practice.

The only reason I can think of for this regulation is that the front wheels of a tractor, being relatively small, travel faster than do the rear wheels, and "in road gear" they may throw mud to some extent. If that is the reason for the regulation, I suggest that an exemption could be granted for tractors travelling under a certain speed. I asked the Minister yesterday

whether, if his answer was correct (which, as I have said, means that all tractors fail to comply with the regulations), he would try to see that the regulation was brought more into line with common practice. Has he a reply?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yesterday I undertook to have a further look at the question of mudguards on farm tractors raised by the honourable member. The position is as I have previously indicated, that regulations under the Road Traffic Act provide that all tractors are to be equipped with mudguards for wheels on the foremost axle, but they are specifically exempt from fitting guards to the rear-most axle.

I understand that the Road Traffic Board is at present considering amendments to the appropriate regulations. I am sure that the points made by the honourable member will be taken into account by the board in framing its recommendations. These recommendations will be considered first by me, as Minister, and then by Cabinet before any approval is given to their introduction.

MINING

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Mines.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Some time ago the Minister gave this Council an informative statement about the mining position in this State, and I have heard recently of certain copper mining activities in my district at Kanmantoo. Would the Minister care to enlarge on this matter?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The honourable member has always had his ear fairly close to the ground on these matters. Broken Hill South Limited, North Broken Hill Limited and E. Z. Industries Limited announce that drilling and other investigations undertaken at Kanmantoo in South Australia have disclosed a copper ore body upon which it is intended to begin mining by open-cut. It is proposed to mine at a rate of 750,000 tons of ore a year over seven years, and the feed to the concentrator is expected to average 1 per cent copper content. Design of the mine, the concentrating plant and other services will be commenced immediately. The project will be managed by Broken Hill South Limited and the interests of the parties are: Broken Hill South Limited, 51 per cent; North Broken Hill Limited, 19½ per cent; Electrolytic Zinc Company of Australasia Limited, 19½ per cent; and McPhar Geophysics Limited, 10 per cent. Drilling indicates that mineralization continues below the bottom of the proposed open cut and the feasibility of mining this ore will be investigated during the period of open-cut mining. This is an important development as far as South Australia is concerned. Although other mines have announced they will reopen in South Australia, so far the mines that will be reopening are in areas previously worked. This is a brand new ore body as far as we are concerned and it is expected it will provide employment for about 100 men over the years that the mine will operate.

WESTERN ROAD

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I understand the Minister of Roads and Transport now has a reply to a question I asked last week about the upgrading of the road from the Eyre Highway to Cook.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Work on upgrading the road from the Eyre Highway to Cook was temporarily deferred in favour of upgrading the Eyre Highway itself. However, now that the latter work has been completed, arrangements are being made to commence work on the road to Cook, and improvements should be completed within two months.

CRYSTAL BROOK RAIL SERVICE

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question when I asked him to find out whether the rail service provided for the Broken Hill Associated Smelters annual picnic to Crystal Brook would be continued in the future?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The passenger service provided hitherto between Port Pirie and Crystal Brook on the occasion of the Broken Hill Associated Smelters annual picnic has consisted of trains made up of passenger coaches drawn from the pool of narrow gauge rolling stock held on the Peterborough division. These vehicles are not suitable for conversion for standard gauge operation. It is anticipated that only five coaches are to be built to serve the Adelaide to Broken Hill standard gauge line and it would not be practical to use them in connection with the B.H.A.S. annual picnic.

The service previously provided has not been subsidized by the Government; the B.H.A.S. picnic committee has borne the total cost. The matter has been discussed with officials of the B.H.A.S., who have been advised that it is unlikely that a rail service will be provided next year. However, the Railways Commissioner will continue to investigate the possibility of securing suitable rolling stock for the purpose.

KIMBA MAIN

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I ask leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Works.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Last year the sum of $207,000 was allotted for the construction of the Polda-Kimba main, which is less than one-tenth of the overall cost of $2,264,000. A further $575,000 was allotted this year in the Estimates. The amount of work to be done for $207,000 is about six miles, and it will take 10 years to complete at that rate. The $575,000 provided this year may reduce it to another eight or nine years. It was planned that this main would be completed within three years. Can the Minister say whether the work is proceeding according to schedule?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: I will get a report for the honourable member.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Roads and Transport. I understand that a committee has been set up to look into the question of what principle shall guide the Government in determining payment of compensation to people affected as a result of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study. I understand that the committee is to report to the Government as to what alterations should be made to the existing Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act in order to provide sufficient scope to ensure that just and adequate compensation will be paid to people affected by the plan. Can the Minister inform me, first, as to the composition of the committee and, secondly, to what extent that committee has proceeded with its work?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: The principal recommendation made by the Land Acquisition Legislative Review Committee deals with the proposed Land and Valuation Court, and flowing from that are the relevant Bills in this Chamber at the present time. I am still waiting for the committee to make recommendations to me concerning the second important aspect of ascertaining whether the present Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act should be amended so that people whose properties will be compulsorily acquired will be treated fairly and justly. Of course, this Act is used by many State Government departments in regard to acquisition, and not only by those that are concerned with the M.A.T.S. plan.

I inquired late last week from members of the committee as to what progress it was making and, although I am only speaking from memory, I believe the report revealed that the committee was hoping to bring recommendations before me this week; they were expediting their work because of the urgency of the matter.

However, I shall inquire again for the honourable member and find out the exact position. I assure him that at this moment the matter is well in hand and that it is being treated as urgent. I hope that within a week or two I will be introducing a measure to upgrade the provisions of the present legislation dealing with the acquisition of land.

As regards the present committee, the chairman is Mr. K. C. Taeuber, a member of the Public Service Board, who has been (or is) the Australian President of the Commonwealth Institute of Valuers. Another senior member of the committee is Mr. W. A. N. Wells, the Solicitor-General. At the moment I cannot remember the third member, but I shall bring down a report for the honourable member.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 22. Page 2352.)

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Chief Secretary): I do not intend today to speak at length on this Bill. Only two years ago, in 1967, I spoke at some length on the Bill then before the Council; on that occasion I opposed it very strongly and I can see no reason to alter my mind. Such a Bill has been before this Council on many occasions (I think 17) since 1894.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: Does your memory go back as far as that?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: No, but my research does. Whilst on some occasions the Bill has succeeded in one House, it has never succeeded in both Houses. In fact, it has met the fate of being defeated either in the Council or in the House of Assembly on about an equal number of occasions.

If one examines the main reasons why this Bill has been put forward, one finds that it is based on the fact that the House of Commons has had a public accounts committee since 1836, and it is taken as a fair precedent that because such a committee operates in Great Britain it should operate here. It was instituted in the British system because of the

desire of Parliament to restrict Government spending and to have some greater control over the money it allocated to the various departments.

I point out that the public accounts committee in Great Britain became operative before the office of Auditor-General was constituted; in other words, it assumed the present role of our Audit Department and the Auditor-General. In 1866, 30 years after the public accounts committee commenced to operate in Great Britain, it was decided to institute the office of Auditor-General there, and the Auditor-General on appointment drew his powers completely from the public accounts committee.

Let us examine the different situations involved. Here in this State we have an Auditor-General who is protected from interference by reason of the fact that he has a certain amount of independence, and, with all due respect, he relies a great deal on this Council for the preservation of that independence. He has his own particular power and, indeed, he fulfils the function of a public accounts committee. As I said, the Auditor-General in Great Britain must draw his powers from the original public accounts committee.

One can understand that, with the simplicity of accounting procedures in Great Britain in 1836, a public accounts committee possibly could be of some use. However, with the great complexity of accounting procedures today, I wonder whether any public accounts committee is capable of performing any useful function. I should like to quote from a publication *Control of Public Expenditure,* published in 1952, regarding a comment on the present standing of the public accounts committee in Great Britain. This publication points out very clearly that that committee has a total membership of 15 and that the work is done by a chairman with a possible attendance of one or two members. The Auditor-General also attends the meetings. Therefore, we see that the committee in Great Britain is virtually under the control and advice of the Auditor-General. The publication also states:

> There are perhaps two criteria: some relevant knowledge and experience and service on the committee—and it is certain that it takes two or three years before they can find their way about the intricate accounts.

I also quote from a statement of Sir John Wardlaw-Milne, who told a Select Committee on procedure on this matter:

> I do not think the public accounts committee can in any way be said to examine expenditure from the point of view of getting value for money. The committee is mainly interested in the regularity of accounts and in assuring itself that money is spent as Parliament intended.

With all due respect, I cannot see any advantage in adding to our system in South Australia a public accounts committee. Such a committee would be working not as the Auditor-General is working today throughout the year with the accounts of the State and making his report as an independent person but working *post facto* for about 18 to 24 weeks a year and not performing any real function. Mr. Harold Wilson, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, is reported to have said that the public accounts committee there was the only blood sport now permitted in the United Kingdom.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: What about the Commonwealth Public Accounts Committee?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I agree that the Commonwealth Parliament has such a committee.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: Tell us how they are run here.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Although I have no notes on this, I think I am right in saying that that committee was instituted in about 1920. The Scullin Government, in 1931, decided to get rid of the committee as an economy measure. The committee was abandoned at that stage and was not reinstated until 1949.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That was Professor Bland's committee.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, and I believe that while Professor Bland was with that committee it may well have been of some benefit. But how often today can we find a committee that has at its disposal a gentleman of the calibre of Professor Bland? The rather interesting thing is that the Scullin Government in 1931 decided, as an economy measure, to disband the public accounts committee.

I cannot see any advantage whatsoever in a public accounts committee when we have an Auditor-General who is independent, who is protected by the Houses of Parliament, who is engaged in his work with the department during the full 12 months of the year, and who can make his report quite clearly to this Parliament. When I spoke on this matter in 1967 I stated my views, and I have seen no reason to change my mind since then. Therefore, I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. H. K. KEMP secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 22. Page 2354.)

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS (Midland): I rise to speak fairly briefly to this Bill. I have to inform my friend and colleague the Hon. Sir Norman Jude that I cannot support the Bill, although I appreciate his sincerity in bringing it forward.

The Bill seeks to take out subsection (3) of section 31m of the Act and replace it with another subsection which allows for the payment of a dividend on the day of the race on which the bet was made. I think that this is a retrograde step. I do not go all the way with my friend the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Mr. Shard, for I do not think it is necessarily a big step backwards towards having betting shops again. If it were, I would oppose it all the more earnestly. However, I believe it is a step in the wrong direction.

The Bill that established the Totalizator Agency Board two or three years ago, during the term of the Labor Government, established it on the clear understanding that pay-outs would not be made on the day of the race. Both Houses, the public and everyone concerned with the industry realized his, and it was one of the reasons why T.A.B. was established in South Australia. Whether or not one agrees with the establishment of the board, it must be said that it has carried out its work well and that the agencies are well maintained and are not, by any stretch of the imagination, the sort of blot on the landscape that the old betting shops were. However, I feel obliged to oppose anything that tends, in however small a way, to cause a return to those days.

Moreover, this Bill has been introduced despite the fact that the Bill that established T.A.B. was passed on the clear understanding that there would be no pay-outs on the day of the race. Two or three years ago a Bill was passed that permitted dog-racing on the clear understanding that no gambling would be associated with the sport; however, some people now wish to introduce gambling to this sport. If legislation is passed on a clear understanding, that understanding should be adhered to. I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE (Northern): I support the Bill. Pay-outs after the last race will lead to greater use of T.A.B. facilities and provide a service for people travelling to and from country areas and other States who would normally have to attend a race meeting to have a bet; such people would often be unable to stay in the city over the weekend to collect on the Monday. This Bill will be appreciated by the general public, and it meets with the approval of the T.A.B. authorities. It will to some extent reduce the period for which large sums are held in T.A.B. agencies. As I believe this move is overdue, I support the Bill.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL (Central No. 2): I was in the Chamber, as I think all other honourable members were, when the Bill establishing T.A.B. was passed in 1966. The expressions of opinion then were that, as long as the purposes of that Bill were fulfilled, most honourable members could not see very much wrong with it. However, many of us, like the Hon. Mr. Shard, had vivid recollections of the old betting shops, and most honourable members (certainly those who knew those days) did not want to see their return or any danger of their return. It is in this respect that I object to this Bill.

The best point that the Hon. Sir Norman Jude made was that the T.A.B. agencies would get rid of much money on the day of the race meeting and therefore be less liable to hold-ups. I certainly respect that point. On the other hand, the Hon. Mr. Shard said that this Bill could well be, and in his opinion would be, the first step toward pay-outs after every race, which would inevitably, I think, bring back the situation that existed in the old betting shop days, and I certainly would not want to be a party to anything that led in that direction.

I have given this Bill much consideration. If I were not concerned about the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Shard, I would not be worried about the refinements that have been talked about in connection with night trotting meetings and race meetings in different States, because these things are rather insignificant and fractional. When the debate on the second reading has concluded, if I believe that the danger pointed out by the Hon. Mr. Shard could come to pass, I will vote against this Bill. I think there will be a little further debate on the second reading and that there will be further debate on clause 2, which is the operative clause, during the Committee stages, so I will reserve my final vote until I have heard all the arguments.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD secured the adjournment of the debate.

UNDERGROUND WATERS PRESERVATION BILL

In Committee.

(Continued from October 15. Page 2209.)

Clause 11—"Term of permit."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Minister of Mines): In reply to the point raised by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, I submit that clause 8, in both subclauses, requires the issue of a permit before certain action can be taken. In subclause (1) the action involves mechanical work, and in subclause (2) the action is to change the use of a well. In each case, if the permit contains no conditions it is discharged when the action is completed—for example, in subclause (1) when a well is drilled, and in subclause (2) when the use of a water supply well is changed to use as a drainage well. If, at a later stage, the continued use of the well is considered undesirable for any of the reasons set out in clause 17, action can be taken under that clause.

If permits in either category contain conditions, the situation is unaltered except that the conditions may provide for some continuing requirement by the permittee, for example, under subclause (1), a restriction on the amount of water withdrawn from the well, and in subclause (2), a restriction on the amount and nature of the fluid introduced into the well. If, subsequently, it is considered necessary to take other action in respect of the well, action can be taken to vary the conditions of the permit under clause 12 (4), or action can be taken under clause 17 according to the particular circumstances. Once the permitted action is carried out and the permit discharged, it cannot then be revoked.

If a permit is issued in respect of action set out in either clause 8 (1) or (2), and that action is not taken within 12 months after such issue, clause 11 allows a review of all matters that led to the approval of the permit application in relation to the possibly changed circumstances at the later date. This does and should apply equally to both types of action.

It is agreed that the powers to revoke a permit set out in clause 10 could be invoked at any time the Minister was satisfied the conditions justified such action, but it is considered important that provision be made to make sure that any permit for any action is reviewed if such action has not been carried out within 12 months. Since Sir Arthur raised this matter, it has been discovered that clause 8 possibly needs to be amended, so I will later seek the recommittal of the Bill to amend that clause. If necessary and if the honourable member requires it, clauses 9, 10 and 11 can be recommitted, too.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I thank the Minister for the thoroughness with which he examined the matter I raised. I did not regard it as vital, because, as I pointed out, other clauses could be invoked to save the situation that I contemplated might exist. I do not know whether my query was instrumental in promoting amendments to clause 8.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I assure the honourable member that the examination was made and the amendment proposed on his query.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I thank the Minister for these crumbs that fall occasionally. The matter is reasonably covered by the rest of the Act. I raised the question in a technical rather than a real way, because it was not the sort of matter I wanted to pursue unless real reasons existed for doing so. However, I felt obliged to raise it as I considered there was some variation between the two clauses.

Clause passed.

Clauses 12 to 19 passed.

Clause 20—"Artesian well to be capped, etc."

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I move to insert the following new subclause:

(5) This section shall not apply to or in relation to a well situated upon any lands within the meaning of the Pastoral Act, 1936-1968, unless the Minister, with the consent of the Minister of Lands, directs by notice in writing served on the owner of the land on which the well is situated, that this section shall apply to and in relation to the well.

The Minister of Lands has power under the Pastoral Act to control the drilling of wells and the capping of artesian wells. As clause 20 would take precedence of existing powers in that Act, it is considered that the co-operation which has always existed between the Lands and Mines Departments should continue. This new subclause therefore requires the consent of the Minister of Lands to be obtained before the full application of the clause can be effected.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: As one who is interested in the pastoral country, I think this is a good amendment. I am always opposed to any matter being dealt with by two different authorities.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 21 to 23 passed.

Clause 24—"Establishment of committee."

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: Having discussed this matter with the Chief Secretary, and being satisfied that at least some of the objects I hoped to achieve by my foreshadowed amendment can be attained under subclause (2) (*g*), I do not intend to move my amendment.

The Hon. L. R. HART: Can the Minister say how many persons will be appointed under subclause (2) (*g*), whether all the persons so appointed will be permanent members of the committee, and whether they will have full voting rights?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The situation is that the members of the advisory committee vary according to the area to which the defined area applies. Whilst we have a permanent part of the advisory committee, there are some members who serve on it only within various areas. The committee is well supplied with the right people to give advice but, in the case of the defined areas around the State, the Minister has certain powers to appoint people to this committee. I do not think the Minister should be restricted in who should be appointed. However, I can give the Hon. Mr. Hart the assurance that most people I have spoken to who are associated with this work are perfectly happy with the present situation.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: If the answer to the Hon. Mr. Hart's question was "one only", there would be no less than seven members of this committee already.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That is right.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I have much experience of committees, as I think most honourable members have, and I think it is agreed that a reasonably small committee generally does the best work. It seems to me that, even if only one man was appointed under paragraph (*g*) as a representative on the committee, he would have a say on the committee. I should like to draw attention to the fact that it is an advisory comittee, and under clause 27 (3):

The Minister shall consider any recommendation of the advisory committee but shall not be bound thereby.

Therefore, if the Minister considers any recommendation from the committee, he will certainly consider any dissenting voices or a recommendation for disagreement. Thus, it seems to me that the clause as drawn does successfully cover the representation of all interests who may attend the committee.

Clause passed.

Clauses 25 to 27 passed.

Clause 28—"Licences."

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I move:

To strike out subclause (3).

In the second reading debate I stated my opposition to this clause, because it provides:

(1) A person shall not—

(*a*) drill or construct a well to a depth deeper than the prescribed depth;

(*b*) deepen or enlarge a well so that it becomes deeper than the prescribed depth;

(*c*) deepen or enlarge a well that is already deeper than the prescribed depth;

(*d*) remove, replace, alter or repair the casing, lining or screen of a well that is deeper than the prescribed depth;

or

(*e*) plug, backfill or seal off a well that is deeper than the prescribed depth,

unless he holds a licence of an appropriate kind, or is acting under the personal supervision of a person holding such a licence. Penalty: Five hundred dollars.

(2) This section shall apply to and in relation to persons employed by the Crown.

Then subclause (3) provides:

This section shall not apply in respect of anything done by a person upon land of which he is the owner or occupier, or by a person ordinarily employed by that person.

If that is so and it is important that care be taken in such an area, then subclause (3) hands over the liability for doing something about this to somebody who may not have any skill or the required qualifications for doing it. Therefore, the subclause saps the clause of its strength.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I oppose this amendment, even though it applies only to a prescribed area. I believe that any person on the land should have the right to drill for water at any time. Already, under clause 17, the Minister has the necessary powers to close and shut off the supply of underground water from any well; he has complete control over any supply of underground water. I do not think it is necessary to delete this subclause, which permits a person to drill on his own land.

It is true that the Well Drillers Association claims that its drillers have attained some standard, but these claims are not always what they are crackd up to be. It is rather like the woolclassers, some of whom are efficient and some are not. I have worked with and employed well drillers, and I know that there are many people who could economically drill on their own property. If any provision of the Act is jeopardized, the Minister already has the overall authority.

The Hon. L. R. HART: When the Minister replied to the debate, he suggested that the department would have no objection if honourable members decided to delete this subclause. He indicated that it was not in the original legislation but had been inserted by the Council itself. As this Act has been operating for a few years and we have had some experience of it, perhaps at this point of time the Council again, in its wisdom, could delete this subclause. That would clarify the situation.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I tender my apologies to the Hon. Mr. Hart because, when I spoke on clause 24, I was dealing particularly with paragraph (*f*), while the honourable member's queries related to paragraph (*g*). I am indebted to the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill for giving the correct reply to the Hon. Mr. Hart. As the Hon. Mr. Hart has said, it is correct that subclause (3) of clause 28 was inserted by the Council in the Bill that first went through this Chamber.

The Hon. C. R. Story: In 1967.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes, in 1967. The department would welcome the deletion of subclause (3), but it was the view of this Council in 1967 that it should be inserted. In answer to the Hon. Mr. Whyte, I fully respect his views on this question, but clause 28 applies only to a defined area. I cannot visualize a pastoral area ever becoming a defined area. The Pastoral Act controls this substantially, so the total area controlled by that Act would not be included in this legislation. The Hon. Mr. Whyte also said that a landholder should have the right to sink a well on his own land. Of course, this legislation would remove that right, and whilst it is controlled to the extent that a permit to drill is necessary and whilst it must be held under tight control, subclause (3) does provide for a situation where controls do not apply. From the department's point of view, we are prepared to support the Hon. Mr. Kneebone's amendment, but I again point out that this subclause was inserted by this Council in 1967.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: It would be interesting to see who supported this provision in 1967 and how those same people will vote today, because I am sure many of them will not remember how they voted in 1967. If this subclause is deleted, then only a person holding a licence would be permitted to drill, and in clause 6 "licence" means a well driller's licence for the time being in force under this Act. Clause 29 (2) reads:

Licences shall be of such types and shall contain such conditions as may be prescribed.

As I understand it, if a landowner wished to drill on his property and if this amendment is carried, he would have to possess a general well driller's licence, because I do not know that there is any category of licence applying to a person wishing to drill on his own property only. I believe if the proposed amendment is passed there should be a further amendment passed for a category of licence to cover that situation. After all, while a fee simple system of land ownership exists, a person owning land should surely be able to do what he likes on his own land as long as he does not damage other people's interests. I believe he should be able to carry out such work himself rather than be compelled to employ an outsider. It would be unreasonable to ask that a landowner should obtain a general well driller's licence before sinking a bore on his own property. I think that the clause could well remain.

As has been mentioned, we have had experience of the Act, which I think has been a desirable innovation and has worked well. The Act will need refinement from time to time in the light of experience; I am certain of that, but I do not think this is the time to make such a refinement by deleting this clause. I think that people, until experience shows otherwise, should have the right to control their own properties. If it is found that this does not work, then the matter can be given further consideration. After all, it has worked for one and one-third centuries up to date. People have been permitted to drill for water on their own properties, and I do not know of any occasion where damage has been caused by a person putting down a bore in too amateurish a fashion. I know a little about drilling bores; I know a bit about bores as well—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Which sort?

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: All sorts, and you don't have to go far from here to experience some of those, either. The fact remains that most people who set out to sink bores on their own property have to have some knowledge and experience. They would use a percussion drill because I do not suppose anyone can afford a diamond drill unless he is in a pastoral company, and in such cases, as the Chief Secretary has said, that situation is catered for under the Pastoral Act. However, I recommend that honourable members retain this clause. I repeat: if it is found that damage is being done by providing

owners with this facility, then the position can be rectified at a later stage. There are plenty of other powers under the Act capable of preventing damage being done if anything goes wrong.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: At least I will be consistent in supporting the proposed amendment, because I opposed the clause strongly in 1967, when I had charge of the Bill. Opponents of this amendment this afternoon have pointed out that many people are experienced in well drilling, but this clause does not apply only to well drilling. If that were so, then perhaps it would not be so bad, but the clause also applies to all types of repairs as well as to deepening or enlarging an existing well or bore. Paragraphs (*d*) and (*e*) of clause 28 (1) read:

(*d*) remove, replace, alter or repair the casing, lining or screen of a well that is deeper than the prescribed depth;
(*e*) plug, backfill or seal off a well that is deeper than the prescribed depth,
unless he holds a licence of an appropriate kind, or is acting under the personal supervision of a person holding such a licence.

If it were confined to drilling, particularly outside a defined area, it would not be so bad. However, a landowner or an employee of a landowner permitted to drill on his own land in a defined area could cause untold damage not only to himself but also to every other landowner who may be drawing water from the basin in that area.

As I see the position, a serious situation exists in the area known as the Northern Adelaide Plains where a considerable number of people have their livelihood tied up in the area. There have been cases in the area where wells have not been drilled in the proper manner and underground water is being continuously contaminated because of incorrect drilling of bores or wells. There is a considerable quantity of highly saline water above a basin of good water. and there is no protection to prevent saline water from escaping to the good water in the lower aquifer and continually contaminating it. If that situation is allowed to continue, the possibility is that the whole of the underground basin will become contaminated.

The Hon. A. M. Whyte: The Minister has the right to have that well plugged, back filled, or sealed off.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The Minister would not have that right because what is being asked is that a landowner be given the right to do as he likes on his own property. I have pointed out some of the dangers that could occur. Not only are we faced with the serious situation in the Northern Adelaide Plains but also in other areas. One such area is at Langhorne Creek where a similar situation exists, and another is in the South-East where good water can no longer be found on a property because of contamination. I ask honourable members: how many landowners would be able to do pressure cementing? This would be necessary to prevent saline water from getting into the good water down below and contaminating it, and experienced well drillers would be required.

This matter has to be considered seriously, because in a defined area all the landowners drawing water from the aquifer become involved. Some landowners have limited experience in drilling, but very few would be able to do pressure cementing. If water became contaminated, the supply of good water would be gone because of the actions of inexperienced well drillers. Soon after this Bill was introduced I had a talk with the Minister of Mines about one instance in the South-East in which a bore was sunk originally for oil exploration. No oil was found, but an unlimited quantity (at that time) of good water was found and an artesian bore was created. Although that bore was cased, that casing has rotted to nothing today, and the water is no longer rising to the surface but is running away underground.

I inspected this bore myself when I was Minister. We traced it back a considerable distance from the head itself, and we could hear this water running underground from the bore head. We followed it some distance and found that it gradually rose back to the surface: it was not going down into the aquifer at all. The surface was wet and boggy where this water was eventually finding its way up to the surface. The landowner concerned would not have a clue about how to repair or cement and block off that particular well.

In view of the seriousness of the position in relation to underground water in defined areas, we should delete this subclause and make sure that work is done by properly qualified registered well drillers. I support the amendment.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: A good deal of fuss is being made about this provision. However, I consider that it does not make much difference, because I do not think a private landowner can drill very much more cheaply than the cost at which he can employ a contractor. I cannot quite follow the Hon. Mr.

Bevan's story, because although one can employ a qualified well driller one has no actual control over the work that he does.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The department has every control over it.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Not all pressure cementing is successful, and no well driller would be foolish enough to guarantee that he could stop the flow of contaminated water.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: A well driller can become trained in the correct procedure.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I realize that, and I know that there are some very good well drillers. I believe that property owners would be foolish to drill in difficult country. For instance, it is most unlikely that people on boulder granite or other land that is hard to drill would think of drilling under their own steam. Drilling is very simple in some places; often people can find water at 50ft. or 60ft. without much difficulty, and these people should be allowed to put down a well without having to bring in a qualified well driller. Although I will vote for the retention of this provision, I do not think it is of much consequence.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I agree with the Hon. Mr. Whyte that this provision is not going to cause a great deal of difficulty. Mostly, the defined areas relate to the market garden type of situation. Also, very few people would have the capacity to do any deep drilling. I think I can give an assurance that this provision will not apply in the pastoral areas of the State, for I cannot conceive a situation where we would have a defined area in a pastoral area. Provisions of the Pastoral Act already make sure that drilling is adequately controlled.

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN: I believe that some members may not have fully appreciated this provision, which deals not with drilling a bore but with drilling deeper than the prescribed depth in a prescribed area. The passing of this amendment would not have any effect on a landowner drilling in normal circumstances.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 29 to 52 passed.

Clause 53—"False statements."

The CHAIRMAN: I have to point out that this clause contains a drafting error and that "Act" second occurring should be struck out and substituted by "section".

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 54 passed.

Clause 55—"Summary procedure."

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I move:

In subclause (2) to strike out "Director" and insert "Minister"; and in subclause (3) to strike out "Director" and insert "Minister".

These are drafting amendments.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The amendments are acceptable to the Government.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 56—"Orders by court."

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I move:

In subclause (2) to strike out "Director" and insert "Minister".

This amendment is similar to those relating to the previous clause.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: This is not a drafting amendment and is not in the same category as are those relating to the previous clause. However, I do not object to the amendment, for I do not think it makes much difference here whether the Minister or the Director has the power to carry out orders already made by the court. If members believe that "Minister" should be inserted, I am prepared to agree to that.

The Hon. A. F. KNEEBONE: I was merely trying to be consistent.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (57 to 61) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

Bill recommitted.

Clause 8—"Permit for operations"—reconsidered.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I move:

In subclause (2) after "area" to insert "either of the following changes in the use of a well is made:—"; in paragraph (*a*) to strike out "when the area was constituted a defined area by regulation"; and in paragraph (*b*) to strike out "when the area was constituted a defined area by regulation".

I have already thanked the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill for allowing me to have these provisions reconsidered.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Bill reported with further amendments. Committee's report adopted.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28. Page 2488.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): This Bill comes before us as a result of a commission set up under an Act of this Parliament which was known as the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Act and which was assented to on February 20 this year. On February 27, only a few days later, Executive Council appointed the commission, which at that time comprised Mr. Justice Chamberlain, who unfortunately later became unwell and was replaced by Mr. Justice Bright.

The other members of the commission were Mr. H. A. Bailey, the then Surveyor-General, and Mr. N. B. Douglass, the Returning Officer for the State. The commission was a highly competent and efficient body whose integrity was beyond reproach. It carried out its duties in accordance with its instructions, and I pay a tribute to it for the work it did in a relatively short period.

Its first duty was to determine what should constitute the new metropolitan area. Very early it issued what is now known as Part I of its report, in which it defined the metropolitan area. Then, after the parties concerned had been given the definition of the metropolitan area and, therefore, the area of the rest of the State, submissions were made about the division of the metropolitan area into 28 seats and the division of the country into 19 seats, making a total of 47 seats. Although I did not oppose the Electoral Districts (Redivision) Bill, I believed then, and I believe now, that the division of the State into 28 metropolitan districts and 19 country districts represents too great a loading in favour of the metropolitan area.

I do not accept the principle of one vote one value, because I have always regarded it as a political catch-cry. I do not think there is any evidence in the Constitutions of other countries to justify that kind of principle. It is much more important to see that everyone has adequate representation in relation to the problems of his area. I would have much preferred to see a redistribution nearer to that proposed some time ago, of 20 country districts and 20 metropolitan districts, with two additional country industrial districts. Such a redistribution would have served the purposes of this State much better than the redistribution proposed in this Bill. Obviously, under this redistribution we will see a political set-up in this State the like of which we have not experienced before, because the 28 metropolitan seats can control the political destiny of this State.

The problems of country people—problems of distance, roads and water supply—have recently been accentuated by the surplus of primary products such as wheat, wool, barley and fruit. Consequently, we must be careful that we do not do anything that will unduly reduce their voice in the State Parliament, and that will be the effect of this redistribution. For this reason, I am sorry that we have increased the number of metropolitan seats so substantially and proportionately reduced the representation of country people. I have received representations from various people expressing some degree of dissatisfaction with this Bill. I told them that I would see that their representations were brought before this Council. The first such submission came from the Kadina District Council. It is dated October 15 and signed by Mr. D. Hoare, the District Clerk; it is as follows:

My council is concerned that the report of the electoral boundaries commission has recommended the creation of two rather unwieldy electoral districts for Yorke Peninsula, whereas, in view of the geographical location and common interests of the people of the peninsula, it would be preferable to have Yorke Peninsula from Port Broughton to Warooka as one district.

The new district of Gouger extends from Wallaroo in the west to Riverton on the east and Para Hills on the south, whilst the district of Goyder covers the major portion of the peninsula with the addition of an area east of St. Vincent Gulf. My council believes that the interests of all concerned would best be served if the whole of the peninsula was proclaimed the electoral district of Goyder and the area east of St. Vincent Gulf proposed to form part of the electoral districts of Goyder and Gouger to comprise the district of Gouger.

Such an arrangement would, in the opinion of the council, meet the terms of reference as to the number of electors because the suggested alterations would give approximately the same number of electors in both districts. The council solicits your support for its proposal when the electoral Bill is before Parliament.

My reply, dated October 20, was as follows:

I acknowledge your letter of the 15th instant conveying to me the concern of your council upon the report of the electoral boundaries commission so far as it relates to the electoral district of Yorke Peninsula.

I note that your council believes that the area would be better served if the whole of Yorke Peninsula was proclaimed as one electoral district to be named Goyder and that the area east of St. Vincent Gulf be added to the remainder of the proposed district of Gouger to form the new district of Gouger.

I will raise this matter when the Bill is in the House but I am not hopeful of achieving success as I notice that the Bill passed the Lower House without any amendment. I may say that personally I am dissatisfied with the proposed redistribution and that I will be pleased to raise the matter mentioned by you in my speech on the second reading.

There is, therefore, some dissatisfaction with the redistribution coming from a responsible body in the Wallaroo area. For those reasons we should not unduly hasten the passage of this Bill but should allow it to take a normal passage so that, if there are other people who think that amendments should be made, we can have an opportunity to listen to their representations.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Did they put their cases before the commission?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: I presume they did, but I do not know. I have no evidence of that. I was surprised that this Bill went through the Lower House so quickly. It will affect representation in this Parliament for some years to come and it drastically alters the present Constitution. It moves most electors out of one electoral district and into another. Only about three speeches were made on this Bill during the second reading stage in the Lower House; that was a mistake—it should have been discussed at greater length to give people an appreciation of the situation. So, I hope this Council will not proceed with undue haste in considering this very important matter. The question of the names of electoral districts has been raised. In this connection I have received the following telegram:

Residents Karoonda and district unanimously urge you to retain name of Ridley for new electorate.

This is a reasonable request and, personally, I am not enamoured of the name "Mallee" applied to this district. We should consider this name and possibly one or two others. In paragraph 33 of its report the commission states:

The Act does not specifically direct us to recommend names for proposed districts, but we considered that it would be useful if we did so. We recognized that in this respect, as in all others, the final decision would lie with the Parliament. The parties, and others, suggested various names. We have also felt free to make suggestions of our own. We have derived some assistance from the principles stated in the 1969 report from the House of Representatives Select Committee on the naming of electoral divisions to the Parliament of the Commonwealth.

The electoral commissioners in their wisdom said that all they did was to make suggestions to us regarding what these names should be. They understood and believed that the final suggestions would be left to us. It is therefore open to us to correct or alter any names if we consider that something else is more suitable. I am not enamoured of the name "Mallee" and all it connotes, whereas anyone associated with country areas or with agriculture would realize the contribution that Ridley made to agriculture with the development of his stripper. I consider that "Ridley" should be continued rather than be replaced by "Mallee".

I turn now to a part of the report which, to me, causes the most concern of all, and which relates to the redivision of Legislative Council districts. The following appears on page 14 of the report:

Section 8 (1) (*b*) of the Act directs that subject to the Act the Comission shall—

(*b*) subject to subsection (8) of this section, adjust and re-define the areas of the five existing Council districts in terms of the proposed Assembly districts.

It seems to me that when we passed this Bill we were not sufficiently explicit in our instructions to the commission regarding what we required it to do in relation to the alteration of existing Council districts. We merely said that it was to redefine the areas of the five existing Council districts in terms of the proposed Assembly districts. Paragraph 14 of Part II of the report states:

Section 8 (8) of the Act reads as follows:—

For the purposes of paragraph (*b*) of subsection (1) of this section, the Commission shall, as far as practicable, retain the existing boundaries of Council districts;

Therefore, the commission was required to keep as close as it could to existing boundaries, subject to the following:

(*a*) where, in the opinion of the Commission, any Council district falls wholly or predominantly within the metropolitan area the boundaries of that Council district shall be adjusted and re-defined so as to incorporate those proposed Assembly districts within the metropolitan area which, in the opinion of the Commission, fall wholly or predominantly within that Council district;

and

(*b*) such consequential adjustments shall be made to other Council districts as the Commission thinks necessary without substantially altering the present boundaries of those Council districts.

In our instructions we therefore said two things: first, that consequential adjustments were to be made to Council districts without substantially altering the present boundaries of

those districts and, secondly, that the commission was to redefine the boundaries in terms of the proposed Assembly districts. The commission apparently experienced difficulties in relation to the instructions given to it. Having said that, pursuant to section 8 (1) (*b*), they should adjust and redefine the areas of the five existing Legislative Council districts in terms of the proposed Assembly districts, the commissioners stated in their report:

At the present time, pursuant to section 19 and the second schedule to the Constitution Act, 1934-1961, every Legislative Council district comprises whole Assembly districts.

Therefore, while the commission was obliged to make only such minor amendments to Legislative Council district boundaries as necessary, it had to ensure that Council districts comprised whole Assembly districts and not portions of them. In that regard the commission's report states:

We interpret section 8 (1) (*b*) as making a legislative direction that this practice shall continue, and it is in this light that section 8 (8) must be construed. The first conclusion which we draw is, therefore, that no Assembly district may be divided by a Legislative Council boundary. We heard considerable argument on the meaning of the words "wholly or predominantly" twice occurring in section 8 (8) (*a*). It was contended on the one hand that these words in their context related solely to area and on the other hand that they denoted (or at least included) a concept of "numbers of Council electors".

Paragraph 16 of the report states:

We are left with a further difficulty as regards section 8 (8) (*b*). The adjustments which this subsection directs us to make are characterized as being "consequential", which we would understand to mean being automatically governed by the application of the "predominant" criterion in relation to proposed Assembly district boundaries, and by the repositioning of adjacent Legislative Council boundaries. But the subsection also imposes limits on these consequential adjustments, namely, that they are to be made "without substantially altering" the present Legislative Council boundaries. The argument was advanced that the substantial alteration which was to be avoided was one in which the alteration would result in a substantially larger or smaller number of electors than previously being included in the Legislative Council district whose boundaries were being altered. We think, as above stated, that section 8 (8) (*b*) is unmistakably geographical. It deals with boundaries not electors. It follows that the only way in which we can give effect to section 8 (8) (*b*) is by paying heed to it when we fix the relevant Assembly district boundaries. This view is strengthened by section 9 (1) (*b*), if the words "other defined areas" occurring in that subsection are construed as being wide enough to include Legislative Council districts.

The commissioners go on in paragraph 17, which I will not read, to mention the difficulty that these instructions provided for them, particularly when dealing with Midland District. The effect of this is that the alterations to Legislative Council districts have been consequential on the alterations made to Assembly districts, and the commission did not (nor was it required to do so) look into what should be the future of Legislative Council districts.

I consider that, in view of the great growth in the metropolitan area and in view of the alterations in centres of populations throughout the State, overall consideration should be given to the future position of Legislative Council districts, just as it has been necessary to make substantial alterations to Assembly districts, and we should not be satisfied, as we have to be with this Bill, with minor alterations that are consequential on what was done in the Assembly areas.

If one examines the position, one will see how important this becomes. Originally, the concept was that the Legislative Council should consist of three country districts and two metropolitan districts comprising four members each. In the redistribution we still have the city districts comprising four members each, but we also have what has been known as the country district of Midland comprising more electors from the metropolitan area than from the country. This does not line up with the principles set down in the Bill in relation to a community of interests between electors. Admittedly, the commissioners were required to look at this aspect as far as Assembly districts were concerned, and it seems to me to be logical also to look at community of interests in relation to Council districts.

Leaving aside the question of Midland (a district in which I am not uninterested), with the growth of population to the south of Adelaide it will not be many years before a large proportion of the population in Southern District will be people not from rural areas but from the metropolitan area. Consequently, we shall have the position of Central No. 1, Central No. 2, Midland and Southern Districts all being controlled by metropolitan interests.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: It cannot come quickly enough.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: That would be a bad thing for this State because, under the redistribution, the large preponderance of representation in the House of Assembly is from the metropolitan area. If we reach the stage where the large preponderance of representation in the Council is also from the

metropolitan area, the country people will not receive the consideration they are entitled to and should receive.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: You are saying the boot will be on the other foot?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: No; I am not saying that the boot will be on the other foot, but in days gone by nobody ever suggested that the city suffered because the majority of representation was from the country areas.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Whom are you trying to kid?

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: That is what I say. If we look back over the last 15 years at the tremendous development that has taken place in the city of Adelaide, its environs and the new metropolitan area, we can see that progress has been great, whereas in some areas of the country there has been retrogression and the country people have suffered to a degree.

The Hon. A. F. Kneebone: Your Party has had control for most of that time.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: Yes, but unfortunately we have not been able to do quite as well in the country areas as we should have liked to. I hope for support in what I am proposing, and that the country areas will fare better in the future.

The Hon. S. C. Bevan: The honourable member will not have to worry about that.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: The honourable member is not worried. He has been told that he is a "has-been", so he does not have to worry about these matters.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The electors may tell you the same, too.

The Hon. C. D. ROWE: That may be so. However, I am one of those people who believe firmly in the bicameral system of Government, in the maintenance of the Legislative Council, and in a different franchise for this place from that of another place. In fact, I moved in this Council to that effect towards the end of last year, when I suggested that the franchise should be extended from its present basis to allow thousands of people who voted for the House of Assembly to vote for this place, too. That seemed to be a compromise. I am sorry that that suggestion was not accepted and that legislation to that effect is not on the Statute Book at present. If we accept the principle of a bicameral system of Government, as most honourable members in this Council and I do, we must see that the electoral system by which people are elected to both Houses of Parliament is kept up to date.

It may be better or worse for this Council if that is done. For the Legislative Council, all we have said is simply this: "Having divided the House of Assembly into 19 country seats and 28 city seats, just as a piecemeal proposal we shall try to adjust the Legislative Council boundaries to fit in with those." The Electoral Commission, with the integrity that we expected from it, has said, "We got into questions involving areas of electors and we are not quite certain whether we should adjust the boundaries so that they do not alter the areas very much. We are not quite certain whether we should adjust the boundaries so as to keep the number of electors in each division about the same." They did the best job they could under the instructions they were given. I am not satisfied with it, and the whole basis of representation in the Council should be looked at and considered separately; it should be put on a basis to allow adequate representation to the people of this State in relation to the alteration in population and the developments that have occurred.

Having said all that and having expressed my dissatisfaction about some aspects of the proposed redistribution, it remains for me to indicate my view of this Bill. Before doing that and so as to make certain that there will be no misunderstanding or misinterpretation of anything I have said, I want to say again that I have the greatest confidence in the ability and the integrity of the commission and commend it for the conscientious way in which it carried out its duties. I make no reflection on the members of that commission in any way. I want to make that quite clear: I said that at the beginning and I say it again to emphasize it. The members of the commission were hampered by the instructions they received; they acted within the limits of what Parliament told them to do, and I think they have done that well.

Having considered (*a*) the fact that this Bill in another place gives a great preponderance of voting power to the metropolitan area, (*b*) that the proper redistribution of electoral districts in the Legislative Council has not been undertaken because the terms of the Bill did not provide for that and, therefore, we have to seek redistribution for the Legislative Council, (*c*) the fact that, whilst the metropolitan area is progressing, and progressing rapidly, the country areas are lagging behind at present and are facing up to a situation that is causing great concern to and apprehension in the minds of country people, and (*d*) that over the next few years, if we

leave things as they are, there will be a possibility of a city-controlled House of Assembly and also a city-controlled Legislative Council, I do not think we have done the job we should have done. Therefore, I intend to vote against the Bill.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER (Central No. 2) moved:

That this debate be now adjourned.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (14)—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, and C. R. Story.

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

Majority of 10 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (VALUATION)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28. Page 2482.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): This Bill is the forerunner of a number of other Bills dealing with similar subject matter and therefore it is most important that it be examined carefully. Its purpose is to establish a special court under the Supreme Court Act to deal with compensation to be paid in cases of dispute. I imagine that in future there will be a considerable number of disputed compensation claims relating to acquisitions for freeways, or for main or arterial roads, and for other purposes, in all involving some millions of dollars.

Referring, in particular, to the programme of freeways, a large number of houses will be acquired and I believe considerable difficulty will be encountered by property owners and occupiers when this takes place. Many houses today are freehold, and over the years their owners have worked for most of their lives to reach that position, only to find that, in what may be termed the latter part of their working lives, their houses will be acquired for the construction of freeways. In other instances houses are still subject to mortgages, and the occupiers will be forced to make arrangements to move into other houses at some future time when their existing houses have been acquired. Undoubtedly the original mortgage would have to be cleared and compensation paid to the occupiers, and with the amount left over they would have to attempt to secure other dwellings.

Many people have worked throughout their lifetime to acquire their freehold properties. Many are old houses and their owners are now pensioners; what will happen to those people? Because of the cases I have mentioned, I believe there will be a considerable number of instances where agreement cannot be reached in relation to payment of compensation.

In his second reading explanation the Minister stated that the establishment of this court would speed up the processes of law and that a consistent and predictable principle would operate, thus saving lengthy litigation and heavy costs to the ordinary person. I hope that will be so. I was under the impression that the court would be empowered to fix compensation on a more equitable basis instead of taking into consideration a particular case before it. However, it seems that the present method will prevail, a method based on market values. My understanding was that the court would deal speedily with disputed matters concerning the payment of compensation on a basis more equitable than that existing at the present time.

At the time when discussions were being held on the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study in this Council some time ago, I directed a question to the Minister of Roads and Transport. At that time the Minister stated that he desired to introduce amendments to the Act to establish a more equitable basis for compensation than the existing method. Recently I directed another question to the Minister asking when this legislation would be introduced. Relying on my memory, I believe the answer given was that the Minister hoped that the report from the committee would be in his hands within a couple of weeks, when he would go ahead and introduce this legislation. Flowing from that is the legislation before us today, and this Bill is the forerunner of 14 other amending Bills on members' files, all dealing with one subject matter, all dealing with the powers of the court under this Bill to deal with matters of compensation that may be in dispute.

The Hon. Mr. Rowe directed a question to the Minister of Roads and Transport relating to a more equitable form of compensation to be paid because of the probable circumstances that will be encountered. I repeat that some houses are freehold, some still under mortgage, and some belong to pensioners. What will happen to those people if compensation is based purely and simply on market values when decisions are handed down by the court? At

present I suggest that is the only method by which a court could determine compensation, and because of that considerable hardship will be caused to many people in the situations I have depicted. From the answer given by the Minister to the Hon. Mr. Rowe this afternoon regarding compensation, and as I understood the Minister's reply, I believe the Minister said that he expected to have a report and he hoped to bring down amending legislation within the next fortnight.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That is not in regard to acquisition legislation; this court, although related to it, is a separate matter.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: I appreciate that, but although it is a separate matter it is definitely associated with this matter. It deals with compensation for houses where agreement is not reached between the parties. I am using the phrase because the principal applications before this court will relate to acquisition of property to enable the freeways programme to proceed. The Highways Department was acquiring property for freeway purposes before the M.A.T.S. plan was adopted. These acquisitions go back to my own time as Minister.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: It is strange that it should do that before you agreed to M.A.T.S.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: The people concerned accepted the compensation offered because they knew perfectly well that they had no chance of selling privately to anyone else. Everyone should know where the proposed freeways are to go. Who would buy a property knowing that it was required for freeway purposes? I appreciate that general values in the area concerned would be taken into account in assessing compensation.

The setting up of this special court is a matter that is related to the question of compensation for acquisition. If in a fortnight's time the Minister introduces legislation altering the principle of compensation and taking other factors into account, a person whose house was acquired in the future could perhaps get a much better deal than are the people whose properties are being acquired at present. I think the proper course for us to adopt is to adjourn all these matters until the Minister brings down the other legislation.

This special court to be set up will adjudicate on matters in which there are disputes and will assess compensation. Undoubtedly, in many instances compensation will be a matter of agreement. At present, people accept an offer based on the current principle of assessing compensation. The legislation that the Minister foreshadows may well alter the whole basis of payment of compensation, and this may not be fair to the people who are receiving compensation on the present basis of assessment. I hope the Minister will consider this point, for the delay of a fortnight would not make much difference to the legislation now before us.

It is quite apparent that another judge will be appointed to the Supreme Court bench. This will be necessary because of the expected volume of work. We in this Chamber cannot determine that matter, because money is involved in the appointment. The Bill also makes provision for the conclusion of any matters that may now be before a court or an arbitrator. This applies to all the other amending Bills that are before us this afternoon. There are one or two parts of the Bill to which I cannot agree. Proposed new section 62c sets up the Land and Valuation Court as a division of the Supreme Court, and subsection (2) states:

> The court shall be constituted of a judge upon whom the jurisdiction of the court has, in accordance with this section, been confirmed.

So we will have a judge of the Supreme Court who will be the judge whose duty it will be to adjudicate in this special court to be set up. However, subsection (5) provides:

> A judge upon whom the jurisdiction of the court has been conferred is not thereby precluded from performing and discharging any other functions and duties of a judge of the Supreme Court.

One can visualize that this could be the cause of considerable delay in the hearing of matters before this special court. One of the reasons for setting up this court was that there would be speedy hearings of matters in dispute. However, if the civil list is heavy, it could be some time before the judge appointed to adjudicate in this special court was in a position to hear the matters referred to it.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: It is a matter for administration.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: That is so. However, when the special court is not sitting the judge will perform other duties, and if he then becomes engaged on a list which occupies some considerable time the special court will have to wait until he is again free to sit in that jurisdiction. I know this is conjecture, but that is a possibility. I consider that matters referred to this special court should take precedence of any other civil matters. There is another matter that I cannot accept, and unless some alteration is made to it I will vote

against it. I refer to new section 62f, subsection (1) of which states:

Subject to the provisions of this section, a judgment or order of the court shall be final and without appeal.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: That is qualified, isn't it?

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Only by new subsections (2), (3) and (4). The appeal is only in relation to a question of law. I am only a layman (and perhaps a poor one at that) but I believe that any person or company has a right of appeal even against a decision of the Full Court. Millions of dollars will be tied up in respect of this matter, yet the decision of a single judge will be binding, except in the case of a question of law. I firmly believe that every person should have the right of appeal to a higher court.

The Hon. F. J. Potter: They are not all unlimited rights: some are very limited.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: In some instances, yes; however, in this case we are saying that there shall be no appeal other than on a question of law.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: You must look at the further qualifications in new subsections (3) and (4).

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: That is a minor exception.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: The principle of a valuation can be taken to a higher court.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: Can the Minister say who decides that a certain case is of exceptional importance? Is it not the judge himself? Certainly, it is! How often will the judge say, "I consider this is an exceptionally important case, and I therefore refer it to the Full Court"? I am thinking of the ordinary person who thinks he has been harshly dealt with in connection with compensation. When the judge has given a decision the ordinary person has no redress whatever. I realize that this could work both ways: an award of compensation might be satisfactory to the landholder but not to the party compulsorily acquiring the land. In that case the position is reversed. It has been suggested that these provisions have been included on the grounds of expediency and to hurry these cases through so that they will not be delayed by appeals. This is not in the best interests of justice.

The Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill: The whole crux of the Bill is that it takes away the right of appeal. I cannot see that it alters anything else.

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN: That could be so. At present, a dispute about compensation for compulsory acquisition of a property normally goes before the Supreme Court. If either party is aggrieved he can appeal, but under this Bill once the umpire's decision is given it is "full stop". Consequently, I intend to vote against this provision. I hope the Minister will consider my suggestion that the debate be adjourned until he introduces the other legislation he has foreshadowed; in this way the whole question can be dealt with at the one time. With the reservations I have made, I support the second reading.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

CROWN LANDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28. Page 2482.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): This Bill is complementary to the Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill. It provides that the lessee of Crown Lands that are resumed is entitled to compensation for any loss sustained in consequence of that resumption. Where the amount of compensation is disputed, it is to be determined by the Land and Valuation Court. I support the Bill.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENCROACHMENTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28. Page 2482.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): This Bill, too, is complementary to the Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill. Clause 4 repeals and re-enacts section 3 of the principal Act. Questions of compensation arising under the principal Act are to be dealt with by the Land and Valuation Court. I support the Bill.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

HIGHWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL (VALUATION)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28. Page 2482.)

The Hon. S. C. BEVAN (Central No. 1): Like the last two Bills on which I have spoken, this Bill is complementary to the Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill. Clause 3 amends section 30b of the principal Act. This provision deals with the proclamation of a controlled access road. A person who has any

estate or interest in any land abutting on a controlled access road may recover from the Commissioner compensation for any loss or damage sustained by him by reason of the proclamation of the road. The definition of an access road in the principal Act is that it is a road that is proclaimed an access road from time to time. Naturally, an access road is not a freeway or a main road. The Bill merely amends the provision dealing with access roads.

The compulsory acquisition of land involves both the Supreme Court Act and the Compulsory Acquisition of Land Act, and the Highways Department and other Government instrumentalities with compulsory acquisition rights operate under the latter. Therefore, the Bill applies not only to access roads but also to all operations of the Highways Department in connection with compulsory land acquisition cases which will come before the court. If honourable members consider that this provision is not a good one, I point out that all land acquisition cases will come before the court. I support the Bill.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

PETROLEUM (SUBMERGED LANDS) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28. Page 2488.)

The Hon. G. J. GILFILLAN (Northern): I rise briefly to support this short Bill, which was amply covered by the Minister of Mines in his second reading explanation and later by the Hon. Mr. Bevan. As has been stated, it extends certain powers to offshore drilling sites. I believe this is fair and reasonable, as we are responsible to keep law and order and to see that those engaged in such operations have the protection of workmen's compensation and other legislation.

We do not experience the problems here that arise when considering the Petroleum Act or, in some instances, the Mining Act, as this Act applies only to offshore drilling operations that do not, in the main, interfere with the rights of people who in other areas on the mainland could reside on the land in question.

I am interested in the new words contained in the Bill. Also, some of the provisions allowing the Act to be modified by regulation are new to me, although this may apply in other Acts. I see that "modification" is defined to mean "the omission or addition of a provision or the substitution of a provision for another provision". The intention of this subclause is clear and, as the Bill deals with matters connected with offshore drilling operations that are carried on away from residential and industrial areas where people can be affected personally, I see no objection to it, and I therefore support it.

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

TEXTILE PRODUCTS DESCRIPTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 2440.)

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Minister of Agriculture): I should like to reply to one or two matters that were raised during the debate. The Hon. Mr. Kneebone analysed the Bill very well and had nothing specific to say against it. The Hon. Mr. Geddes asked whether I could name the 12 fibres that were mentioned in the second reading explanation. They are acetate, acrylic, chlorofibre, elastomeric, glass, metallic yarn, paper yarn, polyamide or nylon, polyester, polyolefin, polyvinyl alcohol, and rayon.

The honourable member also asked a question in relation to the Brussels Tariff Nomenclature. It is merely a list, collected throughout the world, of all sorts of articles that are collated and placed on a register. This is the world authority for naming and classifying various types of rayon and yarn. In other words, it is the standard that is used in relation to textiles, and the Commonwealth Government has decided to adopt it as such.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Alterations to the regulations will come as a result of the Brussels Tariff Nomenclature?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Yes. It is one of the points I wanted to raise. The honourable member made the point that he did not know about these 12 items in the Bill. It has happened recently that fibre glass has been included as a textile. This sort of thing will continue to happen. If we have to open up this legislation every time there is an alteration to the Brussels Tariff Nomenclature or, for that matter, an Australian Parliament in some other State decides to alter something, we shall have to follow suit. So it is reasonable that this be done by regulation. It is not as though anything very wicked will happen if it is done by regulation. I think we have the right to do it that way.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Requirements as to description."

The Hon. R. A. GEDDES: The point I could not quite follow from the Minister's answer to my interjection about the changing or adding of names by regulation in respect of fibres is this. The principal Act protects the wool industry and wool fibres sold over the counter. Does the Minister envisage that, where alterations in the type of material that may be blended with wool, in relation to the wool symbol, are made, they will be made by regulation? Will this be subject to the approval of the industry prior to the regulation being made?

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Minister of Agriculture): As the honourable member will remember, this was dealt with last year by Parliament.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Yes.

The Hon. C. R. STORY: Let us take as an example "pure wool" and "all wool". "Pure wool" is that which contains 90 per cent wool and 10 per cent other animal fibres, while "all wool" is what we know as pure wool, 100 per cent wool. Anything done by this Bill will not alter what our Statute or the Commonwealth Statute provides about those two things. It is specifically laid down what the yarn shall contain in order to receive the correct imprimatur.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: If any other additive went into the wool in the future, we would have to amend the Act?

The Hon. C. R. STORY: No, not necessarily, but the yarn that is made up and the cloth made from it would not be able to carry the wool symbol if additives other than animal fibre or wool were used.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (5 to 7) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 28. Page 2489.)

The Hon. C. D. ROWE (Midland): I support this Bill and commend the Government for bringing it before the Council. It provides protection for members of the public who may suffer by reason of defalcation or negligence on the part of a legal practitioner. It also provides financial support for the increasing burdens imposed on the legal profession by the Legal Assistance Scheme, which has been conducted in this State by the legal profession since 1933, and a wider cover than that given in the other States, in that it covers actual defalcations and losses sustained by negligent legal practitioners.

These objectives are achieved by the establishment of what is to be known as the Legal Practitioners Guarantee Fund. Ultimately, that fund will build up to an amount that will equal the number of practising solicitors in South Australia multiplied by $2,500. With the present number of legal practitioners in this State, it would mean that the fund over that period (which would be about 10 years) would build up to about $1,100,000. Solicitors run what are known as trust accounts, in which are kept moneys belonging to clients. At the present time, these moneys lie in a current account at a bank nominated by the solicitor concerned, and they earn no interest. At any given time most solicitors have large amounts of money in their trust accounts pending the finalization of estates, and these moneys are earning no interest. It is proposed that about half of the lowest amount held by a solicitor in his trust account during any year shall be invested in what is to be known as a guarantee fund. It will be invested on behalf of the Law Society of South Australia, and the interest earned on those investments will be applied as to one-half of it to provide a guarantee fund against defalcations by negligent solicitors and as to the other half of it to provide some additional assistance in connection with the administration of the Legal Assistance Scheme.

It seems to me that it is an eminently desirable proposal. It will mean two things. First, it will mean that a person who conducts business with a solicitor who turns out to be negligent will have some protection or assurance against that negligence. Many solicitors at present carry their own fidelity insurance—a policy with an insurance company that covers them against negligence—but that is expensive. Not every solicitor carries that type of insurance, and some of them do not carry it to the extent necessary to protect a client from a reasonably large loss. This provision is desirable. In South Australia we have been remarkably free from defalcations by solicitors and claims arising from the negligence of solicitors. However, as time goes on and the numbers in the profession increase (and, if I may say so, also the increasing complexity of the matters with which they have to deal and in respect of which they have to give advice), it seems to me that the possibility of negligence may increase. Indeed, when one looks at some modern legislation one almost feels that it

needs the wisdom of Solomon, plus a little more, to be able to handle it adequately.

The fund is designed so that it will protect the smaller claimants, because claims against the fund are to be limited to not more than 5 per cent of the fund at any particular time. I think it is desirable that some preference should be given to the smaller claimant.

This proposal has been examined by the Council of the Law Society for a very long time, and in April, 1967, a very broad outline of the proposals was circulated to members of the profession. Of the 278 replies received from individual solicitors, 272 stated that they were in favour of the proposals. Following that very favourable reply from the profession, a detailed draft was prepared by the special committee and approved by the Council of the Law Society, and the draft was submitted to the Attorney-General. Later, the Government indicated that it approved of the proposals in principle, and at a special meeting of the members of the profession on May 15 this year an overwhelming majority approved the draft proposal.

Following all this work, the matter has now come before this Council for consideration. I support the proposals. I think they will involve in the initial states a fairly large amount of administrative work by those who are responsible for the scheme. However, knowing the members of the profession as I do, and particularly knowing the President of the Law Society and the Council of the Law Society, I believe that they are prepared to give this time willingly and that it will turn out to be quite a satisfactory proposal.

I do not think many people realize the very large amount of work members of the profession do almost for no reward at all to assist those people who are not able to provide the necessary finance themselves to secure legal assistance. In 1966, for instance, out of the moneys that were provided to the Law Society the solicitors received only 25c in the $1 in criminal matters and 18c in the $1 in other matters for work that they did; in 1967, the figure was 25c in the $1 in criminal matters and 16c in the $1 in other matters; and in 1968 it was 26.5c in the $1 for criminal matters and 19c in the $1 for civil matters. That is the amount they received on their bill.

When one realizes that it is a very fortunate legal office that can keep its expenditure down to less than 50 per cent of its total earnings, it means that the profession operated at very considerable loss of time and loss of remuneration with regard to these matters. I think it is true to say that most practitioners these days have more work than they can reasonably handle and that it is a struggle to keep work up to date, and when on top of this load is imposed the work involved in assignments from the Law Society it means a terrific load on the profession.

This scheme will do two things: first, it will provide a guarantee against defalcations and against negligence and, secondly, it will help to see that the solicitors who do this work for the Law Society receive a little better remuneration. I think that is desirable. I compliment those members of the Law Society and the Council of the Law Society who have spent so much time and effort in connection with this proposal, and I compliment the Government also on the fact that the scheme has reached the light of day in this House. I wish the scheme every success.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.16 p.m. the Council adjourned until Thursday, October 30, at 2.15 p.m.