

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

Thursday, July 30, 1970

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

**QUESTIONS****ROYAL SOCIETY FOR ANIMALS**

The Hon. L. R. HART: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. R. HART: A report in this morning's *Advertiser* says that the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals is facing a \$16,000 deficit this year. The report goes on to say that the society has been running at a loss for several years. I understand that the Government subsidy in the past has been \$600 a year. Can the Chief Secretary say whether an application for an increased subsidy has been made and, if it has not, whether, if an application were made, the Government would consider increasing the subsidy to this very worthwhile organization?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Because I have not yet studied the lines of the Budget, I do not know what amount is provided in it for the society. I do not know whether a letter of recent date has been received seeking an increased subsidy; if it has been received, I have not seen it. However, I will consider the matter. The whole budgetary position will be considered early next week. If there has not been any direct application, it is rather late now to expect any special grant to be made except in very special and urgent circumstances.

**INTEREST RATES**

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Treasurer.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: One of my colleagues in another place has informed me that one of his constituents has reported that he has had his interest rate at the savings bank increased by 1½ per cent on money at loan under the Rural Advances Guarantee Act. If this information is correct, whilst I believe the Savings Bank of South Australia Act provides that the bank may vary its interest rates, this action in this instance would seem to conflict with section 3(2)(f) of the Rural Advances Guarantee Act, which provides:

A guarantee shall not be given under this section unless the borrower has obtained from a bank a loan, or an offer to make a loan, subject to the guarantee, and the Treasurer is satisfied—

- (i) that the repayment of the principal sum of the loan and the interest thereon is to be made by such periodical payments as are not less than would be necessary to repay such principal sum together with such interest by equal annual instalments over a period of 30 years; and
- (ii) that the other terms and conditions of the loan or proposed loan are reasonable.

That is the operative part of the section. In view of the fact that many of the proposals for loans under the Act are borderline cases which have to be approved or otherwise by the Land Settlement Committee, the reported increase in rates, if correct, could swing the scales from a viable to a doubtful proposition financially. Will the Chief Secretary inquire whether in fact it is in order for rates of interest to be increased in view of the provisions of section 3(2)(f) (i) and (ii) of the Act and, if it is, whether the Government considers it is wise for the rate to be increased in the circumstances in which primary producers find themselves at the present time?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be pleased to refer the question to the Treasurer to see whether this is a matter of general application. In the event of its being an individual case, if the honourable member would give me the name of the person concerned I would have inquiries made and regard the matter as confidential.

**NURSES**

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. J. POTTER: Yesterday in my Address in Reply speech I made the point that if increases of the magnitude now being sought by nurses in this State were granted it would have a very marked adverse effect on small hospitals and nursing homes that are caring for pensioners particularly, and that I foresaw that many of these places would have to close. I noticed in the press this morning that in fact this position has already been brought to the notice of the Chief Secretary. As the Government is encouraging the nurses to make this claim (I do not wish to imply any criticism in that remark), I presume that the Government has considered this other serious problem and, if it has, I shall be pleased if the Chief Secretary

can tell the Council what steps the Government intends to take to deal with this kind of problem?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I make it quite clear that the Government has intervened in the nurses wages case. The recent award was one of the worst I have ever known or read about. Personally, I am not taking any active part in the nurses wages case because that comes under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Labour and Industry. I realize that some elderly people could be affected as a result of such an increase in wages and that this would cause a number of people some concern. However, I say quite clearly that in my opinion nurses should not have their wages kept down simply for the benefit of other people. I would hope that any Government benefit payable, whether by the State Government or the Commonwealth Government, would be reviewed and increased to such an extent that elderly people would not be at any greater disadvantage than they are at present. I think it goes without saying that anyone who knows me realizes that I have the greatest sympathy for the needs of elderly people, as well as the greatest sympathy for those caring for them. The standard of some homes for these elderly people over the years has not always been high, but with the rise in wages for nurses these homes should become better and a better standard of attention should be available for the elderly people. I hope that both the State Government and the Commonwealth Government will see the necessity for reaching some agreement in this matter. Incidentally, I might say that, as usual, the position was greatly exaggerated in the newspaper report this morning, for it is not really that bad.

#### ABORIGINES

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave of the Council to make a brief statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I have a letter from the justices of the peace at Ceduna enclosing a copy of a resolution passed at a meeting of justices there, part of which states:

That the Honourable the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs be requested to investigate the possibility of local justices of the peace holding court, when Aborigines are being tried, on the reserve from which the person offending has come. The two basic aims behind this request are: (1) to provide an education for Aborigines in the purpose and administration of the law, as cases involving them are tried in their own situation and before their own

people; and (2) to encourage the emergence of indigenous justices of the peace to try their own, and ultimately other, cases, and to provide administration of the law now that is relevant to the Aboriginal.

I fully support this request, which is a step in the right direction. Many of these people who have offended in the Ceduna area have come from the Stone Age to the Twentieth Century in but a few years and it has been hard for them to interpret the white man's law and apprehend offenders themselves, because this is disallowed and is not encouraged. But a move like this where a justice of the peace could hold the trial on the reserve from which the offender came would serve a good purpose.

The second portion of the resolution—to encourage the emergence of indigenous justices of the peace—would be one of the steps that our society should aim to take. If I furnish the Chief Secretary with a copy of this letter, will he present it to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I shall be pleased to refer the question and the letter to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs and bring back a report.

#### UNLEY ROAD

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Minister of Roads and Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: My question refers to a traffic system generally called a clearway. A clearway was introduced some time ago on the Anzac Highway and, shortly before leaving office, the previous Government agreed that a clearway be implemented along the Main North Road, subject to adequate time being given to the shopkeepers and local government in that area to make satisfactory and adequate arrangements for car parking. In the press of July 27 there was a report headed "Unley shop men want clearway". It dealt with traffic problems generally and the need for a clearway along Unley Road. In view of that most recent press report and of the fact that obviously there is growing traffic congestion in the mornings and the evenings along Unley Road, what are the latest arrangements and plans, if any, for Unley Road being declared a clearway?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I will refer the question to the Minister of Roads and Transport in another place.

## POLLUTION

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to asking a question of the Minister of Health.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: At long last it seems that the public of Adelaide generally are becoming really aware of pollution problems, but I thought this morning that I detected some sort of air of complacency about it when it was reported in the paper that it had been discovered or thought that Adelaide's pollution was not nearly as great as that of Melbourne or Sydney. I think that over the last 13 years I have been in an ideal position to see on Monday mornings the pollution on the Adelaide Plain as compared with the plain next door, and it is most alarming to see the way it has built up in that time. I travel regularly to Melbourne and Sydney; I am probably not away from either city for more than two months, and to the ordinary eye, at any event, Adelaide's pollution is worse than that of either of those cities.

The paper stated that many tests had been taken, but I have never seen the results of any of these tests or analyses published. I have recently been in London where I noticed that every day the intensity of pollution in the atmosphere was published, together with a forecast of what it was likely to be. This is the extent to which it is being publicized overseas. Although I know that much is being done about the pollution problem here (and I do not want in any way to minimize it), I think there is much public ignorance about it because very little has been published in the official sense; I certainly am rather ignorant of what is going on, but perhaps it is my own fault. Will the Minister of Health be good enough to bring down a report on this matter? I am not in any great hurry but I thought that if he could bring down a report containing the comparative analyses of the air of Adelaide, Melbourne and Sydney, and stating in brief what is being done about the problem, it would be most advantageous to the public.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: Yes. I do not know whether the honourable member was looking over my shoulder this morning, because less than two hours ago I signed an authority for the Public Health Department to make a report available to the Adelaide City Council, which has been co-operating on tests within the city. I will not attempt to state what is contained in the report but, in comparison with other cities, it is very favourable from our point of view. I will be meeting as

usual with the Director of Public Health tomorrow morning and I shall ask him to give me a report on what is being done and present it to the Council.

## FIRE PREVENTION SERVICE

The Hon. H. K. KEMP: Has the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question regarding fire prevention services?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The suggestions submitted by the honourable member (and I understand that this was done on behalf of a Mr. G. R. Edwards) for a fire prevention service, as distinct from a fire-fighting organization, are interesting, and they have been under examination by the Bushfire Research Committee. The Bushfire Protection Adviser and the secretary of that committee have been asked to develop the proposals further and devise a draft plan for their implementation. It is expected that the plan will be considered at a meeting of the committee to be held on September 22.

## FILTRATION PLANT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: For some time problems have been encountered in the production of modules to filter water through the reverse osmosis system. At present at Coober Pedy the position has deteriorated to the point where the salinity is 2,000 parts to each million gallons. As a result, the water is so saline that most people cannot drink it. A correspondent says that his family (two adults and three children) are drawing four gallons of drinking water a week. When the reverse osmosis system is working it is very beneficial and an excellent means of supplying water to this outback town. Will the Minister ask his colleague for a report on the production of the modules I have referred to? Will he ascertain whether they are being produced in Australia or still being imported?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the question to my colleague in another place.

## ADELAIDE HIGH SCHOOL

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I ask leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: A few days ago I asked a question regarding the Education Department's plan to erect further buildings

on the present site of the Adelaide Boys High School. The proposed buildings will be needed after the amalgamation of the Adelaide Boys High School and the Adelaide Girls High School. The complex is on park lands. A newspaper article of July 28 headed "Park lands may take cars" states:

Most Adelaide City Council members apparently favour park lands parking for major sports and recreation.

I believe that traditionally the Australian Labor Party has opposed the principle of parking or building on the park lands. Can the Chief Secretary say what the present Government's policy is on this question of new buildings and car parks being situated on the Adelaide park lands?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I think I could answer the question but, as it concerns policy, I prefer to discuss it with Cabinet and bring down a reply.

#### GOVERNMENT INSURANCE OFFICE

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Chief Secretary, representing the Treasurer.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Sir ARTHUR RYMILL: It was announced in the Speech of the Governor's Deputy that a Bill would be introduced in this Council to create a Government insurance office. I recall that, when a similar Bill was previously introduced and amended in this Council, I asked whether (to use the jargon of the day) any feasibility study had been made. In other words, I asked whether any examination of the likely profit or loss of the venture had been made. On that occasion the reply was in the negative, as I recall it. Can the Chief Secretary say whether on this occasion we shall have the benefit of a feasibility study or whether, once again, we shall simply be told that a Government insurance office could be profitable?

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: I do not know whether a feasibility study has been made, but I will refer the question to the Treasurer.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONSOLIDATION BILLS

A message was received from the House of Assembly requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment of a Joint Committee on Consolidation Bills. The three persons representing the House of Assembly on such a committee would be the Hons.

D. A. Dunstan and L. J. King and Mr. R. R. Millhouse.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) moved:

That the Assembly's request be agreed to and that the members of the Legislative Council to be members of the Joint Committee be the Chief Secretary, the Hon. R. C. DeGaris and the Hon. A. F. Kneebone, of whom two shall form the quorum of Council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

The Hon. C. R. STORY (Midland): Under Standing Order No. 377 I demand a ballot.

A ballot having been held, the Hons. R. C. DeGaris, Sir Arthur Rymill and A. J. Shard were declared elected.

#### EUDUNDA AND MORGAN RAILWAY (DISCONTINUANCE) BILL

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the discontinuance of the railway between Eudunda and Morgan and for other purposes. Read a first time.

#### MOTOR VEHICLES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959-1968. Read a first time.

#### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption. (Continued from July 29. Page 396.)

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE (Southern): Mr. President, I support with pleasure the eulogistic remarks made by many members with regard particularly to His Excellency the Governor and Lady Harrison. It is very pleasing to know that His Excellency is able once again to undertake many of his duties. I also support with pleasure the remarks made concerning His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, Sir Mellis Napier, who has served us long and truly, and also the references to other honourable members connected with this Council, particularly to our friend and colleague the Hon. Stanley Bevan, who has now retired and been replaced by the Hon. Tom Casey.

I feel that I should express some concern that, as elections were held somewhat closer together than usual a tremendous amount of unnecessary emotional involvement has occurred. Extraordinary statements have emanated from first one side and then the other and, when challenged, many of them have been defended on the grounds that the

remarks have been misquoted or taken out of context, and sometimes the remarks have even been denied. I suggest that we must put these days behind us. The settling in of an enlarged House with many new faces on both sides, together with a change of Government, is always fraught with problems.

I am not an ideologist but a realist, and I say to all members: let us get on under the elected Government of the day, both administratively and legislatively. Many matters are crying out for action which we can all, broadly speaking, approve. We should leave a few of the more controversial and, to some extent, academic questions until we have handled the more practical needs of the day. I will leave it at that for the moment and deal with a few matters that I have been emboldened to suggest we do something about.

Turning first to the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan, I will be more explicit regarding this overall plan. By various means (some of them, of course, not easily accounted for) nearly \$1,000,000 was spent in its preparation and only naturally it provoked, thank goodness, much controversy and speculation—some of fear and some of hope for the future. But surely no Government, no Minister, no public servant or no planner was conceited enough to think it was virtually perfect. It was a master plan showing what was essential and what might be desirable. I suggest that, to be even partially successful, it had to have room for great flexibility; that was obviously required. I do not believe that anyone, including members of Parliament, who really studied it (a very few have) ever meant that it should be withdrawn *in toto*.

Certain groups of people directly affected became worried and, often led on by Party-political interests, of both shades, and supported by a battalion of would-be amateur planners and letter writers, caused thousands of people to fear that everything was for the worst and that not even a smattering of wisdom existed in it. These minor effects snowballed and the matter became a catch cry of despair. I am reminded of *Dr. Syntax in Search of the Picturesque* by William Combe, who said:

That man, I trow, is doubly curst,  
Who of the best doth make the worst;  
And he I'm sure is doubly blest,  
Who of the worst can make the best:  
To sit and sorrow and complain,  
Is adding folly to our pain.

That applies aptly to many of the criticisms and fears about the Metropolitan Adelaide

Transportation Study plan. The continual damming of all freeways holus bolus, wherever they went (we should think more about the damming of the Murray River, which would be much more appropriate) was too fantastic. I was glad to see that, when some of the emotionalism had died down after the election, the new Premier referred firmly to the necessity of some of them being carried out forthwith.

Meanwhile the Highways Department has carried on certain works already approved by the Commonwealth Government (and, I may add, apparently, thought to be financed by it from some hidden source in Canberra). Incidentally, I believe that, when the large sums granted from the Commonwealth Aid Roads Act funds have been approved on a broad basis and formula, our own State instrumentalities are competent to carry on without further duplication with work being submitted in detail to a Commonwealth department—except, of course, where State boundaries are concerned in the west and the north. It is an entirely wrong outlook.

We find ourselves short of skilled staff in the Highways Department and other departments, yet we are building up a Commonwealth bureau, which was never intended as such, which is absorbing dozens of skilled draftsmen, and which is practically a duplication of every State administration in the Commonwealth. May I now stress the all-important part, and here's the rub. Owing partly to group pressures—the planners and the anti-planners, the vested interests, the subdividers and the go-getters—the Minister and the department often lose sight of priorities and even neglect them. I ask honourable members to remember that it is a prerequisite that before many freeways are built the maximum use must be made of our existing arterial roads: *ergo*, we start by using their full existing width as clearways at certain periods and then increase the time. In the meantime, we must acquire the adjacent strips and provide wider traffic pavements. We should not just widen roads to enable more parking on them. Thus, following the correct programme, we move to high-class clearway arterial roads, pedestrian underpasses and overpasses, and in the city no pedestrian crossing between traffic lights where they are comparatively close. Then we compensate the pedestrian by having more malls or sheltered walks.

Incidentally, notwithstanding modern architectural tendencies, this can be a hot city and I am not certain whether cantilever verandahs

should not be compulsory in our main city streets. Surely these can be fitted in with a satisfactory aesthetic design. Alternatively, more fringe walkways or internal verandahs could be provided, as in some of our new city buildings. To return to clearways, I recall that a long time ago, as we have heard this afternoon, Anzac Highway was made a clearway at certain hours as an experiment, and it has proved satisfactory.

The Hon. C. M. Hill: Very successful.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Why not go further and clear it on the out-track on Saturdays between 12 noon and 1 p.m.? It is surely to be presumed that most of the Saturday morning ingoing traffic returns at midday. Also, race meetings are held on more than 20 Saturdays in the year at Morphettville, and people attending the races, football fans and southern holiday seekers use this road, too. What I suggest is surely warranted. Yet we still have these juggernaut buses pulling out into the centre lane and causing endless traffic hazards. Again with some knowledge of the matter, I repeat a statement I have made in this Council, that I will not accept that the road or kerb drainage system on the Anzac Highway cannot be modified to provide suitable bays into which the buses can pull off the highway. It can and should be done. I have condemned three successive Governments, including the one of which I was a member, for not refraining from using these wide buses; but they are now being increased in number. I also point out that what is good enough for the private operator should be good enough for the Municipal Tramways Trust.

While considering clearways, may I draw the attention of honourable members to the extraordinary practice of permitting parking near intersections alongside the modern rumble bars, often reducing two-lane traffic to one in the most hazardous places? As examples, I refer particularly to the Torrens Road traffic lights and the children's playground at the bottom of Jerningham Street in North Adelaide—and there are many others. I read recently that the Minister was pushing on with the "clearway" principle. I can only hope that local government will give him more co-operation than it has done in the past. I wholeheartedly support the recent proposal that all city and suburban transport be co-ordinated under the one administration—and not necessarily an entirely Government one.

I now refer honourable members to a matter already raised this afternoon by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill—traffic pollution. I am glad

we are at least thinking about the problem in various circles. I am worried that they may be ever-increasing circles, "like the laughing Ooja bird", and not direct lines of thought. What are the priorities again? Motor car engines cannot be revolutionized overnight; they will certainly have to be varied, but we already have adequate regulations and laws against the emission of smoke and fumes, although we do not do anything about them. Today many motorists suffer much discomfort and many hazards when confronted by a thick fog of exhaust smoke exuding from the side of heavy transports or buses. In my opinion, and I am certain that in the opinion of many others, such vehicles should be stopped and the drivers directed to have the faults remedied within a day or two before being allowed to take such vehicles on the road again.

The further consideration of modified overhead exhausts should be seriously worked on and, although I know there are technical problems, the poisonous fumes are still there and must be disposed of somehow; but they can be dealt with, and this is where we should look first. There is certainly no excuse for many of the flagrant breaches committed by such vehicles; hundreds of them are not offensive, so why allow the few of them to continue to be offensive?

Regarding noise pollution, many people are complaining about jet engine noise. Jet engines are already being modified, but no-one seems to worry about the law which compels effective silencers to be fitted to cars and motor cycles; this matter can be dealt with now as a priority. The Statutes cover it, yet we want to clutter up our legislation with demerit plans and appoint more committees and hold other talk-ins. I view most of such regulations with increasing doubt. Our courts and police have enough work now in filling in more forms and in keeping more dossiers on everyone's activities. I sometimes think that the ordinary policeman is more in need of a typist or a stenographer than are some members of Parliament. What about a merit scheme for the thousands of good, accident-free drivers, those who can be proud of their driving record.

I note with some interest the official remarks that have been made about a new system of motor vehicle registration. I do not know whether this has something to do with the Bill introduced by the Chief Secretary in the Council this afternoon, but I accept that considerable improvement has already been effected regarding insurance forms and other

forms. However, I hope that, before everyone is forced to carry his driver's licence or registration form with him, some thought will be given to the practicability of workers in both city and country areas being compelled to carry their driver's licence night and day. It is obvious to the practical-minded man that where a man is driving a tractor and wearing only a pair of shorts and no singlet it would be unreasonable to require him to carry his licence, as it would mean he would have to spend time changing his licence from one garment to another. This would not be practicable legislation. This matter is fully covered now. Of course, it could lead to more trouble for the individual who does not carry his licence but who must produce it at a police station within 24 hours or who is allowed longer time in which to do this if he is far from home. However, this legislation can be reasonably policed. On the other hand, I see no reason why people in the city in their ordinary business clothes should not carry their licence. This matter should be carefully looked into.

I am glad to hear that the report of the Local Government Act Revision Committee is about to come to hand. I am aware also that the report is very voluminous. I hope that honourable members will have a chance to peruse portions of the report—although I doubt whether they will read it all, as it is as big as a family Bible—before any legislation based on the report is introduced in Parliament. I strongly discountenance any thought of attracting uninterested people to local government polls to vote on something they are not interested in or possibly do not understand. The really interested people should make the decisions for those who wish to elect them and who are interested in their activities.

Regarding the vital rail link to the North, I have many reservations about the plans that have already been submitted. On the surface, the Commissioner's revised plan appears to be the most practicable, but honourable members must bear in mind that any scheme will need an Act that must be ratified by the Commonwealth Government, and the cost of spur lines is the apparent grave problem with that Government. Once again, I suggest that we are competent enough here to provide our own future planning. I think it would be desirable that Maunsell and Partners should be given an opportunity, or even be asked, to criticize the Commissioner's latest revised plan. The Commissioner is probably more aware of the need

to guard the interests of our local industries at all costs. Indeed, have these industries been thoroughly consulted regarding the alternatives? Anyhow, let us get on with the job one way or the other, and I trust we will soon have the necessary legislation before us.

Before concluding, I know that honourable members realize that I rarely refer to any personal remarks made in this Chamber, but I must recall one made by the Hon. Mr. Banfield yesterday. Apparently when speaking for the Government, he said, "I am not concerned with broad acres"; he was concerned only with his section of the community.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Quote it correctly!

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: The honourable member emphasized this twice.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Quote it correctly!

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: This seems somewhat contradictory to what is contained in the Governor's Deputy's Speech.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. The honourable member said that he was quoting certain words. He is not reading them. I ask him to withdraw them or to quote the correct words.

The PRESIDENT: That is not a point of order. If he wants to, the honourable member can make a personal explanation later.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I did not say that I quoted them or that he quoted them. I am quoting what he said.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: I asked the honourable member to quote me, but he did not quote me.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I heard the honourable member's remarks, and so did many other honourable members, but no doubt they have been changed in *Hansard*.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD: On a point of order, Mr. President; I think the Hon. Sir Norman Jude cast a reflection on the *Hansard* staff when he said, "No doubt they have been changed in *Hansard*." In fairness to the *Hansard* staff, I ask him to withdraw his remarks.

The PRESIDENT: Did the honourable member make those remarks?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: No, I said, "They could be changed."

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Why doesn't the honourable member tell the truth about what he said?

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: If I said, "No doubt they have been changed", I stick

to what I said but, if it is wished that the remark be withdrawn, I will withdraw it.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: Very well.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: I take this opportunity to say that I have known the *Hansard* staff far longer than the Hon. Mr. Shard has. It is not my habit to reflect on them.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: I challenge the honourable member's statement. I have known the *Hansard* staff for as long as the honourable member has known them.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: What I am implying is that from time to time—and can the Chief Secretary deny this?—the *Hansard* reports are altered at the request of the honourable member concerned, and he knows this perfectly well. He is making a song and dance about nothing.

The Hon. A. J. Shard: You cast a reflection on them, and I will stand up to every honourable member who does that.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: This type of remark by the Hon. Mr. Banfield seems somewhat contradictory to the Opening Speech of His Excellency and some of the Premier's remarks, which have suggested that there will be some consideration for rural properties. Many of my constituents and others will be concerned when I bring this statement to their notice.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Take the correct statement to them, not the one you just made.

The Hon. Sir NORMAN JUDE: Let me give a final word of caution: let us not over-legislate and let us not regulate people's lives too much. Because very many of today's problems can be dealt with under existing legislation, why make our lives more complicated? Let us have a thought for those who find our language difficult to grasp and a knowledge of local laws hard to obtain. We should not let our administrators hide behind a prickly hedge of frustration. I, too, have a conscience; the more legal jungle I have to contend with, the more difficult I find it to keep a clear conscience. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

The Hon. A. J. SHARD (Chief Secretary): All honourable members will be delighted to

know that His Excellency the Governor has recovered from his recent illness and will receive from this Council the Address in Reply to the opening Speech of the Governor's Deputy. It will therefore be necessary to amend the Address in Reply and, with the leave of the Council, I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be amended to read:

1. We, the members of the Legislative Council, thank Your Excellency for the Speech with which His Excellency the Governor's Deputy was pleased to open Parliament.

2. We express our deep satisfaction with Your Excellency's restoration to good health.

3. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.

4. We earnestly join in the prayer of His Excellency the Governor's Deputy for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

Motion carried; Address in Reply as amended agreed to.

The PRESIDENT: His Excellency the Governor will be pleased to receive honourable members at 4 o'clock this day for the purpose of receiving the Address in Reply. I ask honourable members to accompany me to Government House to present the Address in Reply at that time.

[*Sitting suspended from 3.18 to 4.12 p.m.*]

The PRESIDENT: I have to report that accompanied by the mover of the Address in Reply to the Opening Speech of His Excellency the Governor's Deputy and by other honourable members I attended at Government House and there presented to His Excellency the Governor the Address adopted by the Council this afternoon, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

I thank you for your Address in Reply to the Speech with which my Deputy opened the first session of the Fortieth Parliament. I appreciate deeply the good wishes expressed by the Council concerning my return to full health. I am confident that you will give your best attention to all matters placed before you. I pray for God's blessing upon your deliberations.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 4.14 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, August 11, at 2.15 p.m.