

SOUTH AUSTRALIA

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES (HANSARD)

First Session of the Forty-Third Parliament (1977)

The Forty-second Parliament of South Australia having been prorogued on August 17, 1977, and the House of Assembly having been dissolved on August 17, general elections were held on September 17. By proclamation dated September 22, the new Parliament was summoned to meet on October 6, and the First Session began on that date.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, October 6, 1977

The Council assembled at 11 a.m. pursuant to proclamation issued by His Excellency the Governor (Mr. Keith Seaman). The Clerk (Mr. A. D. Drummond) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

THE COMMISSION

The Commissioner appointed by the Governor to do all things necessary to prepare for the opening of the session, the Honourable John Jefferson Bray (Chief Justice), was announced by Black Rod (Mr. J. W. Hull) and conducted by the President to the Chair.

A message was sent to the House of Assembly requesting members of that House to attend to hear the Commission read. The members of the House of Assembly having arrived, the Clerk read the Commission.

The Commissioner announced that His Excellency the Governor would, in person, declare the reasons for his calling the Parliament together as soon as the members of the House of Assembly had been sworn and the House of Assembly had notified him that it had elected its Speaker.

The members of the House of Assembly and the Commissioner retired.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I move:

That the sitting of the Council be suspended until 2.15 p.m., the time which His Excellency has appointed to declare in person the reasons for calling Parliament together.

I express on behalf of the Council how pleased we are that you, Mr. President, have recovered from your recent illness. It is a pleasure to see you back.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you very much.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 11.12 a.m. to 2.15 p.m.]

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

At 2.15 p.m., His Excellency the Governor, having been announced by Black Rod, was received by the President at the Bar of the Council Chamber and conducted by him to the Chair. The Speaker and members of the House of Assembly having entered the Chamber in obedience to his summons, His Excellency read his Opening Speech as follows:

1. I have called you together for the dispatch of business.

2. Since you were last called together, a general election for the House of Assembly has been held. At that election my Government was returned to office with an increased majority. The Government views its re-election as an endorsement of the policies put to the people of the State at that election. Accordingly, Bills giving effect to those policies will, in due course, be presented to you along with measures foreshadowed in the legislative programme placed before you on the opening of the last session.

3. It is appropriate that, at this time, the service to this State of Walter Russell Crocker, Commander of the Most Excellent Order of the British Empire, should be acknowledged in this place. Mr. Crocker discharged the duties of the office of Governor from late January of this year, during the untimely illness of Sir Douglas Nicholls, and afterwards on His Excellency's premature retirement until my own appointment. On behalf of all the people of the State, I express our gratitude to Mr. Crocker for the manner in which he carried out the duties of that office.

4. I now declare this session open and trust that your deliberations will be guided by Divine Providence to the advancement of the welfare of the people of this State.

The Governor retired from the Chamber and the Speaker and members of the House of Assembly withdrew.

The President again took the Chair and read prayers.

QUESTIONS

GOVERNOR'S SPEECH

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I direct my question to the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Government in the Council. Honourable members have just heard the Speech made by His Excellency the Governor opening the first session of the Forty-Third Parliament. Did the Government design the Opening Speech for His Excellency the Governor with the intention specifically to insult the institution of Parliament?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: His Excellency's Speech was designed in accordance with past practice.

CORONER'S FINDINGS

The Hon. C. M. HILL: I seek leave to make a short explanation before directing a question to the Minister of Health.

The PRESIDENT: On the subject of?

The Hon. C. M. HILL: On the subject of the State Coroner's findings yesterday concerning the tragic death of a woman in this State.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. M. HILL: Yesterday the State Coroner gave his reasons and his findings concerning the most tragic death of a woman at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. The issue concerned an error that the State Coroner claimed arose in identifying blood samples in relation to particular patients at that hospital. The Coroner stated that this was the only error of this kind that had arisen in the past 20 years and he also stated, according to today's press, that the blood service unit at the hospital had had a remarkable accident-free record. Indeed, he went on to say that this record apparently was better than the position in both the United Kingdom and the USA. He gave his reason, I understand, as being a human error. I am not raising this matter in a critical way, despite the fact that a tragic loss has occurred, but the matter is so serious that I think it quite proper for me to ask the Minister of Health whether he is implementing any changes in procedure or practice at the Royal Adelaide Hospital to ensure that in future an even greater degree of safety in matters of this kind obtains than has obtained in the past.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: As yet, I have seen only the report in the *Advertiser*. I have called for a full report and, when I have seen that, we will be taking action to find out whether there is some way to prevent a recurrence.

RAPE VICTIMS

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health on the subject of rape victims.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: Previously in this Chamber there has been discussion of the recommendations of the Mitchell committee in regard to the treatment of rape victims, and in particular the suggestion was made that the compulsory medical examinations should be conducted not necessarily by the police surgeon but by a doctor chosen from a panel of doctors that included women doctors. I understand that this was to be implemented in this State, but I do not have any information as to whether such a panel has yet been established and, if it has, how many women members are on the panel. Furthermore,

there is obviously a need for counselling and further care of rape victims beyond the immediate period following a rape.

The Rape Crisis Centre's figures indicate that the largest number of rape victims coming to the centre are in the 13 year to 16 year age group. For young girls in this age group continuing counselling, advice and care to prevent deep psychological trauma, as a result of their experience, will be necessary for a long period: perhaps weeks, or even months or years. Has such a panel of doctors, including women doctors, been established? What facilities, if any, is the State offering for continuing counselling and care of rape victims?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: All members know that the honourable member has been interested in this matter and raised it in the past session—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: She was interested—

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Not so much of the "was". If everyone showed the same concern for the welfare of people in this State as does the honourable member we would be much better off. However, I am pleased to inform the honourable member that a Sexual Assault Referral Centre has been established at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and commenced operation yesterday. A panel of medical officers has been appointed to service the centre, the panel being comprised of 27 female doctors and three male doctors. I can assure the honourable member that adequate counselling facilities will be available for victims at the centre.

TRAIN TRAVEL

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: I seek leave to make a statement prior to directing a question to the Minister representing the Minister of Transport in relation to train travel.

Leave granted.

The Hon. JESSIE COOPER: On October 13, 1976, I asked the following question:

Many people, including myself, enjoy train travelling, finding it very relaxing. This is surely the reason why our trains going to other States always are so well filled. However, if trips such as I experienced on the Overland to Melbourne last Friday night become a common occurrence, I doubt that this state of affairs will continue. On that occasion, sleeping-car passengers were comparatively lucky. They merely had to contend with hideous noise, loud-mouthed and foul-mouthed utterances, thumps on the doors, and other anti-social activities. The conditions became so turbulent in the club car that the bar had to be closed early. Sitting-up passengers were subjected to more of the same or worse behaviour, until requests were made to the conductor for police intervention. He telephoned for police to come aboard at Serviceton but, when the train arrived, no police appeared. However, two police officers boarded the train at Dimboola, but took no further action, despite the willingness of many passengers to give names and addresses, if required. I understand that this was because, in the event of an arrest, the conductor must leave the train with the person arrested, resulting in a delay in the train journey. In addition to this, when the train was halted at Diapur, two men were seen running along the roof of the carriage nearest to the engine. I therefore ask the Minister whether he will take steps to prevent this type of hooliganism on all of our railways, so that passengers and conductors can be protected from persecution. Further, will the Minister contact his opposite number in Victoria and, between them, will they work out some easier way in which the police can take action on such occasions?

On November 30, 1976, I received from the Honourable T. M. Casey, representing the Minister of Transport, the following reply:

On this particular occasion a number of sporting clubs were booked on the Overland, departing from Adelaide on October 8, 1976. They became very rowdy and it appears that they consumed large quantities of liquor from cans that they were not purchased on the train. Because of their behaviour, the cafeteria car bar was closed prior to reaching Murray Bridge, and later the club car was also closed. The economy class cars were by this time in a very untidy condition because of empty cans on the floor and window sills and spilt beer on the floors, and other passengers were complaining of the behaviour and language of the persons concerned.

Police were called at Taillem Bend and a number of passengers were warned, but this had little effect as the nuisance continued *en route* to Serviceton, and the Victorian Police attended the train at Dimboola. Experience has shown that instances such as this tend to occur in September and October, when sporting teams traditionally have a celebration trip interstate, and to control these groups is not easy. The police will take direct action against passengers under the influence of liquor, but to press charges of unruly behaviour requires: (1) a railway employee who had been directly involved in the incident leaving the train and laying a complaint with the police who attend; (2) holding the train while police question witnesses and take statements. Obviously, this is impracticable.

Following the Minister's reply, I said:

Following the Minister's kind reply, this is exactly what I asked, whether some measures could be devised with his opposite number in Victoria so that the police in question should not have to go through this long process involving the delay of the train. That was the purpose of my question. The Minister's explanation explains exactly the situation as I have already explained it; it does not give a solution to the problem.

The Minister then replied:

I will refer the honourable member's question back to my colleague.

As about 12 months has passed and we are once again in the special season of sporting team excursions, as referred to by the Minister, and as two young men have been killed as a result of the kind of dangerous behaviour that I referred to nearly a year ago, I now ask the Minister whether it is not possible for the comfort and welfare of passengers generally for the Railways Commissioners to arrange to have special railway police on the the Overland to handle the problem, thereby leaving the train staff free to carry out their normal duties. If this is not possible, will the Minister encourage the Commissioners to make alternative arrangements for the comfort, well-being and good behaviour of all passengers on the train?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and endeavour to obtain a reply. I do not think it is possible to blame the Minister or the Government regarding the two people who, in such untimely circumstances, elected on their own volition to climb on to the roof of a carriage.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Except that they copied other people.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: The honourable member knows that during the war much tomfoolery went on, and unfortunately young people today take the law into their own hands and do their own thing. If they climb on to the roof of a carriage while the train is in motion and if they elect to take the consequences, the onus is on them, and I think the honourable member would agree with me.

ATHELSTONE ROAD

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Lands, representing the Minister of Transport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I refer to development in the lower Athelstone Road area, particularly the northern side, which runs toward the Torrens River. That part of the road extending from the new Athelstone sporting complex to where the road terminates in the foothills is in a shocking state. Will the Minister draw his colleague's attention to the state of the road? I realise that, because of building activity in the area, this is not an opportune time to upgrade the road completely, but it is necessary for some temporary measures, at least, to be taken to improve the road to overcome the anxiety of parents of schoolchildren who need to use the road to go to the Athelstone school.

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the honourable member's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

BURNSIDE ROAD CLOSURES

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister representing the Minister of Transport about road closures in the Burnside area.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: During the Hon. Miss Levy's question I made an interjection indicating the the Government could make promises in the Council but it did not fulfil them. As honourable members will recall, regulations were brought down under which certain roads were closed in the Burnside area. A motion for disallowance was placed on the Notice Paper of this Council. At the end of the last session the motion was not pursued because the Minister gave a firm undertaking in this Council that those regulations would be rescinded and new regulations would be made altering the number of closures from 12 to 8. The Minister undertook that that would take place by April 1, but nothing happened at that time. In July last the local government elections took place, and the issue in the Burnside area was the question of road closures. In that area the candidate representing the Anti-Road Closure Committee won the election by a ratio of two to one. A deputation was taken by the Labor Party candidate for Bragg to the Minister of Transport (who supports the Anti-Road Closure Committee), saying that the Minister had to rescind the regulations, as was undertaken in this Council. The Minister replied to the Labor Party candidate for Bragg that he had no intention of fulfilling his obligation to the Council. Can the Minister inform me whether a Parliamentary undertaking given by the Minister of Transport is worth the *Hansard* paper on which it is recorded?

The Hon. T. M. CASEY: I will refer the Leader's question to my colleague and bring down a reply.

DRUGS

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health about drugs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I travelled extensively during the recent election campaign. Apart from questions relating to unemployment, petrol prices, the Budget and

taxation, most people brought to my notice their concern about the prevalence of drugs in our community. Since that campaign there have been many newspaper articles about the matter. One article that impressed me stated that there was already an estimated drug trade in Australia amounting to \$500 000 000. That is only an estimate.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: It is an underestimation.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I should not be surprised. I am concerned that that sum has been referred to. It also concerned me to see on a recent television programme customs officers who were strongly objecting to their role. They made clear that they were carrying out their job in name only. They worked in no other capacity and, in fact, were not instructed to do their job in any way that would limit the amount of drugs coming into Australia. These two senior officers, who were hostile towards the department, said that, by speaking out against the department, no doubt their promotions would cease and, indeed, they could lose their jobs. That is the sort of intimidation that one would expect from large companies against militant trade unions that were trying to achieve decent conditions for their members. I believe, being a former union official (and I have said this to my trade union colleagues), as a result of not only what I have read in the press but also what I have seen elsewhere that, apart from unemployment, which concerns society the most—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: And inflation.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: If one considers unemployment and inflation—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think the honourable member is straying from his question.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: No, he got led astray.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You never heard DeGaris!

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member is asking a question about drugs. I do not think we ought to get on to unemployment and inflation.

The Hon. J. E. DUNFORD: I wanted to make a comparison. The most sinister danger to our society is drugs. I took a little liberty in explaining my question, Sir, because you were kind to the Honourable Mrs. Cooper, who spoke for about 20 minutes. I was going to cut down my explanation to about 15 minutes. The Australian Labor Party Convention took the initiative some time ago and, as a result, the South Australian Labor Government, followed by the New South Wales Labor Government, instituted an inquiry. Now, at last, we see the Federal Government waking up, as Mr. Fraser has decided to set up a national inquiry. As a result of the initiative of the Labor Governments in South Australia and New South Wales, and with the support of Tasmania, the Federal Government is waking up to the drug threat to future generations in Australia. My question is in three parts: first, has the Federal Government approached the South Australian Government for assistance in that inquiry; secondly, if it has, what assistance was asked for; and, thirdly, what are the terms of reference of the proposed Federal inquiry?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I understand that there have been discussions between the Prime Minister and the Premier, and that negotiations are still proceeding. However, I will seek a full report and bring it down for the honourable member.

DROUGHT RELIEF

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a statement before asking the Minister of Agriculture a question about drought relief.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: Appreciable steps have been taken by the State Government regarding this matter. Perhaps some credit is due to the Minister for the suggested scheme of alleviating the financial position of people in drought-affected areas. However, there is one area regarding which the Minister was perhaps misinformed. I refer to the application for assistance for on-property destruction of stock. The Minister said that pastoralists had not taken heed of warnings given by the Pastoral Board that they should reduce their stock numbers. Of course, that was not entirely true, as pastoralists could reduce stock numbers at their own expense only. Stock sale reports shown to me prove that stock that was in reasonable condition in these areas could not be transported out except at the producers' cost. The Minister can shake his head, but what I am saying is correct. The Minister does not know as much as he should.

The Hon. T. M. Casey: He knows more than you do.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I make the point that, in order to alleviate the position in drought-affected areas, it is necessary to reduce the number of cattle. A plea has been made for assistance for on-property destruction of stock. The State Government said that, although it was unable to help in this area, it would approach the Commonwealth Government regarding the matter. As I understand that the Minister or his officers have made this approach to the Federal Government, I ask the Minister whether he has any good news for us.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: On, I think, September 22 or September 23 the Federal Minister for Primary Industry announced a considerable package of assistance that was to be given to the beef industry. A few days thereafter, I received a telex message outlining the measures to be taken by the Federal Government to assist the beef industry in its present crisis. Among the measures proposed in that telex message was a suggestion that \$10 a head should be paid to beef producers for certain management procedures to be carried out on their properties. The measures suggested therein were connected with disease control, the spaying of young heifers to render them infertile, as well as other management procedures relating to dipping and drenching cattle. It seemed to me that the most appropriate measure in this regard was the slaughter programme. It was a more sound management procedure than was spaying to reduce fertility and lower the stocking rate, as spaying would be slow in having any effect. Shortly thereafter, I sent to the Federal Minister a telex in which I suggested that the criteria in relation to the package being given to the beef industry should be widened to include the slaughter of aged breeding cows in pastoral areas. As yet, I have not received a reply from the Federal Minister. However, I will follow up the matter to see whether he has considered it.

PRICE CONTROL

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I seek leave to make a statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, as Leader of the Government in the Council, regarding price control.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: Earlier this week, I received a telephone call from the distressed owner of a pet dog. Many complaints have come to my desk regarding gross overcharging and misleading charges by certain veterinary operators in this State. Indeed, there are examples of gross overcharging by members of the veterinary profession in the metropolitan area.

I will relate a case as an example of the matter to which I have referred. People who have contacted me approached a veterinary surgeon operating an establishment on the Main North-East Road. The veterinary surgeon's name is Irving (he is one of two brothers), who quoted a price of \$45 for desexing a bitch and later amended the price to \$59. What was more surprising to the owners of the dog was the excuse given for the increased price, namely, that the quote had been given to them by a member of the staff and not by a professional member of the staff. They were told that they were to get the dog from the surgery on the Monday and they were to pay \$79, to which they objected strongly. The owners telephoned me because they were looking for a member of Parliament. No Liberals were available, and I copped the telephone call. There was a threat by Irving to destroy the dog if the owners had not picked it up that day and paid the fee. This is a shocking state of affairs. Will the Minister take this matter up with the Minister of Prices and Consumer Affairs so that not only the public can be afforded some protection from these unscrupulous operators in the profession but also those reputable operators in the profession can have protection from their less responsible colleagues?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The Veterinary Surgeons Board is, I think, the appropriate organisation to investigate this complaint, and the board is under my responsibility. I will refer the question to it and bring back a reply.

DROUGHT RELIEF

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a short statement prior to also asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture regarding drought relief.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. B. DAWKINS: All honourable members must by now be extremely concerned about the ravages of the drought in this State. An instance of this was highlighted on an Australian Broadcasting Commission regional programme only this morning, when a prominent farmer on Eyre Peninsula, Mr. Woods, having referred to the third drought in a row in his area, stated that it cost about \$35 000 a year to run an average farm in his area, with no income forthcoming to provide for this. I ask the Minister whether the State Government has not yet spent on drought relief the \$1 500 000 which is required to be spent to secure Commonwealth assistance. If the State Government has not spent this money, will the Minister tell the Council how much has been spent and when he expects the State Government to be able to qualify for Commonwealth assistance? I understand that the Commonwealth Government already has made \$34 000 000 available for drought relief where this requirement has been met.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: The honourable member is not correct. I do not know the exact figure that has been paid to date, but up to a few weeks ago more than \$2 200 000 had been paid in drought relief. I think the average amount paid in carry-on finance was about \$13 000, but I certainly can get the figures up to date. As far as the Commonwealth is concerned, I think the \$34 000 000 to which the honourable member has referred would apply to the whole of Australia, not to South Australia only.

The Hon. M. B. Dawkins: That is right.

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: We are expecting that about \$10 000 000 will be required from the Commonwealth. I think the point is that the payment of carry-on finance is on the basis of the applications, and we expected

that, if we spent the estimated sum, the Commonwealth would come good with further funds. That is what we expected that the Commonwealth would do, so it is a question not of the amount of funds allocated but of the applications that come in. In recent weeks I have taken action to simplify the procedures so far as farmers are concerned, and the drought relief application form has been shortened so that it is now only four pages long, making it simpler for farmers to apply. Other procedures also have been simplified and the loans that are made once applications have been approved will now be paid out on a quarterly basis. In the past they were paid out on the individual items of expenditure. When farmers presented accounts for superphosphate or seed, these accounts were paid. However, it is much better as far as farmers' financial management is concerned if they receive a quarterly cheque with respect to the deficit in their approved budget and then confine their payments within that amount. A further area of simplification has been on the question of security, involving the practice of taking out a mortgage on the farmer's assets. That could, in certain cases, inhibit further loans in future years. We have now adopted a policy whereby only sufficient security will be taken to cover the actual carry-on finance loan made. That security could involve only a few sections or a portion of the farmer's property being mortgaged as security for the loan.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: Is that for second or third mortgages?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: Second or third mortgages are often involved, but we believe that the procedure now being adopted will give the farmer more financial flexibility in future years if he wants to borrow money for other projects but does not want to go through the procedure of getting the money on second or third mortgage.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Agriculture, representing the Minister of Education, regarding religious education.

Leave granted.

The Hon. ANNE LEVY: A few months ago the Planning and Research Division of the Education Department released the report of the Religious Education Evaluation Committee, which for more than 12 months had been studying and evaluating the religious education programme. Can the Minister say what action, if any, has been taken so far to implement the recommendations regarding the religious education programme and when is it expected that the remainder of the recommendations will be implemented?

The Hon. B. A. CHATTERTON: I will refer the question to my colleague and bring back a reply.

MEMBERS' ACCUSATIONS

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Minister of Health on the matter raised a moment ago by the Hon. Mr. Foster.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that it has become a habit in this Council for certain members, on the basis of a telephone call or a letter from someone, to accuse people in the

community of practices that members may feel are worthy of examination.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. I did not want to weary the Council with details.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris did not mention the honourable member at all.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He did.

The PRESIDENT: No, he did not. He just said—

The Hon. N. K. Foster: He mentioned my name twice.

The PRESIDENT: He did not refer to the honourable member in that way.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: No, but he tried to draw an inference almost by lies.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The inference of lies comes from the Hon. Mr. Foster.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Are you calling me a liar?

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Yes.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD moved:

That Question Time be extended until 3.30 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: The point I am making—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of order. The Leader has called me a liar. I do not expect such a despicable gentleman to make a withdrawal. However, I reserve my right to call him a similar name in the future. I would not expect a withdrawal—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The honourable member will resume his seat. He is not raising a point of order.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President, as I seek clarification from you. It is clear to everyone in this Council, including you, Sir, that the Hon. Mr. DeGaris called the Hon. Mr. Foster a liar. Does the honourable member have to object to being called a liar? You clearly heard this, Mr. President, and is it not your job to see that the Leader apologises to the honourable member? Is that not what the President's job is all about?

The PRESIDENT: On occasions. However, I do not understand what the Hon. Mr. DeGaris is saying in calling the Hon. Mr. Foster a liar. I do not know in what respect he is saying that the honourable member lied. Perhaps he could clarify the situation.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: If the Opposition or the Hon. Mr. Foster insists, I will withdraw that statement.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You're a log, a real log. I withdraw nothing, because I said nothing to damage your reputation in this place.

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr. Foster will cease interjecting. He has had his say in this matter, and he is not raising a point of order as far as anything that has been said.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: I didn't expect him to apologise.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I warn the honourable member to cease interrupting. Perhaps the Hon. Mr. DeGaris will clarify the matter.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It has become the practice of honourable members in this Chamber to accuse people in the community of practices that members may believe are worthy of examination by a Government department. The Hon. Mr. Foster received a telephone call complaining about veterinary practices.

The Hon. F. T. Blevins: What's that got to do with your calling the Hon. Mr. Foster a liar?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Leader is starting the story from the beginning.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I will start again. It has become the habit in this Parliament for some honourable members, as a result of hearsay evidence, to accuse some people of practices that deserve examination by a Government department. As I said, the Hon. Mr. Foster said in this Chamber that he had received a telephone call

from someone complaining about a veterinary practice. The honourable member mentioned that person's name, but I believe that that practice should be discouraged, because it falls into the category of almost guilt before trial.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: You should talk!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: It is on hearsay evidence that the honourable member raised that person's name. He could have approached the Public and Consumer Affairs Department himself, raised the complaint and had it investigated and, if there was any difficulty, then the matter could be raised here. However, to raise a person's name in this Council without trial and examination is a practice that is degrading to Parliament and is unjust and unfair. Will the Leader of the Government in this Council ask his members not to indulge in this sort of practice in this Chamber?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise on a point of explanation, as I am the person wrongfully accused. I spoke at some length with the veterinary company concerned—with a principal member, if not the senior member, of that company. The Hon. Mr. DeGaris also referred to a matter I raised in this Council before the election. I had had correspondence with that company over a period of nine months, and I had noted that the report, tabled in this Council, of the Public and Consumer Affairs Department made continual reference to that company. I had been approached by pensioners and other members of the community in regard to that company and, in my office, I had a letter from that company, prior to raising this matter in this Chamber, saying that it would clear up all outstanding debts to people, especially in relation to money that was held somewhat dishonestly.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I think this is getting beyond a personal explanation.

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: No, I wish to make another point. I have been called a liar by all sorts of irresponsible people. That goes over my head, and I do not want you, Sir, to take up the cudgels on my behalf, unless you feel it is necessary. The *Adelaide Advertiser* went to some pains to make it abundantly clear to the public so that a company with a similar name to the company to which I referred in this Council was not disadvantaged from a business point of view by the question I asked. Therefore, I seek from you, Mr. President, an assurance, contrary to the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, that members of this Council will not be restricted in their rights in raising matters in this Chamber on behalf of the taxpayer, who foots the bill not only for members of Parliament but also for your salary, Mr. President, and also provides the millions of dollars necessary for the establishment and conduct of Parliament in this State.

The PRESIDENT: If the honourable member had mentioned some of these points in his original statement, or in his supplementary statement, the Leader might not have asked his question.

The Hon. N. K. Foster: They're in *Hansard* for his benefit. Why doesn't he accept his responsibility as a member of this Council?

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order. You still have not cleared up the position to my satisfaction, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT: We will deal with the honourable member's point of order after the Minister has replied to the question.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: In reply to the Leader's question about honourable members naming certain companies—

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: People.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Leader asked

whether I would see that members from this side did not indulge in this sort of thing. I make it clear that such naming of people and companies has been going on from both sides of both Chambers for many years. Sometimes it is fully warranted. True, by the naming of people and companies in this place, when a member believes that someone has been wrongfully got at, there may be some damage caused to those people or companies. However, if the warning is not sounded in this place many other people can be touched while the process is going on through the departments, as suggested by the Leader. By the time reports get back, untold damage can be done to the public generally.

I believe that, if firms or people have nothing to hide, then they will have nothing to fear by having their names mentioned in this place. Although I do not know about members opposite, our members are responsible about this, and they do not come into this place making such accusations unless they have something to back up their story.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: Why not take it to the department itself?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I just answered that question: I said that, while we are taking things to the department, the public can be touched. Through a public announcement in this place, the public can be alerted while a matter is cleared up. Honourable members opposite have been doing for years the kind of thing they are complaining about. They have even gone further and, without making their own inquiries first, have accused the Government of doing certain things by innuendo. Honourable members have been doing this kind of thing for years to the Government, to individuals, and to companies.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: I understand that a point of order should take precedence over all other matters.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much audible conversation.

The Hon. F. T. BLEVINS: The Hon. Mr. DeGaris clearly called the Hon. Mr. Foster a liar. As I understand it, that is unparliamentary. Standing Order 199 states:

Order shall be maintained in the Council by the President.

It seems to me that it is your duty, Mr. President, to tell the Hon. Mr. DeGaris to withdraw what he said.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: I did withdraw it.

The PRESIDENT: The Leader withdrew it.

COURT PROCEDURE

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question of the Minister of Health, representing the Attorney-General, regarding directions given to an officer of the Legal Services Department not to oppose an adjournment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: It was reported in the *Advertiser* of October 4 that Mr. J. M. A. Cramond, a solicitor with the Legal Services Department, stated that he had been directed not to oppose an application by the respondent's counsel for an adjournment of an appeal initiated by Sergeant Furnell against the dismissal by Mr. J. M. Lewis, S.M., sitting at Ceduna on July 14 of two charges against Basil Kurt Coleman. The report indicates some reluctance on the part of Mr. Cramond to consent to the adjournment but, when pressed by the Judge, His

Honour Mr. Justice Sangster, to either join in the application or not, it is reported that he said, "I suppose I have no alternative but to consent." The usual and accepted reason for applying for or consenting to an adjournment is lack of opportunity by the party applying to prepare his case. In this matter, all the relevant events had happened some time before, and there must have been adequate opportunity for the respondent to prepare his opposition to the appeal. Supreme Court judges are rostered to hear appeals, and the consideration of which judge would hear the appeal would not be a relevant ground for an adjournment. Did the Attorney-General direct Mr. Cramond not to oppose the adjournment; if not, who did? What were the reasons, in detail, why the direction was given?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I will refer the honourable member's questions to my colleague and bring down a reply.

QUESTION TIME

The Hon. J. R. CORNWALL: I seek leave to make a short statement before asking a question—

The PRESIDENT: It is usual on the opening day for Question Time to be of unlimited duration, but the Council has carried a motion that Question Time be extended to 3.30 p.m.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: The motion was misconceived.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Whether misconceived or not, it was carried.

The PRESIDENT: The Leader of the Government in this Council moved a motion that Question Time be extended to 3.30 p.m. I understand that he moved that motion believing that, otherwise, Question Time would finish, as it does in the normal course of events, at 3.15 p.m. Did the Minister, by his motion, intend that Question Time should cease at 3.30 p.m.?

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: That was the intention.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr. President. Would it not be necessary to suspend Standing Orders for that to happen?

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: Should that point of order not have been taken at the time the motion was put?

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister's motion, which was carried, did not require suspension of Standing Orders. At the same time, I think it is a somewhat nugatory motion. I think it was moved in error and, indeed, I myself was under the impression that Question Time would cease today at 3.15 p.m.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I should not be accused of being responsible for your mistakes.

The PRESIDENT: To clear up the matter, I suggest that, if the Minister wishes to impose a closing time for questions today, he should move a further motion that Question Time cease at a certain hour.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I have already done that. I named 3.30 p.m., and my motion was carried by the Council.

The PRESIDENT: The motion was that Question Time be extended.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: No time would have been mentioned if it had not clearly been the intention of the motion that Question Time should cease at the time stated. The motion was carried unanimously by this Council.

The Hon. M. B. CAMERON: The motion was that Question Time be extended to 3.30 p.m. Now, the Chief Secretary says that he meant it to be restricted to 3.30 p.m. I do not think the Chief Secretary is clear about the true

situation. I ask you, Mr. President, to rule that Question Time should be conducted in accordance with normal practice on opening day. The Chief Secretary does not know what he is talking about.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: The Chief Secretary is in another place.

The Hon. M. B. Cameron: I forgot the demotion.

The PRESIDENT: The only relevant Standing Order is Standing Order 69, which states:

At the expiration of one hour from the meeting of the Council—

I am not sure whether the Council met at 2.15 p.m. or 2.30 p.m. today. I read prayers at about 2.30 p.m.—

the Orders of the Day, if not sooner dealt with shall be called on by the Clerk.

There are no Orders of the Day on opening day. So, there is nothing to be called on.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The motion relating to the time of completion of questions was carried unanimously. If honourable members opposite do not know what they are doing, that is their responsibility. Now, they say that they do not know anything about it. Honourable members opposite should wake up to themselves. The time of 3.30 p.m. was mentioned in the motion, which was carried.

The PRESIDENT: I call on Ministers to lay papers on the table.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the Auditor-General's Report for the financial year ended June 30, 1977.

STATE BANK REPORT

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the Annual Report of the State Bank for the year ended June 30, 1977, together with profit and loss account and balance-sheets.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The PRESIDENT laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

- East Adelaide Primary School Replacement (Interim Report),
- Government Office Building (Wakefield Street) (Final Report),
- Hackham West Primary School (Interim Report),
- Walleroo Hospital (Geriatric and Rehabilitation Unit) (Final Report),
- Whyalla Hospital Redevelopment (Phase I) (Final Report).

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) moved:

That a Standing Orders Committee be appointed consisting of the President, the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, F. T. Blevins, R. C. DeGaris, and C. J. Sumner.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I call for a ballot.

The PRESIDENT: Ring the bells.

While the bells were ringing:

The PRESIDENT: While the ballot papers are being distributed, I point out that, as President, I am *ex officio* a member of this committee. So, only four honourable members need be voted for. Following usual practice, I ask honourable members to strike their pencils through the names of the four honourable members that they wish to have elected to this committee.

I have to report that, as a result of the ballot, the Hon. Mr. Banfield, the Hon. Mr. Sumner, and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris have been elected to the committee and there is a tie between two honourable members, being the Hon. Mr. Blevins and the Hon. Mr. Burdett. According to the Standing Orders, that tie has to be resolved by me by drawing one of the names by lot, so I ask the Clerk to put these two names in the container.

The Hon. C. J. Sumner: What Standing Order is that?

The Hon. N. K. Foster: Isn't this place a relic of the past!

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: I raise the point that has been brought up by the Hon. Mr. Foster. He is talking about this being a relic of the past in regard to drawing lots, and I invite him to move that Standing Orders be suspended so that members can vote again regarding the last appointee.

The PRESIDENT: Order! In response to the matter raised by the Hon. Mr. DeGaris, it is, of course, possible for any honourable member to move that Standing Orders be suspended to enable the ballot to be taken again in lieu of my determining by lot, as required now. I propose to proceed to determine the matter by lot unless I have a motion for the suspension of Standing Orders.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS: Mainly because of the complaint by the Hon. Mr. Foster, I move:

That Standing Orders be suspended—

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I take a point of order. Sit him down while I make my point to the Chair.

The PRESIDENT: I will hear the Hon. Mr. DeGaris first and then, if any honourable member wants to take a point of order, he can do so.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to allow the last position to be re-balloted for.

The PRESIDENT: Does the Hon. Mr. Foster want to raise a point of order on that?

The Hon. N. K. FOSTER: I rise seriously on a point of order and I apologise for having raised it earlier. However, I did so only to draw your attention to the fact that I had some opposition. The honourable member, by implication, suggests that he is moving for the suspension of Standing Orders because I have made some formal objection. That was not a statement of fact. I ask you, as President of this place, to inform the honourable gentleman that the procedure laid down by Standing Orders of this Council is that a member shall rise if he wishes to attract the attention of the Chair and if he wishes to have taken seriously the subject that he wants to raise. I merely made an across-the-Chamber remark.

The PRESIDENT: I do not think the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said that it was a statement of fact. I think he said it was an opinion.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health): I oppose the motion, because I understand that you are acting in accordance with Standing Orders. This matter is the selection of members of the Standing Orders Committee, and the new committee may well look at the Standing Order involved here.

The Council divided on the motion:

Ayes (10)—The Hons. J. C. Burdett, M. B. Cameron, J. A. Carnie, Jessie Cooper, M. B. Dawkins,

R. C. DeGaris (teller), R. A. Geddes, C. M. Hill, D. H. Laidlaw, and A. M. Whyte.

Noes (9)—The Hons. D. H. L. Banfield (teller), F. T. Blevins, T. M. Casey, B. A. Chatterton, J. R. Cornwall, C. W. Creedon, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, and Anne Levy.

The PRESIDENT: There are 10 Ayes and 9 Noes. The motion fails for want of an absolute majority. I shall now proceed to draw one of the two names from the box. I declare the Hon. Mr. Burdett to be duly elected.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) moved:

That a Library Committee be appointed consisting of the President and the Hons. Jessie Cooper, J. A. Cornwall, and Anne Levy.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): In accordance with Standing Order 415, I demand a ballot.

The PRESIDENT: I hope that we do not have the same trouble in this ballot as we had on the last occasion, which resulted because one ballot-paper was informal. Honourable members will strike out the names of only three members, because I am an *ex officio* member of the Committee.

I have to report that the Hon. Miss Levy and the Hon. Mrs. Cooper have been elected to the Committee. Although on this occasion everyone voted formally, there is still a tie between the Hon. Mr. Carnie and the Hon. Mr. Cornwall. I shall therefore proceed to draw one of those names by lot.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: In this ballot and the previous ballot, Mr. President, although you read out the name of the members elected, no detailed result was given. I would have thought that the detailed result of the previous ballot ought to be given and that the detailed result of this ballot ought also to be given.

The PRESIDENT: It has never been done in the past, but I will do it if the honourable member so desires.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER moved:

That detailed results of the last two ballots conducted in this Chamber be disclosed by the President in full and recorded in *Hansard*.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: The detailed result of the voting for the Standing Orders Committee is as follows:

Name of Member	No. of Votes
The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield	20
The Hon. F. T. Blevins	10
The Hon. J. C. Burdett	10
The Hon. M. B. Cameron	1
The Hon. J. A. Carnie	2
The Hon. Jessie Cooper	4
The Hon. R. C. DeGaris	11
The Hon. C. M. Hill	2
The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw	1
The Hon. C. J. Sumner	19

The detailed result of the voting for the Library Committee is as follows:

Name of Member	No. of Votes
The Hon. J. A. Carnie	11
The Hon. Jessie Cooper	13
The Hon. J. R. Cornwall	11
The Hon. J. E. Dunford	3
The Hon. N. K. Foster	2
The Hon. C. M. Hill	1
The Hon. Anne Levy	21
The Hon. A. M. Whyte	1

I shall now draw by lot to determine the tie between the Hon. Mr. Carnie and the Hon. Mr. Cornwall. I declare the Hon. Mr. Cornwall elected.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I should like to examine honourable members' consciences. The voting figures can be disclosed if desired, but it has never been done previously.

The PRESIDENT: This matter is within the control of the Council.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I should like it recorded in *Hansard* that, on most occasions when a ballot has been held in the past, the Parties have already decided for whom they will vote. If it is the intention of honourable members opposite to make people look ridiculous by voting for an honourable member whom neither Party intends to elect to a Committee, honourable members opposite are making a mockery of the system.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: We have co-operated in the past, when there were discussions before ballots were held and agreements were reached. We were in the throes of doing this today, and it was not Government members but Opposition members who asked for the ballot. The responsibility rests entirely on the shoulders of honourable members opposite. The Government was willing to play the game. However, if honourable members opposite are going to breach what has been practised in the past, the Government will change the rules.

The PRESIDENT: Order! I point out to the Minister and to all honourable members that under Standing Orders it is the democratic right of any honourable member on either side to call for a ballot.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: I realise that and I agree with you, Sir. However, the Hon. Mr. Whyte implied that the Government called for the ballot, whereas it was the honourable member's Leader who did so. Otherwise, the normal processes would have been followed.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The whole discussion on this matter is out of order.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: My personal explanation arises out of the comments just made by the Hon. Mr. Whyte, who seemed to cast aspersions on Government members in relation to their conduct of this ballot. I wish to make my position clear, particularly in relation to my motion that the result of the ballot be disclosed. Some honourable members opposite voted against that, although no division was called for. One can only assume that that was because it had never been done before. When I moved the motion that the results of the ballot be disclosed (and I am not talking about calling for the ballot, because that is the right of honourable members opposite; they have done that, and the results have been announced), I had a purely democratic reason for doing so. I do not know of any other organisation, be it the local Country Women's Association Committee or the Parliament for the whole country, whose election results are not made known. It seemed to me that, as there was nothing in the Standing Orders prohibiting it, it was fair and reasonable and, indeed, consistent with democratic principles that the results of the ballot be announced. On that ground, I moved my motion, which was carried with some dissentient voices. I make this personal explanation because I did not explain the matter when the motion was moved and particularly because of the Hon. Mr. Whyte's accusation that Government members were trying to make a farce of the ballot procedure. That was certainly not my intention.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I seek leave to make a further personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: I am not questioning the right of honourable members to seek a ballot or the results thereof. I make clear, so that people reading *Hansard* will not consider this to be a farce, that the membership of most committees is pre-arranged.

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: And the Opposition agreed previously with that arrangement, but it did not do so today. The Opposition called for a ballot twice when pre-arranged names had been submitted. Members opposite alter the groundrules.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: You are telling me something which you believe—

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: And which I know to be correct.

The Hon. A. M. WHYTE: The Hon. Mr. Sumner was not correct in saying that I opposed the motion that the results be revealed. I do not dispute that there should be provision for a ballot and for the results of the count to be revealed. I am making this personal explanation so that people understand that this is some sort of precedent, and do not think that members with one vote appearing against their name are not interested in committee membership whatsoever.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. C. BURDETT: The Hon. Mr. Sumner said that there was a dissentient voice or there were dissentient voices, and he assumed that this was because the numbers had never been called for previously. I was one of the dissentient voices, but this was not my reason: it was that the Hon. Mr. Sumner did not give any reason why he had moved a motion that departed from previous precedents. Because he did not give any reason for moving the motion, I voted against it.

The PRESIDENT: Order! We have not had an opportunity to go back to 1836. There may have been previous precedents, although they have not occurred within my memory. As far as I can see, Parliament does not work in secret anyway.

PRINTING COMMITTEE

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) moved:

That a Printing Committee be appointed consisting of the Hons. F. T. Blevins, J. E. Dunford, N. K. Foster, R. A. Geddes, and C. J. Sumner.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I call for a ballot.

The PRESIDENT: Ring the bells.

While the bells were ringing:

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD: The Leader has accused me of wanting four Government members on the Printing Committee. I remind honourable members that the Liberal Party would have had four members on the Library Committee had the Government agreed to the names which were put forward and which it would have accepted had the Opposition abided by what had happened in the past.

The Hon. R. C. DeGaris: That's not true.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: It is you who put up the President, Mrs. Cooper and Mr. Carnie.

The Hon. R. A. Geddes: But the President is an *ex officio* member.

The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield: Yes, but he votes with the Liberals.

The PRESIDENT: On this occasion, there are no *ex officio* members, so honourable members must vote for five members on the committee. We have a conclusive result. The Hon. Mr. Geddes, the Hon. Mr. Dunford, the Hon. Mr. Cameron, the Hon. Mr. Sumner, and the Hon. Mr. Blevins have been duly elected.

The Hon. C. J. SUMNER: Could we have the number of votes for all members?

The PRESIDENT: In view of the fact that the Council asked for similar information on the last vote, I am prepared to give it on this vote. The voting was as follows:

Name of Member	No. of Votes
The Hon. F. J. Potter	2
The Hon. D. H. L. Banfield	2
The Hon. F. T. Blevins	13
The Hon. J. C. Burdett	2
The Hon. M. B. Cameron	14
The Hon. T. M. Casey	3
The Hon. B. A. Chatterton	1
The Hon. C. W. Creedon	3
The Hon. R. C. DeGaris	1
The Hon. J. E. Dunford	15
The Hon. N. K. Foster	12
The Hon. R. A. Geddes	15
The Hon. C. M. Hill	3
The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw	2
The Hon. Anne Levy	2
The Hon. C. J. Sumner	14
The Hon. A. M. Whyte	1

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The PRESIDENT having laid on the table a copy of the Governor's Speech, the Hon. D. H. L. Banfield (Minister of Health) moved:

That a committee consisting of the Hons. D. H. L. Banfield, C. W. Creedon, R. C. DeGaris, C. M. Hill, and Anne Levy be appointed to prepare a draft Address in Reply to the Speech delivered this day by His Excellency the Governor and to report on the next day of sitting.

Motion carried.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health) moved:

That a Joint House Committee be appointed consisting of the President and the Hons. J. A. Carnie, C. W. Creedon, and N. K. Foster.

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I call for a ballot.

A ballot having been held, The President and the Hons. J. A. Carnie, C. W. Creedon, and N. K. Foster were declared elected.

The PRESIDENT: The result of the ballot is as follows:

Name of Member	No. of Votes
The Hon. J. C. Burdett	2
The Hon. M. B. Cameron	2
The Hon. J. A. Carnie	11
The Hon. T. M. Casey	3
The Hon. B. A. Chatterton	1
The Hon. Jessie Cooper	2
The Hon. C. W. Creedon	14
The Hon. R. C. DeGaris	1
The Hon. J. E. Dunford	1
The Hon. N. K. Foster	13
The Hon. R. A. Geddes	1

Name of Member	No. of Votes
The Hon. D. H. Laidlaw	8
The Hon. Anne Levy	3
The Hon. A. M. Whyte	1

The Hon. R. C. DeGARIS (Leader of the Opposition): I call for a ballot.

A ballot having been held, the Hons. C. J. Sumner, A. M. Whyte, and J. C. Burdett were declared elected.

The PRESIDENT: The result of the ballot is as follows:

Name of Member	No. of Votes
The Hon. F. T. Blevins	1
The Hon. J. C. Burdett	11
The Hon. N. K. Foster	10
The Hon. C. J. Sumner	21
The Hon. A. M. Whyte	20

**JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE
LEGISLATION**

The Hon. D. H. L. BANFIELD (Minister of Health)
moved:

That the Legislative Council request the concurrence of the House of Assembly in the appointment for the present Parliament of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation, in accordance with Joint Standing Orders Nos. 19 to 31; and that the representatives of the Legislative Council on the said committee be the Hon. N. K. Foster, the Hon. C. J. Sumner, and the Hon. A. M. Whyte.

ADJOURNMENT

At 4.52 p.m. the Council adjourned until Tuesday, October 11, at 2.15 p.m.