HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, December 10, 1968

The SPEAKER (Hon. T. C. Stott) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: GAS

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: On Friday, December 6, the Natural Gas Pipelines Authority formally signed a gas transportation contract with the producer companies (Delhi Australian Petroleum Limited and Santos Limited). The principal features of the contract are as follows:

1. The authority will provide the necessary pipeline facilities and undertake the transportation.
2. The gas will remain the property of the producers, who will be responsible for the exploitation of the gas field, the necessary processing or cleaning of the gas, and the sale to customers.
3. Delivery will be made to the Electricity Trust of South Australia, the South Australian Gas Company, and certain large industrial consumers.
4. The transportation charge will cover the whole cost of administration, operation and maintenance of the pipeline system, the net cost of interest on all moneys borrowed by the authority for purposes of the pipeline, and the cost of amortizing the whole capital expenditure upon the pipeline system ordinarily over a 20-year period but, in the case of initial expenditure, over 22 years. There will also be included certain supplementary charges in addition to the full costs as set out, these being of the nature of profit and generally available to reduce the net cost of gas to the public utilities and, accordingly, to the public at large.

It is expected that the cost of the initial facilities up to June 30, 1970, will be about $40,000,000, and all of this must be borrowed by the authority. Arrangements have already been made for long-term borrowing of $20,000,000 from the Government savings banks, the private savings banks, and the life insurance companies in three broadly equal parts. The Commonwealth has undertaken to provide $15,000,000 as a middle-term bridging finance, which will subsequently be repaid from recoveries or converted by long-term borrowings. Already a further $1,500,000 has been borrowed on a long-term basis from a variety of governmental authorities such as superannuation funds and the Public Trustee. The remainder (about $3,500,000) will be found as required from normal semi-governmental borrowing and by temporary advances as may be necessary from the State Treasury, the latter being repaid after a short term from recoveries or subsequent long-term borrowings. At the end of December, 1968, the aggregate of actual borrowings will be about $17,500,000, which will have been fully disbursed during January, 1969.

The arrangements between the authority and the producers are believed to be fair and advantageous to all parties. The producers will have the pipeline provided for them and financed with a significantly lower cost in interest on borrowed money than they could have arranged themselves, and they remain free to devote their own funds to exploitation of the gasfields and to further exploration. The customers are assured of a supply of gas at a favourable and stable price and also the benefit of a share in the economies arising out of the Government financing arrangements, and naturally the public immediately and directly benefits from these arrangements. The authority will be fully protected against all costs and have the assurance that its capital expenditure will be fully recovered over a reasonable period. The supplementary charges, beyond actual costs, payable to the authority have been agreed so as to reserve for public benefit some part of the reduced costs available through the provision of governmental rather than private finance. Of the first 50,000,000 million British thermal units of throughput, for that proportion which goes to the Electricity Trust and the Gas Company (which will be about 80 per cent) a charge of 2c a million b.t.u. will be payable, and this will be passed on to those two public utilities. For all usage above 50,000,000 million b.t.u. the supplementary charge will be 2½c a million b.t.u., and at least 2c a million b.t.u. of this will be passed on to the two public utilities. When the initial capital expenditure is fully amortized, and therefore the basic transportation costs are reduced, a rather higher supplementary charge will then be payable. In addition, the State will, of course, be entitled to the normal royalty of 10 per cent on the well-head value of the gas.

I wish to add to that formal statement the Government's and my appreciation of the

work done on this matter and of the negotiations which, although somewhat protracted, have been conducted in an atmosphere of goodwill and co-operation. I wish to compliment all parties to the discussions on the way this matter has been resolved. The producers of the gas have been fair and reasonable in their approach and I wish to compliment the Under Treasurer, who has been active in the negotiations, and the Chairman of the authority (Sir Norman Young) and the Deputy Chairman (Mr. L. W. Parkin) on the part they have played in the negotiations. I also express my appreciation to those banks and lending authorities which, possibly at some inconvenience to themselves, have assisted in raising the necessary finance required to be raised from the private sector.

QUESTIONS

AIRCRAFT WORKS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Can the Premier say what is the present position regarding negotiations with the Commonwealth Government about the employment of those people who were previously employed at the airframe repair workshops at Parafield and what is the future of the workshops? If no future for the retention of this facility can be seen by the Commonwealth Government, will he say what assistance has been given to employees to obtain employment elsewhere and what representations have been made to the Commonwealth Government about the necessity of retaining this facility in South Australia from the point of view of maintaining in the State both employment and a facility that can contribute to Australia's defence, as South Australia's industry gained a great boost after the Second World War through being very strategically placed in regard to defence establishments?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I gave a reasonably full reply to a similar question asked by the member for Gawler last week, but I will again get the file, which is not now in my bag, and obtain the details sought by the Leader. Also, if any further communications have arrived since then I will include details of them in my reply. I clearly recall communicating with the Commonwealth Minister with the object, first, of asking to maintain the facility, or, if the Commonwealth Government asserted that this could not be maintained, that action be taken to take care of the employees. Secondly, I asked the Minister whether he would make it widely known that this facility was available to other industries, as I think this is an important aspect of the matter. Perhaps an organization in another State would use such a facility but would not know that it existed. However, I will obtain a detailed reply for the Leader.

ADELAIDE TEACHERS COLLEGE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked last week about the entrance requirements for students wishing to enter the Adelaide Teachers College?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: Entry to courses at teachers colleges is competitive. The courses provided at the Adelaide Teachers College are designed mainly to train teachers in general subjects, commercial subjects, agricultural studies, technology, applied science, music and physical education. All of these teachers will be appointed to secondary schools. In general, the entrance requirements are those of the institutions at which the major academic courses are undertaken, namely, the University of Adelaide, the South Australian Institute of Technology and the Roseworthy Agricultural College, as well as the Adelaide Teachers College.

Selection is made from holders of teaching scholarships, or from direct applicants, after considering the recommendations made by the heads of schools and the results gained in examinations or other approved study. Entry to the D course for teachers of general subjects, agricultural science, and music is based on satisfying the requirements for Matriculation for the University of Adelaide or its recognized equivalent. Students who have completed one or more years in university degree courses may be admitted to the first, second, or third year of the D course, depending on qualifications. Graduates may be admitted directly to a special post-graduate one-year course. Students selected to study for technology or applied science at the South Australian Institute of Technology or for the Diploma in Agriculture at Roseworthy need not be matriculated, but fifth-year study is desirable, and the requirements of these institutions must be satisfied.

Candidates for entry to the E course in commercial studies will be selected after the recommendations made by the heads of schools and the results gained in the Matriculation or a Leaving examination are considered. Evidence of proficiency in commercial subjects should be submitted. Candidates for entry to the I course

in physical education will be selected after the recommendations made by the heads of schools and the results gained in the Matriculation examination or any other approved course are considered.

SOCIAL WORKERS

Mr. McKEE: I have been requested by the Port Pirie council to ask the Minister of Social Welfare to consider urgently appointing a full-time social worker at Port Pirie. The letter I have received states that the council, having fully considered the matter, has agreed that there is a need to appoint such an officer at Port Pirie. Will the Minister say whether such an appointment can be made?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I wish I could just say "Yes" to that question and that we would appoint the officer. We are most anxious to establish district offices in various parts of the State. However, we have had to draw up a list of priorities; the first priority is in the Upper Murray, and I hope we shall be able to establish a district office there soon. Port Lincoln is another place where we would like to have someone permanently stationed. I will certainly consider the question of Port Pirie now that the honourable member has raised the matter but, because of lack of funds and of staff, I cannot promise him that we shall be able to establish an office there as quickly as he, the council and I would like.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION

Mr. RICHES: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked some time ago about delays in effecting motor registrations in country centres and about a particular case in my district?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have the following report from the Registrar of Motor Vehicles:

Although there were circumstances outside the control of this department which caused delay, I regret that queries on details supplied by the owner in his application and short payment of the fee triggered off a series of faults within the department. A cover note (not an insurance certificate as stated by the honourable member) was issued on October 11, 1968, to enable the police at Port Augusta to issue a 14-day permit. The insurance certificate was not issued by Hartford Insurance Company until October 21, 1968, and lodged at this department on October 23, 1968. The request for a weighnote resulted from a very rigid application of instructions by an officer who was apparently unaware that there was no weighbridge operating at Port Augusta and who in any case, in the circumstances, could have used some discretion. I might add that our difficulties in the country, apart from problems of insurance of which you are aware, have increased since amendments to weights and measures legislation. We have overcome these to some extent by relaxing our requirements and making police officers aware that they can issue repeat permits on production of further cover note or certificate of insurance. The owner would not have been without the use of his vehicle if this had been done on this occasion. However, these factors cannot be offered as excuses for what happened in this case, and appropriate action has been taken to avoid a repetition.

GRAPES

Mr. ARNOLD: The statutory fixing of the price of wine grapes has become a most important factor in the stability of the wine grapegrowing industry in South Australia. Will the Treasurer say whether the Prices Commissioner has determined the prices to be paid for the 1969 vintage?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Prices Commissioner has concluded his investigations into this matter and has forwarded to me his proposals for the prices to be paid for wine grapes from the forthcoming vintage. Cabinet and I are having a look at these prices, and it is hoped that they will be available for gazettal under a prices order on Thursday of this week. I do not have the schedule of prices with me. It is a long and involved one, which shows some worthwhile and acceptable increases in the prices to be paid for wine grapes as far as the producers are concerned and having regard to the interests of the industry as a whole.

GAWLER RAIL SERVICE

Mr. CLARK: During the last week some of my constituents, in Gawler particularly, have contacted me because they are concerned about the effect of the bus service from the Barossa Valley and Robertstown area on the rail service between Gawler and Adelaide. A report in the Gawler *Bunyip* of December 4 states:

When a big reshuffle of rail and bus transport between the local area and Adelaide is completed this month, Gawler travellers will be worse off. They will have less trains on the time table, but they won't be allowed to travel on the bus to Adelaide which will stop in Murray Street.

Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport for a report on the effect of the bus service from the Barossa Valley and Robertstown area on the train service between Adelaide and Gawler?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes.

BOOK SALES

Mr. FREEBAIRN: Last week, I reminded the Treasurer that some months ago I had asked a question regarding the activities of Grolier International. The Treasurer had promised to take up this matter with the Prices Commissioner, but it seemed that the matter had been overlooked. As the Treasurer has informed me that he has a reply to my question, will he be generous enough to give it?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: The Prices Commissioner has reported that Grolier International, of St. Leonards, New South Wales, employs one representative in South Australia to sell its books on the basis of personal sales. It appears that the company may not have complied with the Book Purchasers Protection Act, 1963-64, in some respects, and a report on the methods of operation has been forwarded to the Attorney-General. Profit margins on these books are similar to those for other oversea publications.

MOONTA HOSPITAL

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Premier a reply to my question of November 21 regarding the Moonta Jubilee Hospital and delays in payment in unusual cases?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The cases cited in the correspondence from Moonta Jubilee Hospital forwarded by the member for Wallaroo are by no means uncommon, and there have been numerous instances of large amounts outstanding on these types of case being referred to the Hospitals Department for advice when the smaller country hospitals have been embarrassed by having to carry the outstanding debts involved. In instances where the insurance companies concerned with the particular case are known, it may be possible to expedite at least interim payments by referring details to the Fire and Accident Underwriters Association, 46 Currie Street, Adelaide, and asking for assistance in obtaining settlement. Failing this, it can only be suggested that active liaison with the solicitors and insurance companies concerned in each case be continued, in an endeavour to hasten settlement.

AIR FARES

Mr. EDWARDS: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about air passenger service charges to be imposed by the Commonwealth Government?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The Commonwealth Minister for Civil Aviation (Hon. R. W. C. Swartz) has stated that the Commonwealth Government's proposed passenger service charges were explained in his second reading speech when presenting the Aerodromes (Passenger Charges) Bill to the Commonwealth Parliament on November 20, 1968. As members will be aware, this legislation failed to pass the Senate and the Minister states that the matter now rests for the time being.

TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Mr. VIRGO: On September 26 (about 2½ months ago) I referred in this House to the case of a constituent who had been transferred to another State but was unable to sell his property because it was in the path of one of the freeways recommended in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Report. On the day after I asked the question I telephoned the Minister of Roads and Transport, who, after considerable delay, told me that he had instructed the Highways Department to negotiate immediately for the purchase of this property. I have now received from the former constituent, who is now in New South Wales, the following brief letter that may be of interest:

> We received a letter from our solicitors last week informing us that they had contacted the Railways Commissioner on our behalf *re* our property at Glandore. They were informed that the Railways were still inspecting and valuing same. We were under the impression that this had been finalized before we left Adelaide. We are now stranded in a caravan park paying $10 a week, plus $4 a week for storage of our furniture, as we cannot purchase another house until we receive payment from the Railways Commissioner.

Regrettably, this is the plight in which the Government has placed people of this kind, consequent on the release of the M.A.T.S. Report. Accordingly, as the Government, by prematurely releasing the M.A.T.S. Report, has deprived people of the advantage of selling on the open market, and as the Minister of Roads and Transport gave me an unqualified assurance that the Government would purchase this property, will the Premier take such action as is necessary to ensure that this constituent is compensated in respect of his property, as the Minister promised, to enable him to resume life under normal conditions?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The honourable member's statement that the M.A.T.S. plan was released prematurely is just political nonsense. Having dealt with his arrogant assertions and his other actions in this House regarding the M.A.T.S. plan, I can now deal with the personal matter that he has brought to the notice of the Chamber. If the honourable member needs assistance in contacting the

Minister of Roads and Transport, I will give him that assistance and I will direct his question to the Minister, from whom I will get the usual speedy service for which this Government is renowned.

Mr. BROOMHILL: My question is about the section of the M.A.T.S. report that concerns the continuation of Brighton Road over Anzac Highway to meet Tapley Hill Road near the migrant hostel. I do not know whether the Minister of Education is aware that the route of the freeway will mean that the land on which the St. Leonards school is situated will be required and that the Glenelg council has suggested alternative routes for the freeway. This is a densely populated area, and there would be no room available for a school to be sited nearby if the St. Leonards school land is required for the freeway. Parents of children at the school, as well as parents of children likely to attend the school in the future, are disturbed as a result of this matter. Will the Minister consider the problem likely to confront the Education Department in this regard, and will she also consider lodging an objection before the closing date of February, 1969?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I am not aware of the problem of the St. Leonards school with regard to the M.A.T.S. plan. However, some Education Department schools could be affected by the implementation of the plan, and departmental officers are now, and have been for some time, conducting a survey of the schools that will be affected. I will endeavour, if it is possible at this stage, to obtain a report on the St. Leonards school and bring it down as soon as possible.

BOOL LAGOON

Mr. RODDA: Last week the Minister of Lands gave a rather lengthy reply to a question about Bool Lagoon and, although he asked leave to have parts of the statement inserted in *Hansard* without his reading them, objection was taken to that and, consequently, the report was not inserted. However, the opening of the spillway at Drain M on Friday night last caused some concern, as landholders did not know that the spillway would be opened and, although we are learning from experience, some cattle were trapped in the drain. Officers of the department got on the job quickly when the trouble had been noticed, and the cattle were taken out. During the weekend many field naturalists expressed to me their concern about the release of water at this time. I understand that information relevant to these matters and a full explanation of them were contained in the lengthy statement that the Minister sought to have inserted in *Hansard*. I consider that the public are entitled to know the full implications of the decisions taken and I am sure that, when the Minister gives this information, everyone will understand the need for doing what has been done. Although the decision dooms some bird life, all matters must be weighed and the drain must be emptied so that work necessary to make the holding basin operate satisfactorily can be done. The possibility of cattle being trapped in the lagoon is a hazard and I understand that officers are trying to overcome the difficulty. Can the Minister report on these matters?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Although the reply that I gave last week was not extremely lengthy, I considered that an accompanying report, comprising about two pages, was probably too lengthy to read and, therefore, I asked leave to have it inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. However, that action was prevented because objection was taken by the member for Glenelg (Mr. Hudson) and, unfortunately, I have taken the report back to the office and I have not a copy of it with me.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister would not be in order in referring to previous debates in the Chamber. Is the Minister asking leave to insert the statement now?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I am explaining the honourable member's reference to the reply being a lengthy one: the part of the reply that I read was not lengthy. However, I can bring down later the report on the levels of Bool Lagoon and on the reasons for the release of the water. It was explained that the lagoon had to be drained so that excavation work on the floor of the lagoon could be carried out to make the drainage system work satisfactorily. Although it was necessary to get the water out fairly soon, the work was delayed as much as practicable to save as much bird life as possible and also so that aerial photographs could be taken. Since the water was released complaints have been made, as the honourable member has said, about the destruction of bird life and also about the danger to livestock. I do not think exception will be taken to my reading the following report from the Chairman of the South-Eastern Drainage Board, comprising about a page of foolscap, on the matter:

Verbal inquiries were received from Mr. W. A. Rodda, M.P. and Mr. R. Attiwill about the release of water from Bool Lagoon causing serious loss of nestling birds. A letter from the President of the Association of Field Naturalist Societies of the South-East, dated December 8, 1968, requests that the water be held at the present level for a further month to permit the majority of nestlings to leave the nests. Mr. Rodda also sought information with regard to reported stock difficulties experienced by landholders downstream of Bool Lagoon resulting from the unexpected release of water into Drain M. Water is being released from Bool Lagoon so that the South-Eastern Drainage Board can complete the construction work necessary for Bool Lagoon to function effectively as a balancing basin in the drainage scheme and to meet the requirements of the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department.

The work to be carried out is to survey and construct a channel across the lagoon floor to ensure that the lagoon will effectively function as a balancing basin. Experience gained this year, 1968, demonstrated that the channel is essential. Survey and construction of the channel must be carried out before the winter of 1969, if the landholders to the north of Bool Lagoon are to be protected. This water cannot be held any longer. The date for release of water from Bool Lagoon was fixed after consultation with Mr. Olsen (Director of the Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department). November 29 was the date agreed upon, but release of the water commenced on Friday, December 6. The delay of one week was to enable aerial photographs to be taken before the release of water.

Inquiries made today disclosed that one landowner had stocking difficulties on account of the unexpected release of water. The animals were rescued and, in the future, landholders who could be affected by abnormal release of water from Bool Lagoon will be notified. The rate of flow from Bool Lagoon was at 500 cu secs into Drain M, which had a capacity of 700 cu secs. The present rate of flow is considerably less on account of the restrictions in Bool Lagoon. It will take several weeks to clear the water before work can start. The Fisheries and Fauna Conservation Department has sent the attached circular to interested bodies.

I do not ask leave to have that circular inserted in *Hansard.*

SCHOOL OVALS

Mr. BROOMHILL: My question concerns the announced policy in 1966 that all new schools opened after January, 1967, would be provided with grassed and reticulated playing areas. I recently asked a specific question about the West Beach school and, in her reply, the Minister of Education said that estimates of costs had been prepared and approval of funds was now being sought to establish ovals at all schools. I point out to the Minister that representatives of several schools have approached me on this question, and most of them expected (and I think fairly) that within 12 months of the school's being opened after January, 1967, they would have received this financial assistance from the Government. At this time, as no announcement has been made and as there is also concern among parent organizations, can the Minister say specifically when money will be available for this purpose?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: In order that I may give the fullest information to the honourable member, I will call for a further report on this matter.

CRUELTY TO CHILDREN

Mr. McANANEY: Recently, I have noticed reports in newspapers that in Victoria an inquiry has been instituted into cruelty to children and also that in South Australia cases of cruelty to children have been reported. Perhaps one difficulty in obtaining a conviction in such cases is that a person who makes a statement about cruelty to children, and cannot prove the allegation, may be in difficulties. Can the Attorney-General comment on this matter?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: This was a matter of some controversy (or some public disquiet, I should say) in South Australia at the beginning of this year, and my predecessor but one, as Minister of Social Welfare, on January 5 referred the matter of treatment of children to the Social Welfare Advisory Council. Unfortunately, the council's report was not received while Mr. Walsh remained in office as Minister of Social Welfare and, indeed, it came to me only in August of this year. At that time I did not release the report to the public, because there was one matter in it (not of any vital significance) that had to be considered, because it recommended a change in the Social Welfare Act, particularly with regard to the definition of "an unfit guardian". The matter was taken to Cabinet, which authorized me to discuss with the Parliamentary Draftsman the proposed definition that had been incorporated in the council's report. There, I am afraid, the matter rested, because of the pressure of work on the part of both the Parliamentary Draftsman and me, but in the last few days I thought it proper, because of the renewed public interest arising out of an article, I think, in the *Medical Journal of Australia,* by the Drs. Birrell, to take the matter again to Cabinet. I have now been authorized to have drafted a Bill, which incorporates the recommendation in the report and

which is to be considered by Cabinet with a view to its introduction. I do not know whether that introduction will be made during the last part of this session in February or, indeed, whether there will be time for it then. However, as well as receiving these instructions from Cabinet I have now released the report to the public, because one recommendation in the report was that the more publicity there was on such cases the better, and I hope that, as this matter is in the news at the moment, it will receive much publicity.

The other matter in the report on which a positive recommendation was made deals with the establishment of a central registry for such cases. This will mean money and staff. As it was recommended that it should be within the framework of the Social Welfare Department, we are examining whether this recommendation can be implemented. Also, I have to report that, apart from the report to which I have referred, some few weeks ago, arising out of our experience in the prosecution of a parent for maltreatment of a young child, I referred certain legal aspects of this matter to the Law Reform Committee, and I understand from my inquiries today that, although the committee is not yet able to report to me, this was one of the first two matters on which it had started work. There are some legal aspects, such as the compellability of one spouse to give evidence against another in the case of a prosecution, the legal position of a person making a report of maltreatment of a child, and so on. These matters must be considered, arising out of the experience we had in the particular case. I hope that I will receive a report from the Law Reform Committee on these aspects, and that I shall be able to refer it to the Government and, if necessary, introduce amendments to the law at the same time as I introduce the other amendment to which I have referred.

STANDING ORDERS

The SPEAKER: I refer to the question directed to me on Wednesday last by the honourable member for Glenelg, concerning Standing Orders 127 and 138, dealing with the insertion in *Hansard* of material not read in the House. The honourable member asked me to consider whether or not Standing Order 138 could be brought into line with Standing Order 127. I quote Standing Order 127, which refers to answers to questions asked by a member, as follows:

> Answers to questions in the form of tables of statistics or other factual information, by leave of the House, may be inserted in the Official Report of the Parliamentary Debates without such tables being read.

Standing Order 138, which refers to rules of debate when a member is speaking to a question, reads as follows:

> Where a member, in speaking to a question, refers to a statistical or factual table relevant to the question, such table may, at the request of the member and by leave of the House, be inserted in the Official Report of the Parliamentary Debates without being read.

Honourable members will see that there is a significant difference in these two matters, but I find nothing remarkable in the fact that the Standing Order 127 as to the insertion of unread material in *Hansard*, in relation to an answer to a question, is a little different from the Standing Order 138 on a similar topic in relation to debate. Questions seeking information and debate are patently two very different forms of Parliamentary proceeding, and are governed by different principles. Parliamentary questions are designed to press for action or to obtain information. With questions it is comparatively immaterial whether the information is supplied verbally or in printed form. In fact, a number of Parliaments in the Commonwealth, including the House of Commons, in addition to allowing oral questions and answers in the Chamber, also provide for both questions and answers to be inserted in *Hansard* without being either asked or answered in the House.

However, the spoken word is the quintessence of debate. This principle is exemplified in the Commons rule that a member is not permitted to read his speech but may refresh his memory by a reference to notes. The real purpose of this rule is to preserve the spirit and the cut and thrust of debate. My view is that Standing Order 138 in allowing a member, in speaking in debate, to seek leave of the House to insert relevant statistical or factual tables in *Hansard* without being read represents the maximum desirable relaxation of the general rules of spoken debate. To extend the exception to allow the insertion of other types of information in *Hansard* without reading, would be the antithesis of the true spirit of debate. To allow other information would place the Chair in an impossible position to establish whether that information conformed to the other rules of the House as to Parliamentary language, relevance, prolixity and the like. Its admission could often allow unread statements and opinions to go unexamined, uncriticized or unrebutted for

lack of an opportunity to know in time what had been inserted in *Hansard* unspoken.

It may be argued that, if other unread material were brought within the ambit of Standing Order 138, its insertion in *Hansard* could still be prevented by one member's dissent; but in my view, if such an extension were made, the imprimatur thus conferred by the Standing Orders would make a member's dissent from the insertion of unread material the exception rather than the rule. May I say on the general topic of questions to the Speaker in the House, that I conceive it to be the duty of the Speaker not to explain or vindicate Standing Orders in the abstract but rather is it his function to interpret and apply the Standing Orders and practice of the House during its proceedings as the occasion arises. I need hardly remind honourable members that the House itself has the exclusive power to change any Standing Order which is not to its satisfaction.

HIGHWAYS DEPARTMENT

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: On November 25, 1968, on television station channel 9, Mr. Hudson, M.P., made allegations regarding falsification of time records, and I quote from a recording of his interview as follows:

> Labour normally associated with departmental equipment is also being left idle and the lost hours are being concealed by alterations to time cards.

This is an allegation which I can say has considerably upset the Commissioner of Highways and his senior officers. The Auditor-General's report, which I will table in due course, indicates that early in November the department instituted a special review of lost time at the Northfield depot. The review was to ascertain whether in fact time shown as lost time should have been charged against direct shop orders. The review, however, indicated that there would have been 177 hours to be charged to other indirect shop orders and 170 hours directly to jobs. The total hours worked during the period under review exceeded 250,000. Some minor corrections were made on time sheets for his sections by the Assistant Workshop Supervisor but in view of the insignificance of the hours involved no adjustment to financial records was made by the Accountant and this meant the alterations to this particular batch of time sheets had no effect on financial records or costs. With regard to hire of plant from private contractors, the Auditor-General in his report points out that recommendations for the approval of the Minister must be submitted through the Auditor-General and in each case the department must certify that it either has no equipment of the type to be hired or that it is in use elsewhere and not available. Internal procedures of the department have resulted in some delays for job approvals and the Auditor-General is taking up with the department ways and means of avoiding these delays. The Auditor-General summarizes his report as follows:

(*a*) I am satisfied that there is no alteration to time sheets as entered by the employees and signed by foremen and Workshop Supervisors except for some legitimate minor corrections. A special review made by the department of one section of time sheets on which no action was finally taken (as set out in the report), which could have given rise to the query on this matter, was for the purpose of correction and not falsification of accounts.

(*b*) There is no current instruction that pencil must be used in preparing time sheets. In fact many time sheets are prepared in ink.

(*c*) There is delay to work in many cases through the necessity to obtain prescribed approvals and obtaining of spare parts. These matters should be the subject of review by the department.

(*d*) Plant is not hired from private contractors unless a certificate is given that the department either has no equipment of the type to be hired or that it is in use elsewhere and not available.

This whole inquiry (and there the report ends) arose out of Mr. Hudson's allegation that "the lost hours are being concealed by alterations to time cards". The Auditor-General's report clearly shows that this is not so and I strongly suggest to Mr. Hudson that he should apologize to the Commissioner of Highways and his officers. As I indicated previously, I ask your permission, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and that of the House, to table the extensive report of the Auditor-General.

Leave granted; report tabled.

Mr. HUDSON: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. HUDSON: I have had only a moment or two to peruse the Ministerial Statement made by the Premier and the report of the Auditor-General included with it. May I correct one impression falsely given by the

Premier, and that was that the Auditor-General suggested that I should apologize.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Mr. Deputy Speaker, on a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. S. HALL: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker. When I had finished reading from the Auditor-General's report, I specifically said, "End of quote" or "That is the end of the Auditor-General's remarks". Most definitely I stated that.

Mr. HUDSON: Now that that point has been made clear and the Premier is satisfied that that is the case, I apologize, but I make clear that it is the Premier and not the Auditor-General who has suggested that an apology is in order. I point out, first, that the words quoted from my channel 9 interview on Monday, November 25, had me as saying, "Labour normally associated with departmental equipment is also being left idle and the lost hours are being concealed by alterations to time cards." I did not say that there was deliberate falsification and, immediately after that statement had been made on that interview, I was asked (and I repeat this again here and now) whether I believed that these alterations had been made under deliberate instructions, and I said, "No, I could not say that". At no stage did I say that any Highways Department officer had instructed people deliberately to alter or falsify time cards: it is the Minister and the Premier who have said that I said that. At no stage did I say that.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HUDSON: The information that I had—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Glenelg is trying to make a personal explanation.

Mr. HUDSON: The information I have is that these time cards were subject to alteration. We asked for an inquiry about this matter and the Auditor-General's report makes it clear that he is satisfied that no illegitimate corrections have been made of those time cards. So far as I am concerned, that is the end of the matter, but no apology will be coming from me about this matter, because at no stage did I make the allegation in the terms that the Minister, the Premier and other members of the Government side have tried to make out. At no stage has that been the case.

Mr. McAnaney: You are making a mountain out of a mole hill.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Previously I have reminded the House that, when a member is making a personal explanation, he is entitled to be heard in silence. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUDSON: Secondly, it appears from the Auditor-General's report that he was requested only to inquire into the allegation that lost hours were not properly shown on the time sheets. However, the Auditor-General does make further statements in his report that substantiate completely the matters that I brought before this House.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Too right they do.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HUDSON: This is what the Auditor-General says, and I quote from his report as follows:

A further point has been made that repairs to equipment are delayed "in some cases up to eight weeks or more" through the necessity for certain job approvals. Also, further delays occur in obtaining spare parts. These statements are justified and, although some delay must occur, a complete review of the procedures should be made by the Highways Department in an endeavour to reduce the time on this account. Idle machinery in workshops is costly. Consideration should be given to a reduction in the detailed estimating required and an increase in the level of authorities to the senior plant engineer to carry out works.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Is the Premier going to apologize about that?

Mr. HUDSON: No, and I am not asking him to apologize.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If there is any further interruption, I will have to ask the honourable member for Glenelg not to continue. The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. HUDSON: The Auditor-General also makes it clear that plant is not hired from private contractors unless a certificate is given that the department either has no equipment of the type to be hired or that it is in use elsewhere and not available, and that certificate must be given to the Auditor-General. However, when one reads that statement in conjunction with the fact that the Auditor-General finds completely in my favour in relation to the delays that have occurred on job approvals, it is clear that, if the delays on certain repair work are substantial, the department may be able to (and may have to) give a certificate to say that it has no equipment available to do

a certain job and may be able to do that legitimately. However, the department would not be in that position in some cases if action were taken to ensure that these approvals were not delayed, that they came through quickly, and that the procedures adopted in relation to the ordering of spare parts were rationalized so that there were no delays there. I am sorry that certain people have seen fit to read into my statement allegations that were not made. I am sorry also that certain statements which appeared in the late editions of the *News* of Tuesday and Wednesday of the week before last took so long to be corrected. This led some people to believe that I was accusing senior officers of the Highways Department, perhaps even the Commissioner of Highways, of doing something that was completely dishonest, but at no stage was that allegation made. However, I firmly believe that it was in the interests of certain people to accuse me of making that allegation so that I could be set up as an aunt sally and appropriately knocked over. On five separate occasions now I have given the full quote from the telecast on channel 9, yet again today, in the Premier's statement, only part of the quote appears (only that part that mentions the alterations to time cards), whereas the questions and answers, of which there must be a record, that follow immediately after that were not given. I leave honourable members to draw their own conclusions from that.

Mr. Broomhill, for Mr. HUDSON (on notice): What was the value of work carried out for each month of this calendar year by private firms undertaking repair and service work on Highways Department cars, trucks and other equipment?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: There are many occasions when the department considers it more expedient and economical to undertake repairs to equipment through service stations and private workshops rather than attempt them departmentally. Typical cases of where these private services are utilized are as follows:

(1) For emergency repair work in country areas where an officer is remote from any departmental facilities, and it is economical to arrange "on the spot" repairs. The cost of repairs in each case would normally be well less than $100.

(2) For repair work to equipment used by a gang located in country areas where complete departmental facilities are not available, and where it would not be economical to transport men and equipment from another area to undertake the repairs. Again, the costs of repairs in each case do not normally exceed $100.

(3) For repairs to and manufacture of specialist equipment and components where the department has not the necessary facilities or trained personnel to undertake the work or where process is patented, etc. This applies to certain repairs to hydraulic systems, track work on large machinery, automatic drives in vehicles, fuel pump assemblies, carburettors, cadmium nickel and chrome plating, galvanizing, etc. The relatively small amount of each type of repair and service work does not warrant the department setting up its own facilities.

(4) For crash repairs to vehicles. The department has not established a panel-beating section, and for administrative reasons associated with insurance claims, it is preferable for this type of repair to be undertaken by specialist private workshops. There are not a large number of these repairs.

(5) For repairs to equipment which is urgently required when all departmental facilities are fully utilized. For example, some months ago the motor repair shop could not handle all repair work awaiting attention and a number of vehicles were sent out to the trade so that work could be expedited. The type of work sent out at that time comprised 10,000-mile services to vehicles, minor gearbox repairs, wheel alignment, etc. The amount of work in this category fluctuates according to demands, but the cost of individual repairs is normally less than $100.

(6) Repairs which could have been carried out in the department's workshops, but which were repaired by private workshops.

In October, 1968, a 54RD vibrating roller was sent to Coates and Company Limited for repairs to the gearbox. Coates and Company is the distributor for the maker (Stohert and Pitt, England) and although the warranty period had just expired, it was felt that some liability for the gearbox failure rested with Coates and Company. The matter is at present under consideration by the maker. It would require a large amount of investigation to determine all the costs requested by the member for Glenelg as the only available source of this information is the payment vouchers. These would have to be examined month by month and a dissection made of appropriate invoices. To do this for the thousands of items involved would necessitate working considerable overtime and, in so far as categories (1), (2) and (3) are concerned, the information allocated would probably prove of little value. With regard to categories (4), (5) and (6), it has been possible to extract some information

from ancillary records and, although not as complete as that requested by the honourable member, some indication of the order of expenditure can be obtained. Then follows a table in statistical form setting these out, and I seek leave to have the table inserted in *Hansard* without the necessity of my reading it.

Leave granted.

Month	Highways Work Category (4)	(5)	(6)
1967	$	$	$
November ..	Not available	—	Nil
December ..	Not available	—	Nil
1968			
January	421	388	Nil
February ...	95	1,041	Nil
March	71	1,690	Nil
April	203	966	Nil
May	1,182	972	Nil
June	726	80	Nil
July	617	217	Nil
August	868	—	Nil
September ..	517	84	Nil
October	392	189	545 (not paid)

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The turnover of the mechanical workshops at Northfield approximates $1,500,000.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. CASEY: Has the Premier a reply to the question I recently asked about gauge standardization?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: The proposals submitted to the Commonwealth Government by the present South Australian Government in respect of rail standardization between Adelaide and Port Pirie in and immediately north of Adelaide, and on parts of the Peterborough Division of the South Australian Railways, are identical with those proposed to the Commonwealth by the previous Government. This Government has always considered that this work has a higher priority than the construction of a railway from Port Augusta to Whyalla. The Commonwealth Government is aware of this. The State certainly would not object to both proposals being carried out simultaneously but this, of course, would be dependent upon the availability of Commonwealth funds. Discussions have been held between State and Commonwealth officers on the independent feasibility study for the Port Pirie project.

SAMCON CONSTRUCTION

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Education say what is the Education Department's policy regarding Samcon construction as against the solid construction school and whether location north or south of the State has any bearing on that policy?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: This question could probably be better answered by the Minister of Works, because decisions are made and work is undertaken after consultations between the Education Department and the Public Buildings Department when the Education Department's requirements in relation to certain schools are considered. I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member on this matter, after consulting my colleague.

WHITE ROCK QUARRIES

Mr. GILES: On November 26, in reply to a question by the Leader of the Opposition about White Rock Quarries Proprietary Limited, the Attorney-General said that the Crown Solicitor would take action over the clearing of some land by White Rock Quarries Proprietary Limited in contravention of section 41 of the Planning and Development Act. Can the Attorney-General say whether the action the Crown Solicitor intends to take involves the stopping of quarrying on the section of land on which this alleged breach has taken place?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: As it is a couple of weeks since I looked at this matter, I have forgotten the details. I will check for the honourable member and let him know.

KINGSTON AREA SCHOOL

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of December 4 about the paving of the yard at the Kingston Area School?

The Hon. JOYCE STEELE: I have been informed that funds have been approved and that detailed tender documents are nearing completion for a comprehensive scheme of paving, drainage, etc., at the Kingston Area School. The Public Buildings Department expects to be able to call tenders in January, 1969. Taking into consideration the period required for the tender call, for letting of contract, and for the contractor to move on to the site, it does not appear likely that completion of the work could be achieved during the Christmas vacation. However, every effort will be made to ensure that it is finished at the earliest possible date.

ISLINGTON SEWAGE FARM

Mr. JENNINGS: Some time ago I introduced to the Minister of Lands a deputation from the Corporation of the City of Enfield regarding the future use of the Islington

sewage farm. The answer to the deputation has taken a long time to arrive because, I understand, transfer of titles is involved. Rumour is rife in the district that all of the property is now vested in the Minister of Lands and that already certain organizations are claiming that they will get the use of various parts of the property. Will the Minister say whether it is true that all of the land is now vested in him and that part of the land has already been allocated? If the answer to the second part of the question is "No", will he make this clear so that many misleading rumours can be squashed?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Substantially, the honourable member is correct in saying that the land is now vested in the Minister of Lands. This has been achieved only within the last few days. It has been very complicated to clear the titles.

Mr. Jennings: It's astonishing that so many people know about it.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The honourable member interjects and adds a little more to his explanation. If people know about it, I see no reason why they should not because I have made no secret of it and, indeed, there is no reason why this should be a secret. It remains now for the land to be disposed of properly. It still requires decisions on two or three major points. There are several claims that cannot be denied: freeway design is one, and site, type and size of the industrial enterprise is another. There are certain organizations which will undoubtedly get some of the land and which now know that they will. From memory, I think the Municipal Tramways Trust is one such organization. Some associations have asked for allocations of land, and these requests are being considered, although I know of no request from a sporting association on which a definite answer has been given. If I have been incorrect in what I have said, I will clear it up tomorrow. In short, some major decisions still remain to be made. The rumours, if any, would not have much substance, other than that certain semi-government organizations can be assured of some part of the land. I am more anxious than almost anyone else to have this matter resolved once and for all.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mr. LAWN: Has the Premier any further information about improvements at the Adelaide Oval?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I have the following report:

Section 855 of the Local Government Act, 1934-1967, is the statutory authority that enables the Corporation of the City of Adelaide to lease the Adelaide Oval on such covenants, conditions, clauses, provisos, limitations and agreements as may be determined by the council. On November 28, 1962, the council leased the Adelaide Oval to trustees of the South Australian Cricket Association Incorporated. The lease was approved before execution by the Governor, as provided by section 855 (4). Clause 3 of that lease provides: It shall be lawful for the lessees to use the land and premises hereby demised for all or any of the following purposes following, that is to say, for cricket, football, hockey, lacrosse, athletic sports and games generally, purposes of public recreation, gatherings of societies, concerts and outdoor entertainments and amusements and in particular to do all or any of the following acts and things namely:

(*a*) To erect according to drawings and specifications to be approved of in writing by the lessor (in addition to the buildings and erections being upon the land hereby demised at the time of the granting of this lease) such grand stands, booths, fences and other erections convenient and necessary for the purposes aforesaid or any of them on such part of the land hereby demised as the lessor may approve of and with the consent in writing of the lessor to remove the whole or any of the buildings and erections for the time being thereon and to rebuild or re-erect the whole or any portion of the buildings and erections so removed as aforesaid.

In addition, clause 4 (*d*) of that lease provides:

The lessees shall not remove, rebuild or re-erect the whole or any of the buildings, fences, structures and erections for the time being upon the land and premises hereby demised or make any substantial alteration therein or addition thereto or in or to the elevation thereof respectively without the consent in writing of the lessor for every purpose first had and obtained.

Clause 4 (3) provides:

The lessees shall not erect, build or put up any grand stands, booths (except temporary booths and erections as hereinbefore authorized), fences or other erections upon any part of the land hereby demised except where and in such position as the lessor shall first approve of nor unless and until the lessees shall have first submitted proper plans, drawings and specifications or such grand stands, booths, fences and other erections to the lessor and obtained its approval thereof in writing.

The effect of these clauses is to provide that the council has the sole right to determine whether stands are to be erected and where they are to be erected if approved. The decision of the council is not subject to a review of any kind. In my opinion, the only way a decision of the council made under this lease

can be altered is by the council reversing its decision or by Parliament passing legislation (probably in the form of an amendment to the powers given to the council by section 855 or by a special Act) to alter the decision.

HIGHBURY SEWERAGE

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question about Highbury sewerage?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: The matter has been further examined and approval has now been given for the short length of sewer required to serve allotments 35, 36 and 1, Valley View Drive, Highbury, to be constructed at departmental cost, and normal sewer rates only will apply on those properties.

ROADSIDE SALES

Mr. BROOMHILL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the question I asked recently about children selling fruit on roadsides?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: This matter has been investigated on more than one occasion during the last three years. Each investigation revealed that the persons serving from these roadside stalls, both inside the metropolitan area of Adelaide and on the outskirts, were either the proprietors or members of their families. There is, therefore, no control over the hours in which they work.

GRAIN STORAGE

Mr. HUGHES: Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my recent question about wheat storage?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture has received the following report from the General Manager of South Australian Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited:

1. I am unaware of any penal clause in the Bill whereby farmers who are apprehended for not complying with the Bill's contents that allow them to deliver 75 per cent of their grain to the silo system can have action taken against them if they over-estimate their crop to defeat the 75 per cent quota system and deliver 100 per cent of their wheat during December.
2. The bulk handling co-operative has placed farmers on their honour to sign a declaration and requested silo agents and terminal officers, when accepting the declaration from the farmer, to impress on all farmers the necessity for an honest declaration.
3. It is expected that growers should be able to deliver up to 75 per cent of their wheat deliveries into the silo system during the harvest period and not later than about the end of January.
4. It is envisaged that, if the Australian Wheat Board can effect sales to the traditional and their regular markets, almost all of the remaining 25 per cent of wheat stored on farms could be delivered in bulk by about the end of March.
5. The present programme of erection of large structural steel sheds at country silo stations will be extended to the months of February and March, if necessary.

TRADING HOURS

The Hon. B. H. TEUSNER: I understand that in the past year or so many moves have been made in various parts of the State for excision from the provisions of the Early Closing Act, such moves having been made some time ago by the city of Adelaide and other metropolitan areas. Can the Minister of Works say whether, generally speaking, these moves by certain areas for excision from the provisions to which I have referred have been successful, whether the general feeling of the community favours later shopping hours, and whether any such feeling is brought about because of the increase in the community of the number of migrants, who usually favour having later shopping hours? Can the Minister also indicate the result of the latest moves made in relation to the metropolitan area and the city of Adelaide?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Some country areas have successfully applied to have their shopping hours excised from the provisions of the Act. On the other hand, some have been unsuccessful in their efforts to achieve this excision. I have before me at present, in respect of one country district, a petition and a counter-petition, and the matter has not yet been resolved. Regarding the general desire of the people, there has been a mixed reception, some shopkeepers wanting to stay open longer, others being opposed to this, and members of the public not being unanimous in their thinking. The Returning Officer for the State (Mr. Douglass) has, in terms of the Act, now certified to me the results of the petition and counter-petition recently taken in the city of Adelaide and, as the honourable member knows, the area includes not only the square mile but also North Adelaide. Mr. Douglass has certified to me that, allowing for persons who had signed the original petition but who had reversed their opinion on the counter-petition (and this is not uncommon, as the honourable member knows), there were 976 effective signatures on the petition and 1,096 effective signatures on the counter-petition.

Therefore, as the number of valid signatures on the counter-petition exceeded the number on the petition, the petition to abolish the shopping district in accordance with provisions of the Act could not be granted. The result of the petition indicates that most electors in the area oppose any change in shopping times in the city of Adelaide. Therefore, in accordance with the provisions of the Act no further excision of the municipality of Adelaide from the metropolitan shopping district can be lodged before December, 1970, three years from the date on which the original petition was lodged. Apparently, the people living in the city of Adelaide are opposed to the change.

Mr. NANKIVELL: My question relates to the trading hours of chemists' shops, a matter that is even the subject of a cartoon in this morning's *Advertiser*. As I believe that chemists have had discussions with the Minister of Labour and Industry concerning trading hours and other matters, will the Minister tell the House just what is the result of those discussions?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: As this matter is of importance to the people of the State as well as to the House, I desire to make a full statement on the matter. Last Tuesday, December 3, 1968, the President and Secretary of the South Australian Branch of the Pharmacy Guild of Australia saw me (for the first time since my appointment as Minister of Labour and Industry) and asked that—

1. The Early Closing Act be amended to make chemists' shops non-exempt and items in paragraph (8) of the Second Schedule of the Act be made non-exempt goods.
2. Partnerships of 10 or more chemists in an area be permitted to conduct an after-hours pharmacy to dispense and supply medicines and surgical dressings only.
3. Burden Proprietary Limited, at 49 King William Street, Adelaide, and the Friendly Societies Medical Association at 56 King William Street, Adelaide, be exempted from the provisions of the Early Closing Act.

I notified them (and have now confirmed this in writing) that their proposals would be closely examined when amendments to the Early Closing Act were being considered. In the *Sunday Mail* the Publicity and Public Relations Officer for the guild was reported as stating that the Government had been approached to promote legislation to control night trading for chemists, but had received no satisfaction. There have been no legal restrictions as to the closing time of chemists' shops in this State since 1926. These shops are permitted to sell any goods exempted from the Early Closing Act (as set out in the Second Schedule to the Act) at any time. This is quite an extensive list. In recent years some chemist shops in the city and metropolitan area of Adelaide have stocked goods which are not exempt under the Early Closing Act. Inspections which are regularly made reveal that in chemists' shops which have been opening at night, provision is made for these goods to be locked away so that they are not exposed for sale outside the hours permitted by the Early Closing Act. In fact, in March, 1967, 10 chemists' shops were warned, in writing, that they were then committing breaches of the Act. Subsequent inspections have revealed that they are now observing the Act. The Early Closing Act has not been reviewed for many years and I have had representations from many organizations and shopkeepers for it to be reviewed. Some want its provisions relaxed, while others want more restrictions.

I have felt it inappropriate to make any general statement on the matter while a petition for the excision of the municipality of Adelaide from the metropolitan shopping district was unresolved. As I told the House earlier, the Returning Officer for the State has now completed his examination of the petition and counter petition in this matter and has certified that there is a majority of persons who have signed the counter petition. Under the provisions of the Early Closing Act, the municipality of Adelaide will remain part of the metropolitan shopping district. Now that matter is resolved, I intend to proceed with a detailed revision of the Early Closing Act and will give consideration to any submissions made to me, including those from the Pharmacy Guild, as well as to the report of the committee which was appointed by the previous Government to inquire into certain aspects of the Act and which submitted its report in June, 1966. I have no doubt that certain conditions of the Early Closing Act are outmoded and, in many cases, inadequate. I have said publicly on a number of occasions, and I repeat now, that I invite representations to be made to me in the new year by reputable organizations and by people who represent certain phases of trade and commerce in the State. I desire to consider all these representations with a view to up-dating the Early Closing Act to make it really work.

BOOKMAKERS

Mr. VIRGO: Last week I and the member for Glenelg asked the Premier several questions concerning the then current dispute (unfortunately, it is still current) existing between the Adelaide Racing Club and the South Australian Bookmakers League and, in reply, the Premier said on Wednesday that he would treat the matter as extremely urgent and bring down a report on Thursday. Unfortunately, the report was not illuminating and, obviously, the Government had not been able to do anything. The result was that the meeting held last Saturday, if you agree with the bookmakers, was a flop, but, if you agree with the racing clubs, it was a success. My question is not related to whether it was a success from the bookmakers' or the racing club's point of view, but rather whether it was a success from the Government's point of view, as since it came into office the Government has cried poverty in all its statements. Information provided to me by a person who does much accurate figure work (and I am not referring to the member for Glenelg, because this person is not a member of Parliament) indicates that at a normal meeting such as last Saturday, with pleasant weather conditions, a normal number of races, and so on, bookmakers would have held about $600,000 which, after allowing for punters' investments (which are not taxable), would have netted a tax of about $10,000; turnover tax would have amounted to about $4,500; and the ticket tax to $500. This makes a total tax of $15,000, which was not collected by the Government. However, to offset these figures, an additional amount of about $120,000 was held on the totalizator, which returned the Government an added amount of $4,800. This still left a deficiency to the Government of $10,200 at the fiasco last Saturday. Can the Treasurer say whether these figures are substantially correct?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I cannot say whether they are substantially correct because, in asking his question, the honourable member indicated that the estimates were somewhat hypothetical. It would be correct to say that the Government lost, in that the receipts were less than they could have been in normal circumstances, but how much less would be speculative. I think the honourable member would accept that.

Mr. Virgo: But you will agree it was considerable?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: Any loss to the Treasury is a matter for concern. I cannot say whether the figures are correct or not. One or two other people as well as the honourable member (and people of equal ability in these matters, I say with due deference) have had a stab (if I could use a good Australian term) at this, and I have received various figures.

Mr. Virgo: They are not my figures I am quoting—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has asked his question.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I am glad the honourable member has acknowledged that the figures are given by another authority. This is not a matter that should be approached purely from the Treasury angle. I share the honourable member's concern, but this matter should not be resolved entirely on the question of whether or not it has been of benefit to the Treasury. I know the Premier is concerned about this matter and is anxious that some satisfactory conclusion be reached.

GLENCOE ROAD

Mr. RODDA: Members of the Glencoe Dairymen's Association have spoken to me about the condition of the road between Glencoe East and the Princes Highway, a distance of nine miles. This is the main connecting road to Mount Gambier, and it is used by the residents of Glencoe East and Glencoe West, those distinguished people who are represented by the member for Millicent. This road was part of the Princes Highway before it was realigned but, because of its present poor condition, with numerous depressions in the bitumen, these residents have asked that the road be realigned and resurfaced. In bullock track fashion, it goes in and out like the dog at the fair. Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Roads and Transport to investigate this request?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I shall be happy to do that.

HOVERCRAFT

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Marine received an application for a licence to operate a hovercraft passenger and freight service in the Spencer Gulf area?

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Some approaches have been made in this regard, but I have not seen a definite application. Some conversations have been held on this matter, and the question of control of hovercraft and hydrofoils has been discussed by me and my officers with relation to amendments to regulations under the Harbors Act and the Marine Act. As the honourable member will realize,

these craft come within both categories of vessel. However, as I have no definite information concerning the matter to which the honourable member particularly referred, I will find out as quickly as possible.

ASBESTOS DUST

Mr. EVANS: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I recently asked about hazards associated with asbestos dust?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have a lengthy report from the Director-General of Public Health and, having had a quick look at the report, I think it will not make sense if I fragmentate it. If honourable members will therefore bear with me, I shall read it, as follows:

Asbestos has been used for at least 4,000 years, but it became an important industrial mineral only at the end of the last century. Since then its output has risen from about 500 tons to more than 3,000,000 tons a year. It now has innumerable uses in building, shipbuilding, insulating, refrigeration, engineering and many other industries. Asbestos is a generic name for a group of complex silicates. The common types of asbestos which have been used in industry are chrysotile, amosite, and crocidolite. There is at present a world-wide interest in asbestosis and its relationship to lung cancer, and in the association between exposure to asbestos dust and mesothelioma. The pulmonary fibrosis caused by asbestos (asbestosis) has been recognized as an occupational disease for over 50 years, and it is well recognized that the degree of hazard depends on air concentration of dust and period of exposure. In addition, it is now known that the dust of crocidolite is more hazardous than the other asbestos dusts for equal exposure. It has been established that patients with asbestosis have an increased risk of lung cancer. This risk has been shown to be between seven and 10-fold greater than the risk for the unexposed population. However the risk of lung cancer to workers in asbestos industries, who do not suffer from asbestosis, is the same as that for the general population.

The association between exposure to asbestos dust and mesothelioma was first noted in South Africa in 1960. Prior to that time, mesothelioma (a growth occurring on the serosal lining of the lung or abdominal cavity) was so rare as to be considered a medical oddity. These tumors are still rare, the total reported up to 1966 being about 500 in all parts of the world. Evidence from several countries suggests that exposure to crocidolite may be of particular importance in this condition. No authenticated case of mesothelioma following exposure to the dust of the other types of asbestos has yet been reported, but extensive research is currently being conducted overseas to confirm this. There have been reports of mesotheliomata occurring in people exposed for relatively short periods, or exposed to asbestos dust in a non-occupational environment. These reports have prompted extensive investigations which are still proceeding, and no absolute opinions can yet be expressed on those cases. However the majority have occurred in environments related to the mining or milling of asbestos, and many of the cases which have been subjected to thorough investigation have revealed that the exposure has been quite substantial. Officers of the Public Health Department are well aware of the hazards associated with exposure to asbestos dust. In 1955, a survey was conducted of the South Australian industries using asbestos, when dust counts and radiological examinations of workers were made. Some occupational environments were considered to be potentially hazardous and recommendations for improvement were made. No case of asbestosis or carcinoma of the lung was found.

A similar survey is at present being undertaken. In addition, cases of carcinoma of the lung and mesothelioma which have been admitted to public hospitals are being studied for possible association with asbestos dust. The records over the past 10 years include two cases only of mesothelioma. In one case there is an occupational history suggestive of exposure to asbestos whilst working in dockyards in England, and further information on this is being sought. Efforts to obtain information relating to the second case have so far been unsuccessful. All but a small amount of the asbestos used by South Australian industries is imported from South Africa or Canada. Large crocidolite deposits occur at Wittenoom, Western Australia. This mine operated until 1966, when poor fibre return, labour problems, transport costs, etc., forced its closure. Some crocidolite from Wittenoom is still used, but the stockpile is rapidly dwindling, so that the majority is now imported. Each of the three types of asbestos has slightly different properties and contributes characteristically to a product. In practice, some industrial asbestos products are manufactured using a mixture of the three fibres, blended in proportion according to the desired characteristics of the product. Although the greater hazard of crocidolite is known, there appears to be no move to find a substitute for inclusion in those products in which crocidolite is at present included because of its particular properties.

SLEEPY LIZARDS

Mr. RICHES: During the weekend I heard reports and read details of the exploitation being carried out in connection with sleepy lizards; indeed, the exploitation, which is on a far wider scale than I ever imagined when I asked my original question on the matter, is of considerable proportions. Has the Minister of Lands a reply to my original question about sleepy lizards, and can he say whether the Government has considered exercising control over their exploitation?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister of Agriculture reports as follows:

The well-known sleepy lizard is a prevalent species of lizard in this State, and is not protected under the provisions of the Fauna

Conservation Act. I am, however, astonished that anyone would subject these harmless reptiles to an apparently revolting preservation treatment as a commercial enterprise; and that people would wish to buy them is even more amazing. When this practice first came to notice recently, the Director of Fisheries and Fauna Conservation contacted certain city stores which were displaying "specimens" for sale, advising them that he would not grant permits for the export overseas of these reptiles. I and my department will certainly discourage this distasteful practice of preserving sleepy lizards for sale, and I sincerely trust that the exploitation of this species of native fauna in this way will cease, now that it has been made public. I have received a recommendation from the Flora and Fauna Advisory Committee urging that certain classes of reptile be protected in this State, and this matter is at present being examined by officers of the Crown Solicitor's Department.

TOURIST INDUSTRY

Mr. CORCORAN: Has the Minister of Immigration and Tourism a reply to my question of last week about a survey being conducted in relation to Queensland's tourist industry and also about the appointment of a research officer to the South Australian Tourist Bureau?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I have the following information from the Director of the Tourist Bureau:

Detailed official information has not been received yet regarding the Queensland tourist research survey. The information has been sought. The scheme appears to have merit. It was for the purpose of carrying out similar work that a request was made and approval given for the creation of the new office of Research Officer in the Tourist Bureau. Unfortunately, a suitable person with the necessary academic training and experience has not yet been found. I have discussed the vacancy again with one of the Commissioners of the Public Service Board and he has informed me that further attempts to find a suitable person will be made.

ELIZABETH INDUSTRY

Mr. CLARK: During the last few days I have been most concerned, indeed saddened, to hear that the factory of Worldwide Camps Proprietary Limited at Elizabeth has put off about 100 employees in the last few weeks. This is bad news at any time, but it is particularly bad now with the Christmas season approaching. In his capacity of Minister of Industrial Development, will the Premier ascertain the number of employees put off and, if possible, the reason for their being put off? Also, will he ascertain the likelihood of their future re-employment by this firm?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I, too, was concerned at the laying-off that occurred at Worldwide Camps Proprietary Limited. I hope that the company will obtain increased orders to enable it to re-employ these people as soon as possible. I think that anyone who has been through the plant as I have and as, no doubt, the honourable member has, and who has studied the type of operation and the types of sale made by the company will realize that this is not a day-to-day business in the sense of continuity of orders.

Mr. Clark: I thought they were booming.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Yes, I believe that, as a company, this company is solid. However, in the study I made several months ago of the company's operations and selling efforts, it became apparent to me that much of the demand for its products was based on large single orders. Of course, if orders do not eventuate in proper sequence, the requirements of the factory are spasmodic. At the time I was there, the company was negotiating for a multi-million dollar oversea order. It may be that that order did not eventuate, for the competition for this business overseas is most keen.

Mr. Broomhill: It's not very satisfactory for the employees.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: No, it is not, but this is a problem inherent in that type of industry, much as I regret the laying-off that has occurred. I will obtain the necessary information for the honourable member and draw to the company's attention his question.

TAXATION REIMBURSEMENTS

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question about taxation reimbursements?

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I have the following report:

In calculating the grant payable to the States each year the grant actually paid in the previous year to each State is increased by (1) the percentage increase in the population of the individual State; (2) the percentage increase in the level of average wages throughout Australia; and (3) a betterment factor of 1.2 per cent. The main alternative within the formula offered by the Commonwealth in June, 1965, was whether the 12 months' period for the wage calculation should be the previous financial year (as under the previous arrangements) or a more up-to-date period ending on March 31 of the year of payment. The States determined unanimously to continue the old arrangement in respect of wages because, on the estimates before them at that time, that was the more favourable alternative. In February, 1967, the Commonwealth again offered to up-date the period for measurement of wage movements. The States accepted that offer because, on the estimates available to them, to do so would mean increased grants.

The taxation reimbursement grants actually received by South Australia and the preliminary estimate for this year are as follows:

	$ (million)
1965-66	86.5
1966-67	94.3
1967-68	102.7
1968-69 (estimate)	111.1
Total	394.6

Had the alternative offered by the Commonwealth in June, 1965, been accepted the amounts would have been as follows:

	$ (million)
1965-66	85.1
1966-67	92.8
1967-68	101.0
1968-69 (estimate)	109.2
Total	388.1

That would have been about $6,500,000 less for the four years.

The honourable member will see that the adoption of the second offer made in February, 1967, by the Commonwealth Government has resulted in grants to the States being increased from what they would have been by $6,500,000. The other part of the question dealt with the effects of the $1.35 wage increase on the finances of the Commonwealth and the States. The result in the current financial year will be that the Commonwealth will receive a net gain, after all deductions for its own wage costs and its reimbursements to the States, of $16,000,000, whereas the net cost to the States, after deducting from the actual wage costs the sum to be recovered from the Commonwealth, will be $14,000,000. In other words, as a result of the wage increase the Commonwealth will gain a net $16,000,000 and the States will suffer a net loss of $14,000,000.

BOOL LAGOON

Mr. NANKIVELL: The Minister indicated that the water from Bool Lagoon was now being released via Drain M because Bakers Range Drain has not run so much this year as is usual. In view of the need for water—

At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

PARKIN CONGREGATIONAL MISSION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA INCORPORATED BILL

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

THE REPORT

The Select Committee to which the House of Assembly referred the Parkin Congregational Mission of South Australia Incorporated Bill, 1968, has the honour to report:

1. In the course of its inquiry, your committee met on two occasions, and took evidence from the following witnesses:

Mr. R. J. Keynes, the Reverend M. F. Sawyer, and Mr. P. R. Morgan, President, Secretary, and Solicitor respectively of and for the Parkin Congregational Mission of South Australia Incorporated.

Mr. G. A. Hackett-Jones, Legal Officer, Crown Solicitor's Department, Adelaide.

2. Advertisements inserted in the *Advertiser* and the *News*, inviting interested persons to give evidence before the committee, brought no response.

3. Evidence submitted to the committee indicated that the proposed alterations to the deed of trust of the Parkin Congregational Mission of South Australia would bring that trust more into line with present-day requirements. This view was expressed in evidence as follows:

> We are looking to the future to see how best we can utilize our funds in the changing circumstances that face the church today, and to interpret this matter as William Parkin would have done in his day and age.

4. Your committee is of the opinion that the proposed alteration to the trust is both desirable and necessary, that there is no opposition to these proposals, and recommends that the Bill be passed in its present form.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Weights and Measures Act, 1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It arises from a review of the first year of operation of the system of administration provided by that Act. At the same time it makes the consequential adjustments to the weights and measures legislation as are necessary following the passage of the Packages Act, 1967. Clauses 1 and 2 are quite formal and clause 3 amends the arrangement of sections provision in consequence of an amendment effective to the body of the Bill. Clause 4 inserts a definition of "financial year" in the

principal Act. This is merely to make the use of the expression in the Act quite clear. Clause 5 amends the heading to Division I of Part III of the Act to ensure that the heading more accurately reflects the contents of the division.

Clause 6 re-enacts the provisions of the Act relating to the appointment of the officials to administer it and in particular spells out the power of the Deputy Warden of Standards to substitute for the Warden of Standards during any absence from that office. In the principal Act in its present form, it is felt that there may be a suggestion that the appointment of a deputy was a mere *ad hoc* one which would be most inconvenient for the administration of the weights and measures branch of the Lands Department. Clause 7 enacts a new section 14a, which is really a combination of sections 20 and 21, which deal with offences and breaches of confidence by council inspectors. In its re-enacted form this provision has been expressed to apply to all inspectors, that is, Government inspectors, as well as council inspectors and sections 20 and 21 will accordingly be repealed.

Clause 8 repairs what appears to be an omission in the principal Act. At section 15 of that Act the local administration of the Act was, in effect, vested in municipal councils and no reference was made to district councils. In fact, a number of district councils have undertaken the local administration of the Act and this amendment regularizes this position. At the same time due regard has been paid to the position of those district councils which have surrendered their local administration to the central administration. Clause 9 again repeals and re-enacts in the interests of clarity the provision of the principal Act which deals with the appointment of council inspectors. Clauses 10 and 11 repeal sections 20 and 21 which have been substantially enacted as new section 14a.

Clause 12 spells out a little more clearly the duty of the "proper officer" of the Garden Suburb Commissioner and the Whyalla City Commission as to the provision of returns and alters the date for their lodging from November 1 to August 1, in the interests of convenience of reporting. Clause 13 corrects two minor clerical errors in the principal Act in section 30. Clause 14 inserts the word "re-verification" after the word "verification" in section 35 of the principal Act. It is of some importance that these two procedures be distinguished since although they involve comparing the appropriate instrument or measure with a fixed standard in the case of re-verification the tolerances or allowable departures from the standard are approximately twice what they are in the case of verification.

Clause 15 amends section 42 of the Act, which amongst other things provides that an agreement made with reference to unjust weights will be void. The amendment in effect proposes that where the use of the unjust weight was due to a mistake or to a cause over which the user had no control then the agreement will not be void. Clause 16 repeals section 45 of the principal Act which is no longer necessary since appropriate provision for the use of metric and other systems as Commonwealth legal units of measurement is made elsewhere in this Act. Clause 17 repeals section 46 of the principal Act which dealt with the marking of metric weight on the packages used for trade. This matter is now dealt with adequately under the Packages Act.

Clause 18 corrects a clerical error in section 47 of the principal Act. Clause 19 strikes out from section 49 two provisions that are now included in the Packages Act. Clause 20 repeals section 50, since a provision having the same effect is now included in the Packages Act. Clause 21 amends section 52 of the principal Act by granting certain powers of inspection already vested in council inspectors to Government inspectors. Clause 22 amends section 55 of the Act by including the fact of re-verification as well as the fact of verification amongst the facts that must be proved by the owner of the instrument. Clause 23 amends section 60 by making clear the classes of officers who may commence prosecutions without fear of being personally liable to costs. Clause 24 amends section 67 of the Act by extending the scope of certain offences in relation to obstruction, etc., of council inspectors to include similar action in relation to Government inspectors. Clause 25 amends section 68 of the Act to make it clear that the regulating power in respect of verification extends also to re-verification.

Mr. CORCORAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

SWINE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Swine Compensation Act, 1936-1964. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to give effect to the wishes of the pig industry (as expressed by deputations to the Minister of Agriculture from the United Farmers and Graziers of S.A. Incorporated) to provide the Agriculture Department with funds to enable it to establish a pig research unit at the Northfield Research Centre. This unit will provide facilities for conducting research into diseases and nutritional disorders of pigs as a basis for future extension activities by the department in connection with the pig industry. A total of $50,000 is required to construct, equip, and stock the centre, and plans have already been prepared for this purpose. In addition, the industry representatives have agreed to the annual allocation from the fund of an increased amount of $10,000 in lieu of the present allocation of $5,000. This will assist in staffing the research unit and cover contingent expenses.

The research unit will provide facilities for the isolation of pigs undergoing tests and for the study of obscure problems of pig health associated with infective and nutritional factors. The unit will be run by the staff of the Northfield Research Centre under the technical supervision of officers of the Animal Health Branch of the department. Clause 2 amends section 12 of the principal Act so as to provide for the payment out of the Swine Compensation Fund of $50,000 to establish a research piggery to be conducted by the Agriculture Department. It further provides that after July 1, 1969, a sum not exceeding $10,000 a year may be expended from the fund for research and investigation into swine diseases. The amount previously authorized to be expended was $5,000 a year.

With improvements in pig health and the consequent build-up in the compensation fund it was considered by leaders of the industry that money could be spent wisely on research, and the assistance that has been offered will greatly benefit the industry. As the Minister of Agriculture would like the Bill passed through Parliament this week I will probably ask for it to be discussed later, but as it is a straightforward Bill I should prefer to have it dealt with immediately, if the Opposition does not object.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): The Opposition supports this Bill, and I agree that the Swine Compensation Fund is buoyant. The Auditor-General reported that there was $348,046 in the fund at present, so that there was ample money to cover the $50,000 required by the department to set up the piggery. I am pleased that the department has done this, because in the last five or 10 years the pig industry has progressed. The sale of pig meat in South Australia has exceeded all expectations but, unfortunately, the housewife has not had the benefit of a lower price for pig meat. Recently, the member for Rocky River said that there was still a disparity between the price paid by the housewife and that received by the producer, but the industry is growing appreciably and the setting up of the piggery will benefit it further. As the Opposition does not wish to hinder the passage of this Bill, I support it.

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

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I thank the House for its courtesy, and I have no doubt that the industry will appreciate the speed with which this House has worked.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the Bill.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Labour and Industry) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Service Act, 1967. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It is intended to remedy what has appeared as an omission in the principal Act. Section 126 of that Act purported to apply the long service leave provision of the principal Act to employees of the State who are not members of the Public Service within the meaning of the Act. However, the Government has been advised that this section is not adequate to extend to such employees the provisions of the principal Act relating to payments to certain persons who do not qualify for long service leave. Payments of this nature are often referred to as pro rata long service leave payments. Since it was clearly the intention of the

Government that provision for such payments should extend to employees of this class this Bill at clause 2 repeals and re-enacts section 126 of the principal Act and applies the long service leave provision and the pro rata long service leave provisions to these employees. The amendment is expressed to have retrospective effect to the day on which the principal Act came into operation.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): This brief Bill is designed to remove anomalies in the present Act in relation to long service leave and, as it was designed to cover suggestions made by members on this side, we do not oppose it.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

SCIENTOLOGY (PROHIBITION) BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Few honourable members will be unaware of the growing public disquiet engendered by those associated with the spread of the studies of the so-called sciences of dianetics and scientology. In Victoria in 1963 a Board of Inquiry into Scientology was appointed by Order in Council. Mr. Kevin Victor Anderson of the Victorian Bar, a Queen's Counsel, constituted the board. His report, the "Anderson report" published in September, 1965, rapidly achieved a wide measure of acceptance as a definitive and impartial study of the subject and its effects on the community. Mr. Anderson's conclusions can be summed up in his words "Scientology is evil; its techniques evil; its practice is a serious threat to the community medically, morally and socially; and its adherents sadly deluded and often mentally ill." I would commend the 200-odd pages of the Anderson report to the attention of honourable members.

In 1967 a document entitled "Kangaroo Court—An investigation into the conduct of the Board of Inquiry into Scientology" appeared; it is published by the Hubbard College of Scientology and represents the scientologist's view of Mr. Anderson's conduct of the inquiry. Again, I commend this document to the attention of honourable members since it represents the case for scientology. Scientology and dianetics are the brain children of Lafayette Ron Hubbard, a native of the United States of America, who continues to this time apparently to exercise an extraordinary degree of personal control over the operations of these so-called sciences. He is a prolific writer on these subjects and the Anderson report at page 47 has this to say:

> Expert psychiatric evidence was to the effect that the Hubbard writings are the product of an unsound mind. This opinion emerged from a combination of the qualities observable in his writings, which contain great histrionics and hysterical, incontinent outbursts, which, by the very nature of their language, indicate their author to be mentally abnormal. They abound in self-glorification, and grandiosity: Hubbard claims that he is always right, that he has all knowledge on all subjects and that he has had supreme experiences, including visits to the Van Allen Belt, Venus and Heaven; he claims equality with Einstein, Freud, Sir James Jeans and others, and immeasurable superiority to all leaders in learning past and present whose teachings do not agree with or support his propositions; he has instituted his own calendar, his own dynasty and he grants amnesties as would a potentate.

This gentleman appears to exercise absolute and total control over scientological activities throughout the world. In 1951 he developed the so-called science of "dianetics" which has been defined as "a system for the analysis, control and development of human thought from a set of co-ordinated axioms which also provide techniques for the treatment of a wide range of mental disorders and organic diseases". From dianetics Hubbard evolved the so-called science of scientology which has as its professed aim "to make people more able" and which does not contain any mention of the curing of mental or physical ills as does the so-called science of dianetics. Generally the practitioners of scientology state that dianetics is no longer practised as part of scientology, since claims to cure mental and physical illness are liable to attract actions for fraud. However, the Anderson report suggests very strongly that dianetics are practised conjointly with scientology and certainly the proponents of scientology have no qualms about letting their adherents claim numerous cases where mental and physical ailments have been alleviated through scientology.

Generally a person is introduced to scientology through advertisements relating to improvements in personal efficiency or personal development courses; these courses often do not mention scientology and are usually advertised as being "free" or "without obligation". Once the person attends such courses it is suggested to him, that by undergoing a "clearing process", he can increase his efficiency and develop greater intelligence and a more fully developed personality. At this stage all the techniques of high pressure salesmanship

are applied and the subject is induced to sign up for a number of hours of auditing at a cost of the order of $8 an hour. This process of auditing takes place between the subject and a practitioner known as the auditor, and as to this the Anderson report says:

Many scientology techniques beyond the elementary stages are essentially those of command or authoritative hypnosis and are potentially dangerous to mental health. Scientology processing or auditing is administered by scientology-trained auditors "who have no knowledge or appreciation of, or skill in, orthodox psychiatry or psychology; they are generally unaware of the dangers of the techniques which they practise and are unable to detect in their patients a variety of symptoms which would indicate to a medical practitioner or a trained psychologist mental and physical conditions which may require professional treatment".

During these auditing sessions the subject is encouraged and even commanded to reveal his innermost thoughts and fantasies which are recorded and checked against an instrument known as the E-meter which is described in detail in the Anderson report. The progress of the subject through the auditings is assessed, and tremendous pressures are placed on the subject to progress along the stages to his complete release from his alleged aberrations. It must be remembered that further progress is contingent on further hours of auditing at $8 an hour. The Anderson report suggests that these assessments are nothing more than spurious nonsense designed to ensure that the subject, often fully dominated by the organization, continues to take more and more hours of auditing. It is significant that of the thousands of adherents claimed by scientology no-one has reached the stage of "operating thetan" the ultimate stage of complete release. A characteristic of an operating thetan is his total control over matter, energy, space, time, life and form. An operating thetan can, it is alleged, knock off hats at 50 yards. The remainder of the adherents, wishing to obtain the ultimate development, must continue with their hours of auditing. What then of a person who sees scientology for what it is and desires to break away from it and even to criticize its tenets publicly? Such a person, in the jargon of the cult called a "suppressive person", can expect considerable vilification from scientologists together with a co-ordinated campaign of poison pen letters and telephone calls, but must he live in fear of something far worse? On critics of scientology Hubbard in his official journal, *Communication,* Vol. 9, No. 3, writes:

Now get this as a technical fact, not a hopeful idea. Every time we have investigated the background of a critic of scientology we have found crimes for which that person or group could be imprisoned under existing law. We do not find critics of scientology who do not have criminal pasts. Over and over we prove this—

and he goes on to say in the same article:

We are slowly and carefully teaching the unholy a lesson. It is as follows; "We are not a law enforcement agency. But we will become interested in the crimes of people who seek to stop us. If you oppose scientology we will probably look you up—and will find and expose your crimes. If you leave us alone we will leave you alone."

I invite members to consider the frightening implications of these words for a person who has laid bare his innermost secrets and thoughts in auditing sessions in scientology, who knows that his revelations have been recorded and who now wishes to break away from the movement. Scientology has a particular appeal to people who for one reason or another feel socially inadequate. When such people are subject to the pressures inherent in the "clearing" process of scientology, coupled with the command or authoritative hypnotic techniques of auditing, they may get an illusionary feeling of well being, but there is a greater chance that the application of these techniques by unskilled persons may result in a complete mental breakdown. In any case, the knowledge that the scientology centre possesses a complete record of a person's most intimate revelations places that person in a totally frightening degree of moral subjection. No responsible Government could be expected to tolerate this situation. In fact, this problem has concerned the Ministers of Health at both their 1967 and 1968 conferences.

The Anderson report recommended, in effect, that scientology should be controlled by the establishment of a council to control the activities of qualified psychologists and, as a corollary, the improper and unskilled psychological practices of scientologists should be proscribed. Mr. Anderson did not consider that suppressing scientology by name would be sufficient. However, in any event, the Psychological Practices Act, 1965, of Victoria did both of these things and its effectiveness can be gauged from the fact that a number of scientology executives appear to have since left Victoria and taken up residence in this State. The Government has given earnest consideration whether it should adopt either or both of the approaches adopted in the Victorian legislation. In this consideration, it

has had the advantage of a view expressed to the former Attorney-General from the South Australian Branch of the Australian Psychological Society, an organization of trained professional psychologists, suggesting some opposition by that society to legislation controlling psychologists being linked with the suppression of scientology.

The Government's thinking on this matter is that legislation regulating a legitimate profession should be introduced only after full discussion with the members of the profession concerned. Honourable members may be aware that when this Bill was introduced in another place it was referred to a Select Committee and as a result was substantially amended. The Bill provides as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 sets out certain definitions of which three are of some particular significance. The definition of "galvanometer" has been included to encompass the device known as an "E-meter" which is part of the trappings of the cult. In addition, a definition of "scientological records" has been included to cover records of a "confessional nature" and a definition of "scientology" itself has been included. Clause 3 in effect prohibits the teaching etc. of scientology and the use of the E-meter.

Clause 4 enjoins persons holding or having in their custody or control scientological records to deliver them immediately to the Attorney-General where, pursuant to clause 6, they may be destroyed. Clause 5 provides for the issue of search warrants in relation to scientological records. Clause 6, as has already been stated, deals with the destruction of scientological records. Clause 7 prohibits interference, etc., with the execution of a search warrant issued under the Act. Clause 8 provides for summary hearings of offences against the Act, that is, that proceedings may be determined in a summary way under the Justices Act, and also provides that no prosecution for a breach of the Act shall be commenced without the certificate of the Attorney-General. Clause 9 gives a general regulation-making power.

In introducing this measure, the Government does not impeach the good faith of numbers of adherents of scientology, but it does suggest that their beliefs are misguided ones and it believes that the system is essentially ill-conceived and as such it has inflicted and is capable of inflicting untold distress and harm to the mental health and social fabric of the community.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 3. Page 2924.)

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): On behalf of the Opposition, I support the second reading. It is necessary to support it in order that there should be a Select Committee to inquire upon the matters of substance referred to in the Bill. In giving support to the second reading, I indicate to the Attorney-General that support on the second reading stage does not imply that any member on this side is committed to the Bill or to any other measure on this matter.

Mr. Corcoran: That should be made clear.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: That is understood.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I want that understood, because I point out that, when similar proceedings were being debated somewhere else recently in order to provide for a Select Committee of inquiry, it was later suggested that support of the second reading involved support of the principles of the Bill. Members on this side believe that it is useful, indeed most desirable, at this stage of proceedings to have an inquiry on this important issue. Therefore, we intend to co-operate in the holding of the inquiry and thus we will vote for the second reading.

Mr. EVANS (Onkaparinga): At this stage, I do not want to speak about whether I agree with the Bill. After this matter has been considered by a Select Committee, I should like to express my point of view. Personally, I believe that some reform of the present law should be made, but I shall have to be guided by the people in my area, and I shall not be able to express my personal view. At this stage, I should be happy to see a Select Committee look into the matter.

Mr. CASEY (Frome): In view of the remarks made by the Leader, I will go along with the second reading of the Bill in order that a Select Committee can be appointed. However, I make it clear at this stage that I will not support the Bill as it is now drawn.

I take that view mainly because I am a Catholic, my religious convictions being such that I do not believe the way the Bill deals with abortion to be entirely in the best interests of the community. I think the introduction of the Bill is most inopportune. I cannot find anything in the Attorney-General's second reading explanation to substantiate why he should have introduced provisions as wide as those contained in the Bill. I think the Act could be tidied up, as it is out of line with what is going on today in hospitals through the medium of gynaecologists and other medical practitioners. I support the second reading of the Bill, but I will speak on it again after the Select Committee's report has been tabled.

Mr. GILES (Gumeracha): The Bill could be one of the most controversial pieces of legislation introduced in South Australia for many years. Under the Act, abortion is totally prohibited in any circumstances, and I do not agree with that situation. I believe circumstances exist that require a woman to be aborted for the sake of her health, but we should not relax this law to the point where it would make it easy for a woman to have this operation performed on her. The Bill takes away this prohibition to the extent that where a pregnant woman's actual or foreseeable environment is endangered she will be able to be aborted with the consent of two independent practising qualified medical men. I do not consider that this should be permitted, as it could lead to immorality, not only on the part of unmarried women but on the part of married women as well. I agree that where pack rapes or acts of incest take place a woman should be allowed to be aborted, but these are exceptional circumstances. More abortions are performed in Sweden than in any other country of the world. Sweden also has the highest suicide rate.

Mr. Freebairn: What do you think justifies those two statements?

Mr. GILES: Those figures are available in the Parliamentary Library, but whether there is any connection between the two figures I do not know; there could be. Whatever decisions are made as a result of the Bill will upset many people in South Australia: certain religious orders believe there should be no abortion; other religious orders believe abortion should be allowed to a certain degree; and some people believe that if a woman does not desire to bear a child she should be allowed the right to be aborted. Many of the people in my district are satisfied with the law as it is at present. If a woman's life is in danger, a doctor is allowed to perform an abortion, but this provision should not be extended any further. I support the Bill, so that a Select Committee can be formed to further investigate the position, but I am not in favour of widening the scope of the Bill to make it easy for any woman to have an operation performed on her.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): I support the second reading, in the knowledge that the Bill will be referred to a Select Committee, although if the Bill were not to be referred to a Select Committee I would have difficulty in supporting it on the second reading. I have had a number of representations made to me by people in my district protesting at the proposed change in the law, and most of these have done so without real knowledge of the extent to which the Bill alters the present law. Some of the representations were made in the belief that the change in the law would be far more drastic than will be the case. I congratulate the Attorney-General on introducing the Bill, and I look forward to the Select Committee's report.

Mr. ARNOLD (Chaffey): I, too, support the second reading of the Bill, knowing that a Select Committee will be set up; but I believe that the Bill is too broad and far-reaching. I agree with certain alterations to the Act: for example, in the case of a proven attack the woman involved should not be subjected to having to continue any pregnancy that may have resulted from it. The strong medical grounds will need to be spelled out in the Bill more clearly before I give it my support on the third reading.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support the second reading and congratulate the Attorney-General on introducing a Bill on a question of considerable public interest at this time. I welcome the setting up of a Select Committee, so that everyone in the community will be able to put his case for or against the Bill. I am a broad-minded person who is open to suggestions to change the law, but the Bill goes too far. There are definite cases where a female has been sinned against by society and where she should have the protection of society in trying to solve her problems, but when it comes down to the discretion of an individual whether or not there should be an abortion where those circumstances do not exist I am against any extension of power to enable such abortions to be carried out.

I support the appointment of a Select Committee, because it will consider the evidence and enable Parliament to reach a proper decision on this important matter.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): Many people in my district have expressed concern at the introduction of this type of legislation, and I have received petitions to that effect. All persons and representatives will be able to place their views before the Select Committee and I will ensure that the persons concerned are conversant with the machinery of doing that. Personally, I dislike this type of legislation. Abortion is a social question and it has concerned the people of this country and many other countries for some time. Of course, abortion is practised in many countries.

Mr. Hurst: Do you believe in birth control?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Bill does not deal with that matter.

Mr. RODDA: As the committee will consider the matter of abortion, I am not required to express an opinion now. However, if I were required to state my opinion I would be against abortion. I do not bind myself to support any recommendation made by the committee, which I hope will be given time to consider the whole question. It has been said the Roman Catholic church is expressing much concern, and I think the member for Millicent (Mr. Corcoran) is correct when he says that Roman Catholics are not the only people to complain about this measure. Many Protestants have joined issue with me over this. I must say that, although I thought that many people in my district would not be concerned, they have been outspoken in their comments to me, as a member of the Government Party. I do not want to cast a silent vote: I undertake to see that the people in my district are made fully aware of the ramifications of giving evidence before the committee.

Mr. RICHES (Stuart): The Leader of the Opposition has made clear the position of members on this side. I have received representations from people in my district, including members of the Methodist church, who consider that a case for some alteration in the law can be made out but are not prepared to support any alteration being made until the question has been examined much more fully than has been the case to date. The Select Committee should give us that additional information. I have received from the Roman Catholic community in my district the biggest petition that I have received in my 35 years as a member of Parliament. I know the principal signatory personally and I consider that I owe it to the House to make known that about 256 heads of households, who are persons well known to me, in Port Augusta alone have indicated their strong opposition to the Bill. I support the second reading so that the committee can be appointed, and I suggest that all of us should have considerable information made available as a result of the inquiry.

Bill read a second time and referred to a Select Committee consisting of Mrs. Steele and Messrs. Corcoran, Evans, Loveday and Millhouse; the committee to have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to adjourn from place to place; the committee to report or February 13.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from December 5. Page 3065.)

Mr. HUDSON (Glenelg): I support the Bill.

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

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): I move:

That this Bill be now read a third time.

I thank the House for its courtesy in allowing me to move the third reading immediately.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PUBLIC SERVICE ARBITRATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 23. Page 2112.)

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): This Bill has been introduced to clarify certain provisions as a result of changes following the appointment of the Public Service Arbitrator, whereby the Arbitrator was given power to deal with certain matters formerly dealt with by the Public Service Board. It also corrects certain drafting errors. I support the second reading, but certain provisions must be considered, particularly the situation regarding the power of the Arbitrator in relation to certain matters. Amendments designed to improve the situation have been filed. The Arbitrator has authority to deal with salaries, but the Bill does not provide for him to deal with allowances of public servants. The Minister has acknowledged that factors within the Public Service groupings need attention, and the Bill permits individuals to make representations about their positions. Also, the Minister has acknowledged that situations can arise where, because

the Public Service Board is now the employer, many allowances for public servants can be improved.

Allowances in some cases are important in regard to actual salaries, and we intend to try to obviate the hardships that may occur within certain classifications. In addition, we acknowledge that occasions arise when officers encounter situations that are not normally encountered by the average public servant. No precedent would be set by implementing a provision to have allowances considered by the Arbitrator, as similar provision exists in the relevant Western Australian and Commonwealth Acts. Without the provisions that we seek to include in the measure, we believe the legislation is not serving the purpose for which it is designed. Intending to move certain amendments in Committee, we support the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Definitions."

Mr. HURST: I do not intend to proceed with the amendment to this clause that is on the file in my name.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 10 passed.

Clause 11—"Jurisdiction."

Mr. HURST: I move:

In subclause (1) after "in relation to" to insert "(*e*)"; and after "Offices" to insert:

or

(*f*) the allowances which may be paid to officers under paragraph (*a*) of subsection (1) of section 36 of the Public Service Act, 1967, and the circumstances or conditions in or under which any such allowance shall be payable.

The reason for the amendment is that the Arbitrator should have power to consider the allowances of officers who come within section 36 (1) (*a*) of the Public Service Act. Although members will be aware that we do not intend to cover every matter referred to in the Act, we believe that, where officers may not be satisfied with a decision of the board concerning allowances, they should have the right to apply to the Arbitrator to have the matter determined. The Arbitrator, in determining an initial salary, often considers various factors. A situation could develop whereby a group of employees was confronted with factors such as travelling allowances, quarters, meal allowances and so on that could have a great effect on their salary. Where a person suffers some disability, that should be recognized.

As the Arbitrator will determine many matters, surely he should also have the authority to determine the allowances to which I have referred. It is apparent from the Minister's second reading explanation that groups of officers will be considered and that the Arbitrator will not fix salaries for individuals. Why should he not have the power to proceed to determine these other allowances if a situation develops whereby those officers are not satisfied with the decision of the board? The principle of arbitration is for officers or employees to confer with their employer about a matter and to try to reach agreement. If agreement cannot be reached, then the matter is referred to an arbitrator. Since the board has now virtually become the employer, I think it is only logical that, if employees cannot reach agreement with the board, they should be able to approach the Arbitrator and have him determine what is fair and reasonable. The Arbitrator should be able to decide in these cases. Allowances have always been regarded as part of the wage structure of employees. I hope the Minister will agree to the amendment.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I cannot accept the honourable member's amendment, and I do not think it would achieve what he desires. The present Public Service Arbitration Act was passed in 1961 and was a big improvement on what existed in those days. It enabled the appointment of an Arbitrator to determine salary standards for the Public Service. The Act intended that the salaries of individual officers and the conditions of their employment in the Public Service should continue to be prescribed by regulation under the Public Service Act or by the Public Service Board with recourse to the Industrial Commission, and that the jurisdiction of the Arbitrator should continue to be confined to the determination of salaries. The honourable member will recall that, when the Public Service Act passed this place last year, section 36 (to which the honourable member referred) provided that the Public Service Board would fix all the allowances set out in that section. That provision was included by the previous Government and the honourable member agreed to it. He is now attempting to vary some of these conditions which touch on travelling allowances, quarters, meal allowances, and so on.

I point out that the jurisdiction of the Arbitrator is invoked only when a specific claim is made in respect of a section or a

group, but not when a claim is made in respect of the whole of the Public Service. I am sure the honourable member will appreciate that the allowances to which he refers in many cases affect individual officers. The Public Service Board, the constitution of which was changed during the term of the previous Government, had its responsibilities spelt out, and it is able to deal with these matters. Obviously many of these allowances have a general application in the service. Of course, they are considered by the board for the whole of the service, but they can apply to individuals. If the amendment were carried, there could be a multiplicity of matters arise with an immediate piece-meal consideration of each of those matters raised by individual groups or organizations.

Section 36 of the Public Service Act sets out a number of items, many of which are administrative. In the main, they are reimbursements of expenses incurred by officers in the course of their normal duties. I, together with the previous Government which brought this section into the Act, considered that these should be administered by the Public Service Board, as reimbursement of expenses is not a matter that should go to the Arbitrator. I am sure that the board has the respect of all members of this House, as it has a well-trained staff and is a specialist in all of these matters. It is a continuing board, which holds frequent meetings and which has the ability to meet promptly, whereas the Arbitrator does not have this facility: if he is in the course of another hearing, this matter may be delayed. Detailed decisions of this nature are more appropriate to the board than to the Arbitrator, so to empower the Arbitrator to make awards in the matter of allowances could very well delay and negate what the honourable member is trying to achieve by the amendment. There could be a division of authority between the board and the Arbitrator.

It is sufficient that the Public Service Board and the Industrial Commission are empowered to deal with matters of this nature, if they are industrial matters. Since the amendment has been on file I have consulted the Chairman of the board and the Secretary of the Department of Labour and Industry to get their feelings on these matters, and they are both opposed to the amendment, mainly because they feel that the jurisdiction of the Arbitrator should continue to be confined to determining salaries and not be extended to allowances or other conditions of employment. In the past, the Arbitrator has had jurisdiction over salaries and incremental increases and the board has had jurisdiction over travelling expenses, meal allowances and reimbursement expenses. I mentioned the question of groups and the whole of the service, but what possibly has escaped the honourable member's notice is that, although some other States have this provision, there is no further appeal in those States, whereas in South Australia, if a dispute arises between the Arbitrator and the board, the appellant, whether a group of officers or the Public Service Association, has the right to approach the State Industrial Commission. This provision does not apply in the Commonwealth or in some of the other States where the provisions the honourable member is seeking are included. There is finality: there is no further appeal.

I suggest to the honourable member and the Committee that it would not be in the best interests of the service if his amendment was carried. If a dispute occurred, the claimants would have recourse to the Industrial Commission set up to hear this type of dispute, in addition to many others. What could happen is that there would be a multiplicity of claims and much overwork. The jurisdiction of the Arbitrator is made in respect to a section or group, not in relation to the whole of the Public Service. The matters to which the honourable member has referred are, in the main, reimbursement of expenses incurred, and the Arbitrator has a clear duty laid down by Parliament to fix salaries and incremental increases. I also point out that the honourable member agreed, and his Government agreed (when the Public Service Act was altered last year), to just the provision he now wants to alter. This amendment cannot be accepted, because I suggest to the honourable member that it would not achieve what he hopes it would.

Mr. HURST: I regret that the Minister cannot accept the amendment, but there seems to be some misunderstanding. The items provided in section 36 (1) (*a*) of the Public Service Act are part of an employee's working conditions, and in the cause of good industrial relations there should be an authority to deal with as many aspects of these conditions as possible. I hope the Minister will see the wisdom of this amendment, as it will provide an important step in obtaining good industrial relations between the officers of the Public Service and the board. It will eliminate the feeling that they can only accept what the board decides to give them.

The Hon. J. W. H. COUMBE: Public servants are affected by the question of their basic salaries and of incremental increases, and these are the main considerations of the Arbitrator. Allowances and riembursements are best handled by the board. I do not suggest that everyone is satisfied, but I believe the present method is the best way to handle what is mainly an administrative matter. If a group is not satisfied, the Act provides that it may appeal to the Industrial Commission, a safeguard that is not present in the Acts of some other States. In this case, if agreement is not reached on reimbursements, the claimant can go to the Industrial Commission. That is the best method. The amendment would not achieve what the honourable member wanted and would clog up the wheels of negotiation, causing delays. The honourable member has not submitted any new information, and the Government will not accept his amendment. I suggest that he has not advanced any substantial argument to justify acceptance of it, particularly as it interposes the Public Service Arbitrator in a system that has been working satisfactorily. One of the reasons why Parliament last year established the new Public Service Board was to give provisions such as are contained in this clause a trial and, although the board has been operating for only about 12 months, many of these matters have to be ironed out. A backlag of items has been agreed upon and I consider that the board is catching up on delays and adapting itself to the new procedures outlined in the 1967 Act. In my discussions with the Public Service Association, agreement was reached on many of the matters dealt with in the Bill, although agreement could not be reached in regard to this particular provision. I suggest that the honourable member withdraw the amendment, in the interests of the people he purports to represent.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Broomhill and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Casey, Clark, Corcoran, Dunstan, Hudson, Hughes, Hurst (teller), Jennings, Langley, Lawn, Loveday, McKee, Riches, Ryan, and Virgo.

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Brookman, Coumbe (teller), Edwards, Evans, Ferguson, Freebairn, Giles, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Venning and Wardle.

The CHAIRMAN: There are 18 Ayes and 18 Noes. There being an equality of votes, I give my casting vote in favour of the Noes. The question therefore passes in the negative.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Claims by Board."

Mr. HURST: My amendment to this clause is consequential, and I do not intend to proceed with it.

Clause passed.

Clause 14—"Claims by organizations and groups."

Mr. HURST: I do not intend to proceed with my amendment.

Clause passed.

[*Sitting suspended from* 6 *to* 7.30 *p.m.*]

Remaining clauses (15 to 26), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment. Committee's report adopted.

FRUIT AND PLANT PROTECTION BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, lines 8 and 9 (clause 3)—Leave out the definition of "the Chief Horticulturist".

No. 2. Page 7, line 12 (clause 17)—After "by" insert "registered".

No. 3. Page 7—After clause 18 insert new clause as follows:—

"18a. Governor may amend, vary or revoke a proclamation—The Governor may, by proclamation, amend, vary or revoke a proclamation under this Act."

Amendment No. 1.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I move:

That the Legislative Council's Amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

The definition concerned is redundant, because those parts of the Bill referring to the Chief Horticulturist have been taken out of the measure earlier.

Mr. CASEY: Having had discussions with the Minister, I point out that we on this side have no objection to this or the other amendments made by the Legislative Council.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 2.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

It will ensure that instructions, etc., in the case of outbreaks of pest or disease will be sent by registered post and not merely by ordinary post. This will benefit orchardists, as it will ensure that they receive the necessary message more safely.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 3.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's Amendment No. 3 be agreed to.

This is a drafting amendment, which seems to be in the interests of clarity.

Amendment agreed to.

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MARINE ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BOILERS AND PRESSURE VESSELS BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

TEXTILE PRODUCTS DESCRIPTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 26. Page 2737.)

Mr. CASEY (Frome): Members on this side support the Bill. When the Minister gave his second reading explanation, I was rather hesitant about supporting the Bill, because the definition required by the Australian Wool Board stipulates that a product can now be branded "pure wool" or "all wool" when it is not all wool as we know it. We must remember that wool is an animal fibre, and the Bill provides that certain specific animal fibres, which I think blend particularly well with wool, can be used. The Australian Wool Board has realized the importance of blending these fibres because synthetic products are increasing in popularity. In order to promote this country's wool, which is so essential because it is our leading export income earner, it is essential that we go about this proposal in the most practical way. The Wool Board will be satisfied for a product to be stamped as pure wool or all wool if it is made up of 80 per cent wool and 15 per cent of the fibres specifically referred to in the Bill.

It is time the Australian people generally realized the value of using our own product, wool. I know that many people in this country now use synthetic fibres more and more. I understand that even in the Premier's Department the carpets are made of synthetic material.

The Hon. J. W. H. Coumbe: That's not so.

Mr. CASEY: That is what I have been told. However, I hope that that carpet is made of wool because, if we are to promote wool, we should start in our own backyard and promote it in Australia as well as overseas. If we do not use wool fully in our own country, how can we expect other people to use what we believe is the best animal fibre produced? Wool is the best known animal fibre in the world, and it is being promoted extensively by the Australian Wool Board. Legislation similar to this Bill will be implemented in oversea countries such as New Zealand, Mexico and South Africa, and this means that the principal wool-producing and consuming countries will be involved in this wool marking scheme.

I hope that this will give wool a better image throughout the world so that more people will use it. However, I believe that the promotion of wool should start at home. Although I realize that many fibres are being used more extensively these days because of our climate (and this applies particularly regarding women's apparel), I still think that there is a ready demand for wool in Australia that should be fully utilized. I hope this system of using 80 per cent of pure wool and 15 per cent of specialized fibres will enhance the future prospects of the Australian Wool Board in its promotion endeavours not only in other countries but in Australia.

Mr. FREEBAIRN (Light): In supporting the second reading, I commend the Minister for introducing the Bill. I do not intend to speak for long. I was fascinated to hear the member for Frome say that we should develop the use of wool in our own backyard. There he stood, in his linen suit, wearing a terylene tie, orlon shirt—

Mr. CASEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Light has accused me of wearing a linen suit. I should like to correct the honourable member: I am wearing an all-woollen suit—it is 100 per cent pure.

The SPEAKER: I do not know that the Standing Orders provide anything to cover this. I point out to the honourable member for Light that there is nothing in the Bill that refers to the member for Frome or to what he is wearing, and I suggest that he stick to the Bill.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: If I have done the member for Frome an injustice, I am the very first to set the score right. It is to the honourable member's advantage if his suit is made of wool and, if it is wool—

The SPEAKER: Order! I have already warned the honourable member for Light: I will not do it again.

Mr. FREEBAIRN: The fact of life concerning the Bill is that people who claim that there is no substitute for wool are wrong, because there are substitutes and, in fact, in most cases the woollen fibre can be greatly improved by the admixture of certain fibres. The future of the wool industry must lie in mixed cloths. I support the second reading.

Mr. McKEE (Port Pirie): I support the Bill, which I hope will promote the sale of wool. This Bill deals with descriptions, but I do not consider it goes far enough. I think honourable members will agree that descriptions should apply to many other forms of advertising. Much advertising is false and misleading to the public. Therefore, I think that, while we are discussing a Bill such as this, we should have regard to other forms of advertising which today hoodwink the public. It is a pity that all forms of advertising are not dealt with in this Bill.

Mr. Virgo: Such as Liberal and Country League advertising.

Mr. McKEE: Yes, that could well come into it, because false advertisements were distributed in the Wallaroo District.

Mr. Broomhill: They were certainly misleading, anyway.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. However, I will leave politics out of the matter: I am concerned about the future. I consider that we could have widened the provisions of the Bill so as to include all forms of advertising, such as the advertising of cigarettes, electrical goods, and other commodities. Indeed, I am inclined to move an amendment to that effect. I understand that in Great Britain legislation has been introduced to enable legal action to be taken against a person who engages in false advertising.

Mr. McANANEY (Stirling): I support this Bill, because I consider it to be necessary. Although the member for Light (Mr. Freebairn) has said that, perhaps, wool is inferior to some other textiles, I consider that where elasticity, warmth or some other characteristic of wool is required, that fibre stands alone as a natural product. Of course, some woollen products can be improved by the addition of other fibres of greater strength. I have in mind the extent to which the heels of socks can be strengthened by the addition of artificial products. It is good that the wool industry realizes the advantage of allowing the addition of certain artificial fibres to woollen goods.

The need for more advertising of woollen goods in Australia has been stated, and I consider it a shame that one cannot readily buy woollen goods in this, the leading wool-producing country in the world. The industry must ensure that this shortage of woollen goods is overcome. The Bill is a wise move, and I am confident that it will receive the support of all members.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Requirements as to description."

Mr. FREEBAIRN: I have inspected the suit worn by the member for Frome (Mr. Casey), and I am satisfied that it would not be classed—

THE CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. FREEBAIRN: —as pure wool or all wool.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BUILDING SOCIETIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 22. Page 2065.)

Mr. VIRGO (Edwardstown): This Bill is supplementary to a measure relating to friendly societies that has already been passed and, accordingly, without wasting the time of the House and in a true spirit of co-operation, I support the second reading.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

STOCK DISEASES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 22. Page 2063.)

Mr. CASEY (Frome): The Opposition supports the Bill for many reasons and particularly because, although the Commonwealth Government is largely responsible for the quarantining of stock and other animals defined in the Bill and imposes restrictions, it is possible for diseases such as foot and mouth disease and rabies to be introduced from neighbouring countries. Because the numbers of stock in Australia are so large (about 170,000,000 sheep, about 20,000,000 dairy and beef cattle and about 2,500,000 pigs, as well as the number of other animals), it is most essential that we use every possible means to prevent diseases from entering this country, particularly as we consider

that Australia is one of the foremost agricultural countries in the world. This Bill is a step in the right direction, and no doubt the officers of the Agriculture Department who visited England recently, when the outbreak of foot and mouth disease was prevalent in that country, pointed out to the Government on their return that it was essential that every precaution be taken and every measure be introduced to ensure that a similar outbreak would not occur in this State.

Every member will support this measure, because it is in the interests of the State and of Australia. I do not know whether other States have introduced similar legislation: if they have not, I am sure they will follow suit, because the combination of restrictions imposed by this Bill and those already existing in Commonwealth legislation will make it difficult for diseases of this nature to enter this country. Although we have been more or less isolated from some parts of the world in which these diseases are prevalent, as microscopic germs can be easily transported into this country in this jet age on the soles of footwear, on luggage, and on other items of personal clothing (particularly on passengers travelling by air), these protections are necessary to ensure that these diseases are controlled as much as possible. For these reasons, I support the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

PETROLEUM ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 5. Page 2196.)

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): The Opposition supports this Bill, the purpose of which is to make several miscellaneous amendments to the principal Act. Last year the House deal extensively with the principal Act. These amendments, except for one important exception, are minor. Clause 4 amends section 7 of the principal Act, and deals with the method of applying for a licence. Although it has been indicated by the Minister of Mines that this amendment will make it much easier for people applying for licences under the Petroleum Act, the Opposition has its reservations regarding the merits of this alteration because it believes that a prescribed form would benefit people making an application as they would know what was required by the department in this respect. Where no prescribed form is to be used in the future, the Opposition believes that this could have some complications in relation to what the department or, more particularly, the Director of Mines will require. Apart from that small objection, I have much pleasure in supporting the main principles of the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

VETERINARY SURGEONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 5. Page 2197.)

Mr. BURDON (Mount Gambier): This is another Bill the Opposition has much pleasure in supporting. The registration of veterinary surgeons in South Australia did not commence until the passing of an Act in 1935, despite two previous attempts in 1919 and 1927. The people who originally sought the introduction of the registration of qualified veterinary surgeons were members of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the academically qualified veterinary surgeons, the former because of the cruelty practised on dumb animals, the latter because they were endeavouring to raise their own status and to protect their livelihood from the activities of totally unqualified competitors.

During the debate that took place in 1935, the Hon. Malcolm McIntosh said that many instances had been noted from time to time of the cruelty practised by unqualified persons in the treatment of stock. However, one of the problems associated with the treatment of disease and ailments in animals has been the shortage of qualified veterinary surgeons in this State, more particularly in country areas. The amendment contained in the Bill is that clause 3 seeks to amend section 17a of the principal Act, which deals with the registration of foreign graduates and which was inserted by the amending Act of 1952. In its amended form it will provide that a person shall be entitled to be registered as a veterinary surgeon if he has attained the age of 21 years; if he is of good character; if he has passed through a course of veterinary study in a country outside the Commonwealth and has duly graduated in that course of study; if the course of study was, if he graduated before January 1, 1947, of not less than four years' duration, or if he graduated on or after that day, of not less than five years' duration; if he is, by law, qualified to practise as a veterinary surgeon in the country in which he graduated; if he has resided in Australia for not less than two years; and if he has satisfied the examiners appointed by the board of his competence in veterinary surgery and practice. The remaining

provisions of the Bill merely make decimal currency amendments and in no way affect the Bill itself.

One of the unfortunate aspects of the present set-up in South Australia is that no provision has yet been made in our universities to train veterinary surgeons. Given the opportunity to train in South Australia, there would be adequate students to justify the establishment of such facilities in South Australia. However, finance is a problem, as it is in many other fields. The need for veterinary surgeons in outback areas and in pathological work, and for more departmental veterinary officers, underlines the necessity for the amending Bill. The veterinary surgeons of today are not only curing but doing much preventive work in the fields of tuberculosis and bovine brucellosis.

An important aspect of the work of veterinary surgeons today is not merely the curing of disease in stock animals but the prevention of epidemics of the type we have had in the past. I believe that, apart from this Bill, which is a move to try to overcome some of the difficulties and so encourage into this State some oversea graduates into the veterinary surgeon field, we must look forward to the day when a chair of veterinary science will be established at one of our universities so that we may train people in this State and not have to send them to universities in other States. I should like the Minister of Lands, if he can, to explain why a foreign graduate should be a resident in this country for two years before being able to practise. I believe that such a provision may well deter prospective veterinary surgeons from migrating to South Australia. However, on behalf of the Opposition I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

Mr. HUGHES (Wallaroo): I support the Bill, because I consider it to be one of the most important measures to come before the House this session. I am aware of the difficulty sometimes experienced in having qualified veterinary surgeons attend to the large number of stud stock situated throughout South Australia. Unfortunately, to date, we have been unable to have a chair of veterinary science in South Australia and, up until now, each State has supplied veterinary science students to a New South Wales university. I was recently pleased to hear that the Minister of Agriculture would sympathetically consider establishing a veterinary science school in South Australia, for I personally believe that it is badly needed here and that the State should now be able to support a school of its own.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Minister of Lands): I think it is fair to say that we would all like to see a veterinary science school established in South Australia; indeed, both the present Minister of Agriculture and his predecessor have undertaken much work in this regard, although the matter is very much in the hands of the relevant Commonwealth committee. Although the other States have been reasonable in creating vacancies for our students, South Australia suffers in not having a central interest or authority for its veterinary surgeons. I do not doubt that in time we shall have our own school, for veterinary surgeons' duties are becoming wider and much more in demand in regard to slaughtering stock, particularly bearing in mind United States regulations which specify anti-mortem inspections to be made by trained veterinary surgeons. I understand from the Chairman of the Veterinary Surgeons' Board that the two-year period of residence in Australia applies almost entirely to people from non-English speaking schools. Although the board has relaxed its conditions over the years, it deeply thought about this particular matter and decided that two years was appropriate for the person concerned to be resident in South Australia before practising. It was thought that this was necessary partly for language reasons and partly because the person concerned should become used to the environment. However, another cogent reason was that authority to practise veterinary science should not be a credential merely picked up by a person passing through South Australia which he had not really earned. It was thought that in the long run, without the period of residence, our own reputation might be adversely affected elsewhere. I thank honourable members for their attention to the Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through its remaining stages.

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 27. Page 2812.)

Mr. BROOMHILL (West Torrens): I support the second reading. Although the Bill serves a useful purpose, I very much regret that the Public Health Department has found it necessary to take the steps provided for. It will be necessary for these steps to be taken because some parents do not provide adequate care for their children. When such children are found to be infested with fleas and lice, apparently some difficulty has been found under

the existing Act in the taking of corrective action. The Bill provides for this action to be taken. I very much regret the need for this provision in the community, as I should have thought that parents would adopt a more responsible attitude. Apparently a campaign has been conducted by the health authorities against tuberculosis, and provisions are made in the Bill to strengthen the position of the authorities in this connection. I wish to draw one matter to the Premier's attention, and perhaps he can provide information about it in his reply. The definition of "vermin" in clause 4 is set out in Latin. I should appreciate it if the Premier could tell me the meaning of those words.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4—"Interpretation."

Mr. CORCORAN: Can the Premier say whether the Latin words in the definition of "vermin" include the common lice or flea, as it is sometimes called?

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): It is sometimes asserted that these vermin occur in the political field. If the passage of business before the Committee is so swift, I am not responsible for the fact that the honourable member has not had time to study the Bill. I suggest that he read this provision quietly by himself. All one needs to understand it is a complete control of the Latin language, and I am sure the honourable member is as efficient in that regard as I am.

Clause passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7—"Exposure of persons infested with vermin."

Mr. CORCORAN: Seeing that the Premier so cleverly ducked giving an explanation of clause 4, can he explain exactly what is meant by "Any person, knowing himself to be infested with vermin, shall not expose himself in any public place without taking reasonable steps to prevent the spread of that infestation"?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: There seems to be some contradiction. I did not know that one was permitted to do the first, whether or not one was infested. I think it would be best to observe the law in the first instance and not do the first, so that one would not run any risk of the second.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (8 to 17) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

REGISTRATION OF DOGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 27. Page 2813.)

Mr. CORCORAN (Millicent): The main object of this Bill is to equate the fees charged for the registration of bitches that have been spayed, and I am rather interested in the fact that the Attorney-General is handling this measure. Indeed, I question his knowledge of this subject, because although he is learned in the law and other things he did not understand the phrase "in and out like a dog at a fair" when it was used by the member for Victoria (Mr. Rodda) this afternoon. Further, I am concerned that the Attorney may have a vested interest in this Bill, because in the past he has mentioned his dog Susie, short for Susanna. I think he has referred to Susie as being the most intelligent member of the family, and I agree. I am inclined to think that, because the Attorney may have had this operation performed on Susie, he is trying to equate the fees so as to save 50c a year. I am sure the Attorney will explain his position on that. If what I have suggested is not the case, I can understand his interest in another matter, but I will not deal with that. I consider the Bill desirable, and the Opposition has no hesitation in supporting it. If people incur the expense of having this operation performed on a dog, there is no reason why the registration fee should not be the same as that for a male dog.

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): Council officers in particular will regard clause 3 as being very worth while. As most members know, almost all councils have accounting machines, and the method of programming receipts for council work varies. The deletion of the requirement that a receipt be in a prescribed form will assist councils to design and programme particular receipts for particular purposes. Regarding the provisions of clause 8, dealing with the requirement to inspect all premises at least once a year, I do not know that any council has been able to fulfil this requirement, and its deletion will be a relief to those in local government who have been concerned about their inability to comply with it.

Regarding full-blood Aborigines having unregistered dogs, I do not know that this was left entirely to full-blood Aborigines. I think most councils near mission stations were rather kind to Aboriginal people and closed an eye to the number of dogs that they kept.

However, much trouble has been caused by packs of dogs roaming among farming communities and destroying sheep. If we are to accept our Aboriginal people into our communities, we should not discriminate. I think the Aborigines would prefer to register their dogs in the normal way. I agree with the member for Millicent in his comments about the desexing of bitches. Although I do not think the Attorney-General would have any more financial interest in the Bill than would any other member, councils in the metropolitan area and in country towns have had many problems with dogs, and the Bill, in addition to granting a concession to dog owners, may also assist in lessening the number of dogs, which would be a blessing to the councils.

Mrs. BYRNE (Barossa): I support the Bill. I agree with people who have complained that, although they have incurred the expense of having their bitches spayed, they are required to pay the same fees as for a male dog. The Bill amends the principal Act regarding the illegal removing of collars from dogs, the destruction of diseased dogs, the penalty on owners of dogs that attack persons or frighten horses, the penalty on persons illegally killing dogs, the use of guide dogs, and so on. I wish to refer to a matter related to the provisions of the Bill. No provision is made about the way in which councils are to spend the income from dog registrations. In most cases, this money is used by councils to employ a dog catcher, but the manner in which dogs are to be destroyed is not specified. I understand that various methods are used, and there should be some way of ensuring that a humane method is adopted.

Mr. McKee: What method are they using now?

Mrs. BYRNE: I would rather not mention a case I know of, because the honourable member would be surprised. The method of destroying dogs should be policed and, although I am not suggesting any particular method, some methods are more humane than others.

Mr. JENNINGS (Enfield): I will not oppose the Bill, although I am reticent about supporting it. I like dogs, and all dogs, except lousy Liberal dogs, like me, as the lousy Liberal dogs have made obvious many times when I have been canvassing for the Labor Party.

Mr. Corcoran: Do you think any dog would bite the Attorney-General?

Mr. JENNINGS: It would be a meritorious dog that would bite the Attorney-General: any that would do that would want an immediate blood transfusion and if it survived would merit the George Cross.

Mr. Corcoran: It would not be a self-respecting dog, anyway.

Mr. JENNINGS: I have often spoken on this legislation, because I have been prompted by my wellknown chivalrous instincts. It has always seemed to be wrong to me that the female of the species, be she a bitch or not, has to pay more for registration than the male. This is undoubtedly inequality of the sexes, and on this occasion we have an amendment that means that bitches, if they are spayed, have only to pay the same registration fee as male dogs. This seems to me not to be at all in accord with what we would like in the equality of sexes, because it seems that any bitch who wants to be put in the position of paying the same registration fee as a male dog has to forget all the better things of life. This is vastly unfair and, although I do not intend to oppose the Bill, I support it reluctantly.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): In thanking those members who have supported the Bill concerning spayed bitches, I would not have considered it necessary to reply had it not been for the remarks of the Deputy Leader in which he impugned my honour, and suggested—

Mr. Hudson: He impugned your intelligence, too.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: He did that, too, and suggested (and this is the important consideration) that I had some personal interest in the Bill. I have to tell him that I am handling this Bill because my honoured colleague in another place is the Minister who introduced it, and I handle his matters as he handles mine. This is by the by. I should like to make a personal explanation. The Deputy Leader referred to Susie, our little bitch. I much regret to have to report that Susie was put to sleep earlier this year. This was a matter of great regret in our family and caused some tears and heartbreaks, as those members who have children with pets will know. However, on a happier note, I mention that Susie was not spayed, and one of her last acts was to have a puppy.

Mr. Rodda: That proved a point.

Mr. Corcoran: Is she Susie the second?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We do not have Susie the second, but we have another.

We have called her Mollie. She is a bitch, and is a longhaired Corgi. I call her Mollie and she has been registered under that name, because she is a pedigreed bitch. However, I am the only member of the family who calls her Mollie. I picked the name, but, for some reason unknown to me, the rest of the family call her Mandy, because they feel that Mollie, in some way, would be a reflection on the member for Barossa.

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

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1)

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following suggested amendments:

No. 1. Page 8 (clause 5)—After line 25 insert—

"(10) For the purposes of this section—

(*a*) "receipt" includes any endorsement made on any document and evidencing the receipt of money; and

(*b*) where any document containing any endorsement evidencing the receipt of money is stamped as a receipt, it shall be deemed to be a duly stamped receipt."

No. 2. Page 8, line 37 (clause 5)—After "person," insert "or as reimbursement of a payment previously made by the solicitor or agent out of his own funds on behalf of his client or principal,".

No. 3. Page 9, lines 1 to 14 (clause 5)—Leave out subsection (2) and insert new subsection as follows:

"(2) Where money has been received by a solicitor or agent on behalf of his client or principal, and a duly stamped receipt has been given by such solicitor or agent to the person by whom the payment was made, or the amount of the money so received is required to be included in a statement to be lodged with the Commissioner by the solicitor or agent pursuant to paragraph (*a*) of subsection (1) of section 84f of this Act—

(*a*) any receipt for such money given to the solicitor or agent by his client or principal upon payment of such money to him;

(*b*) any receipt for such money given to the solicitor or agent by any other solicitor or agent who receives such money from him for transmission to the client or principal of the first-mentioned solicitor or agent; and

(*c*) any receipt for such money given by the client or principal of the first-mentioned solicitor or agent to the solicitor or agent who transmits such money to such client or principal

shall be exempt from duty."

No. 4. Page 9 (clause 5)—After line 45 insert new subsections as follows:

"(4a) No provision of this Act shall be construed as requiring a society to which this subsection applies which has received money in the course of its business, from any of its members, or from the storage, sale, disposal or distribution of any commodity or animal owned by any of its members or acquired by it from or for any of its members, or for resale to any of its members, or from the marketing of any such commodity, whether packed by it or not, or of any product derived from the processing of any commodity owned by any of its members, or acquired by it from or for any of its members, or for resale to any of its members, to pay duty under this Act on the receipt of such money or to include the amount so received in a statement to be lodged by the society with the Commissioner pursuant to paragraph (*a*) of subsection (1) of section 84f of this Act.

(4b) For the purposes of subsection (4a) of this Act—

(*a*) "society" means a society as defined in the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1923-1966, as amended—

(*a*) the members of which are—

(i) persons engaged in the business of primary production as defined in the Land Tax Act, 1936-1967, as amended, or in the fishing industry;

or

(ii) societies defined in the Industrial and Provident Societies Act, 1923-1966, as amended, the members of which are engaged in the business of primary production as so defined, or in the fishing industry;

and

(*b*) the primary object or one of the primary objects of which is—

(i) the sale, disposal or distribution of commodities owned by it or acquired by it from or for any of its members or from or for members of such societies as are members thereof;

or

(ii) the processing, packing or marketing of commodities owned by it, or acquired by it from or for any of its members or from or for members of such societies as are members thereof or products derived therefrom;

and

(*b*) a reference to a society to which that subsection applies is a reference to a society as defined in paragraph (*a*) of this subsection in the ordinary course of whose business, commodities and animals owned by any of its members, or acquired by it from or for any of its members, or for resale to any of its members, are stored, sold, disposed of or distributed by it or such commodities or products derived therefrom are packed and marketed where the receipts from the storage, sale, disposal or distribution of such commodities and animals so stored, sold, disposed of or distributed or the amount of its receipts from the marketing of such commodities whether packed by it or not or of any such products derived from the processing of any such commodities of its members is not less, respectively, than 90 per centum of the total value of commodities and animals sold, disposed of or distributed by the society, or of its receipts from the sale, disposal, processing, packing, storing, distribution or marketing of such commodities or products."

No. 5. Page 9 (clause 5)—After line 45 insert new subsection—

"(5) Subject to any agreement between the persons concerned, a person who, while acting as the solicitor or agent of another person, has paid out of his own moneys duty in repect of money received or deemed to have been received by him on behalf of that other person, shall, if he has not been paid the amount of that duty by that other person, be entitled to recover from that other person by action in a court of competent jurisdiction the amount of such duty or so much thereof as has not been paid by that other person."

No. 6. Page 13, line 30 (clause 5)—After "practicable" insert "for any person, or that it would be unreasonably expensive or onerous for a solicitor or agent,"

No. 7. Page 13, line 32 (clause 5)—Leave out "a person" and insert "him".

No. 8. Page 13, line 34 (clause 5)—Leave out "that person" and insert "him".

No. 9. Page 13, line 35 (clause 5)—After "amount insert "or some other amount".

No. 10. Page 16, lines 22 and 23 (clause 6)—Leave out "for rates or any payment made from Government funds".

No. 11. Page 18, line 24 (clause 6)—Leave out "person or fund" and insert "marketing or equalization board, committee or other body".

No. 12. Page 19 (clause 6)—After line 8 insert—

"30. Receipt for any payment of membership subscription by a member of an association composed or representative of employers as such or of persons who carry on the business of primary production as defined in the Land Tax Act, 1926-1967, where—

(*a*) the Treasurer is satisfied that the sole or principal objects of the association are to further or protect, or to further and protect the interests of its members;

and

(*b*) the Treasurer has, by notice published in the *Gazette*, which notice he has not subsequently cancelled by a like notice, declared the association to be one to which this exemption applies:

But where the amount of subscription received by the association from any member in any year exceeds fifty dollars, this exemption shall apply and have effect in respect only of the first fifty dollars so received in each year."

No. 13. Page 19 (clause 6)—After line 8 insert—

"31. Receipt for any payment by an insurance company to the beneficiary under a policy of insurance on his own life taken out by him with the company where the payment is made under the policy on or after such beneficiary has attained the age of sixty-five years."

Consideration in Committee.

Suggested amendment No. 1:

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON (Treasurer): I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

This amendment adds only one condition and makes it clear what is a receipt under this Bill. Having no objection to the amendment, I accept it.

Suggested amendment agreed to.

Suggested amendment No. 2.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 2 be agreed to.

This again is a clarification of the intention of the original draft of the Bill. I have no objection to the amendment and accept it.

Suggested amendment agreed to.

Suggested amendment No. 3.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 3 be agreed to.

The effect of the amendment is to withdraw the subsection as drafted and insert in lieu thereof a new subsection that conveys the same meaning and effect. Possibly, it is a clearer drafting of the intention of the clause. Therefore, I have no objection to the amendment and accept it.

Suggested amendment agreed to.

Suggested amendment No. 4.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 4 be agreed to.

This amendment was the subject of much consideration in conference and was inserted by another place as a result of a conference held between the solicitors for the co-operatives, the Parliamentary Draftsman, the Under Treasurer, other people, and me. It clarifies the position in which the co-operatives generally are placed under the legislation. The amendment provides that co-operatives which conform to the requirements as set out in sections (4a) and (4b) are, under the amendment, clearly exempt from receipts duty in respect to all moneys received by them in the course of their *bona fide* business with their *bona fide* members.

There has been much difficulty in drafting the clause to meet the Government's wishes and the wishes of the co-operatives generally, but the amendment solves the problems and gives the co-operatives the protection they desire. It also preserves the right of the Commissioner to collect taxation and receipts duty from them in respect of trading outside their membership or for abnormal trading activity. This is what the Government desired to preserve. I consider that the amendment achieves this, and I therefore indicated to members in another place that I was prepared to accept it if it were moved in the form in which it was agreed to at the conference. It does so conform to the agreement reached, and I therefore accept the amendment.

Mr. GILES: I was pleased to hear what the Treasurer had to say about this amendment. When the original Bill was in Committee the Treasurer was asked a number of questions about co-operatives and societies, and he gave his interpretation of what he thought would happen under the Bill when it became an Act. As this amendment specifically states what I believe the Treasurer interpreted from the original Bill, I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

Suggested amendment agreed to.

Suggested amendment No. 5.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 5 be agreed to.

This amendment clarifies the position that exists between a solicitor or agent and his client, the respective liabilities of the solicitor or agent to pay stamp duty for and on behalf of his client, and the ability of the solicitor or agent to recover from his client the duty so paid. It was always the intention of the Bill that there should not be double duty in the case of an agent acting for his principal. The amendment makes that position doubly secure. Therefore, I have no objection to the amendment and accept it.

Suggested amendment agreed to.

Suggested amendment No. 6.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 6 be agreed to.

This amendment inserts a few additional words that clarify the position regarding the practicability or otherwise of calculating precisely any total amount. It also inserts an additional small proviso that no person shall be required to go to unreasonable expense or trouble or indulge in onerous research in order to calculate precisely the amount of tax that may be payable. This is possibly an amelioration of procedure. It was not the Government's purpose in this legislation to create an undue amount of administrative and paper work for any taxpayer. Had we tried to cover every possible point in this legislation, we would have had a Bill with much more verbiage than that of the present Bill. We would have been requiring taxpayers to do much work that would, in effect, return little revenue to the State and, in addition, we would have had to set up sufficient administrative capacity within the department to process all the returns filed. I think that would be a wasteful procedure which would benefit no-one but which would probably cost the Treasury more than it actually received. I was anxious to avoid the additional work on the part of taxpayers and also the department. I therefore accept the amendment.

Suggested amendment agreed to.

Suggested amendments Nos. 7 to 9.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments Nos. 7 to 9 be agreed to.

They are consequential on amendment No. 6.

Suggested amendments agreed to.

Suggested amendment No. 10.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 10 be agreed to.

I am not particularly happy about this amendment and, although I do not intend to make an issue of it, there is some degree of inequity in it, for it gives an advantage to local government which, for example, is not to be enjoyed by the Electricity Trust. It means that not only will rates and payments from the Highways Fund, etc., be exempt but also that

councils and corporations will be exempt in respect of receipts on any of their trading activities. I think the largest taxpayer as a municipality under the exemption as drafted would be the Adelaide City Council, bearing in mind the substantial sums received in respect of parking fines and charges of that sort, and I believe the sum involved in this case is about $2,000. Although the City Council has not made representations to me on this matter, all members, I think, have received correspondence from the Local Government Association, and members in another place have seen fit to move to exempt councils in respect of their trading activities. Although I have some reluctance, I accept the amendment.

Suggested amendment agreed to.

Suggested amendment No. 11.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 11 be agreed to.

I have no objection at all to this amendment.

Suggested amendment agreed to.

Suggested amendment No. 12.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 12 be agreed to.

This amendment represents an addition to the list of exemptions and becomes No. 30 on the list. The amendment is the counterpart in another direction of the amendment inserted in this place which exempts certain associations, societies and trade unions. Having agreed to the amendment inserted in this place, one could not validly object to the amendment which another place has moved, and I therefore accept it.

Suggested amendment agreed to.

Suggested amendment No. 13.

The Hon. G. G. PEARSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment No. 13 be agreed to.

The amendment is designed to give to people who take out an endowment insurance policy, with a view to having some income available to them later in life, an exemption from receipts duty similar to that already given in the Bill regarding superannuation payments, etc. To the extent that this affords a degree of equity for one class of person compared with another, I am prepared to accept the amendment.

Suggested amendment agreed to.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS (REDIVISION) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 2 (clause 3)—After line 10 insert—

"'Council elector' means a person whose name appears as an elector on the electoral roll for a Council district:".

No. 2. Page 2 (clause 3)—After line 13 insert—

"'proposed Council district' means proposed electoral district for the return of members of the Legislative Council:".

No. 3. Page 5, line 20 (clause 8)—After "equal" insert "and into two proposed Council districts (each to return six members of the Legislative Council) that are approximately equal".

No. 4. Page 5, line 23 (clause 8)—After "equal" insert "and into two proposed Council districts (each to return six members of the Legislative Council) that are approximately equal".

No. 5. Page 5, lines 28 and 29 (clause 8)—Leave out "subject to subsection (8) of this section, adjust and re-define" and insert "define".

No. 6. Page 5, line 29 (clause 8)—Leave out "five existing" and insert "four proposed".

No. 7. Page 6, line 6 (clause 8)—Leave out "re-defining" and insert "defining".

No. 8 Page 6, line 6 (clause 8)—After "each" insert "proposed".

No. 9. Page 6, lines 18 and 19 (clause 8)—Leave out "the re-definition of the areas of the existing" and insert "four proposed".

No. 10. Page 6, line 21 (clause 8)—After "report," insert "and as would be necessary or desirable for making provision for the increase in the number of members of the Legislative Council".

No. 11. Page 6, line 22 (clause 8)—Leave out "thereon" and insert "on any such recommendation".

No. 12. Page 7, line 22 (clause 8)—Leave out "and".

No. 13. Page 7 (clause 8)—After line 28 insert new paragraphs as follows—

"(*c*) the two proposed Council districts into which the metropolitan area is divided by the Commission shall be regarded as approximately equal if no such proposed Council district contains a number of Council electors that is more than ten per centum above or below one-half of the number of Council electors within the metropolitan area;

and

(*d*) the two proposed Council districts into which the country area is divided by the Commission shall be regarded as approximately equal if no such proposed Council district contains a number of Council electors that is more than fifteen per centum above or below one-half of the number of Council electors within the country area."

No. 14. Page 7, lines 29 to 44 (clause 8)—Leave out subclause (8).

No. 15. Page 8, (clause 9)—After line 37 insert new subclause as follows—

"(3) For the purpose of determining the boundaries of a proposed Council district, the Commission may have regard to—

(*a*) any physical features within the proposed Council district;

and

(*b*) the existing boundaries of existing Council districts, subdivisions of existing Council districts and local governing, or other defined areas."

Consideration in Committee.

Amendment No. 1.

The Hon. R. S. HALL (Premier): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

These are important amendments, and I am sure honourable members will debate them as such. I am afraid that I have not yet had the chance to read the debate in the Legislative Council on this matter. However, I have looked up what I said when I introduced the Bill on August 1. I realized when I introduced the Bill that there was little agreement between the Parties on electoral reform. However, I am pleased that the Bill passed this place, although it had considerable criticism from the Opposition. It dealt exclusively with the redivision of electoral boundaries for the House of Assembly.

Mr. Riches: You objected to any reference to the Council in August.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I said on August 1, "I am adopting the same principle as was adopted by the Australian Labor Party—

Mr. Virgo: You wouldn't know what the principles of the A.L.P. were.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: I think we can ignore those comments.

Mr. Virgo: If you haven't got an adequate answer, you have to ignore them.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: At page 433 of *Hansard,* I am reported as saying:

I am adopting the same principle as was adopted by the A.L.P. in its last published Bill of dealing only with the House of Assembly. The Bill is, therefore, concerned with the constitution of the House of Assembly, the election of whose members decides the type of Government that will govern South Australia.

The Government had intended that the Bill would continue to deal only with the House of Assembly. However, last week a private member of the Upper House announced that he would move amendments to this Bill to remove the consequential reference to the Legislative Council and to insert substantial amendments redividing the Council district boundaries. The Government has considered these matters carefully both yesterday and this morning and has decided to support these amendments.

Mr. Casey: This would be the greatest backward somersault you've ever made.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Therefore, I obviously support these amendments this evening.

Mr. Virgo: Strongly.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Members opposite can have their full say.

Mr. Virgo: We will, too: have no worries.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: One of the reasons for bringing forward this matter this evening is to extend the time of debate on what is an important issue. I believe it is important to have this Bill through (if it is going to pass) by Thursday. I thought it would be pushing the debating time a little too much if we left it until tomorrow evening, and that is why I suggested that we could debate it this evening. I appreciate the Opposition's attitude (although it seems to be contrary to mine on the amendments) in being ready to debate the matter this evening.

Mr. Broomhill: What you're saying now is contrary to what you said in August.

The Hon. R. S. HALL: It is not contrary to the extent that we made an agreement on the Assembly Bill, and this is not an amendment to the Constitution but sets up a commission to redefine boundaries. As these are substantial amendments affecting Council boundaries, I asked for a report (which I received yesterday) from the Parliamentary Draftsman on the amendments. The report states:

Clause 3: The two new definitions proposed by these amendments are merely consequential on the subsequent amendment.

Clause 8: These amendments are designed to provide for the division of the metropolitan area into two Council districts and the country area into two Council districts, each returning six Council members. Consequential amendments to the Bill are also included in these amendments. Two new paragraphs (*c*) and (*d*) to subclause (7) of clause 8 are also included in the amendments. They provide that the two proposed metropolitan Council districts may have a tolerance of up to 10 per cent above or below one half the number of Council electors in the metropolitan area and the two proposed country Council districts may have a tolerance of up to 15 per cent above or below one half the number of Council electors in the country area.

Clause 9: This amendment inserts a new subclause (3) in clause 9. This subclause prescribes the matters which the commission may have regard to in determining the boundaries of a proposed Council district. In fact these

are the same matters which the Commission may have regard to in determining the boundaries of a proposed Assembly district as provided in subclause (1) (*b*) of clause 9.

Essentially, these amendments alter substantially the Council divisions. There exist today five Council divisions, three in the country and two in the city, and we now have proposed two country divisions and two city divisions.

Mr. Casey: Whom are you kidding?

The Hon. R. S. HALL: Surely members opposite do not doubt that that is the proposal. I remind honourable members that an obvious part of this proposal is that there shall be a newly constituted metropolitan area, the same as is provided in the part of the Bill applicable to the redivision of Assembly districts. Therefore, the new metropolitan area and the country area would each have two districts, each with six members. This will mean a substantial alteration to country boundaries and, although I consider that it will not satisfy all the desires of members opposite, it is a substantial move of reform for Legislative Council boundaries. The explanation that I have read out is of the Legislative Council amendments before they were inserted in the Bill and I take it that the amendments have been inserted as the explanation from the Parliamentary Draftsman indicates. I will check this as we go through, but certainly the proposal is a simple one to divide the State into four districts, two being in the city and two in the country, for Legislative Council elections. I do not say that the alteration is not important: all members will recognize that it is. After considering the effect of having the commission do this work at about the time it considers House of Assembly boundaries rather than wait for some alteration in another session or in the indefinite future, the Government has decided to accept and support the amendments.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Leader of the Opposition): The perfidy and trickery of this Government is now fully exposed to the people. Sir, this is one of the most disgraceful pieces of attempted political trickery that this State has ever seen, but it will not work and it will not wash. This move has been designed purely to tear up the measure previously passed by this Chamber. We all know what has been said around the lobbies and we all know of the discontent of the members of the Liberal Party with what has been foisted upon them by the Premier regarding electoral redivision in South Australia. They did not like what the future held for them under any possible redivision, because it was putting them at less of an advantage than they now have. Therefore, there had to be some attempt to kill it. The measure runs completely contrary to what has been said in this place many times by the Premier, who has been led by the nose by a gentleman in another place in this matter, as in so much else. He does not need his Government: he knows what to do.

These amendments so gerrymander the Legislative Council districts that if the Labor Party, after a redivision of this kind, got 70 per cent of the votes, it would not get more than six members of the 24 in the Legislative Council. We had an election at which the electoral redistribution of the State was a major issue, and the unfairness of electoral distribution was brought home to the people. It came home to them even more solidly when they found that they did not have the Government for which they had voted. Then the Premier tried to get around that situation by saying that, if the Millicent by-election produced a result in favour of the Government, he would put through his proposals without compromise, and those proposals were not an improvement on the existing situation. However, he found that the electors of Millicent would not go along with that and after compromise proposals were submitted from this side (and, I may add, compromise on the increase in the size of Parliament), a measure was introduced and the Premier said:

It is a proposal for improvement. It goes a long way to what is wanted and there is no trickery in it.

That is what he said then. How could he say it now? As soon as this Bill got to the Council, there was a considerable delay, not much debate taking place on it for a lengthy period. Then suddenly at the death knock a Liberal member proposed an increase in the number of members in the Council, although when we had proposed a 48-district House of Assembly, they said that that was too much, and they said the same thing when we proposed a 56-member House. However, they can now go to a 20 per cent increase in the Legislative Council and suggest that this is a necessary increase in the number of representatives in the State Parliament. Whom is this to serve?

The proposal under this amendment, now supported by those people who speak as though they are proposing something for democracy in South Australia, is that 428,000 people will elect 12 members to the Legislative

Council and 182,000 will also elect 12 members. That is the greatest of gerrymanders, making the distribution in the Council worse than it is now and substantially preventing any possible future reform of the Council. If this proposal went into the Constitution, members of the Council could veto the proposals that they now say the Premier should not have supported for adult suffrage and for a referendum before the Council could be abolished, because they will be so far ahead under this gerrymander that a Bill for a referendum of the people would never be passed. Such a Bill could not be got through both Houses of Parliament. The Premier knows well that members on this side could never accept a proposal of this kind. The Government said that it was offering something as a compromise and we said that we would discuss it on that basis, because we would seek to get a substantial improvement on the present grossly inequitable situation that denies to the people the electoral justice to which they are entitled.

This amendment tacks on a proposal for redivision of the Council which, if carried into effect, would make useless the redivision of the House of Assembly, because any Government elected here would be hamstrung by a Conservative minority entrenched in the Upper House that it would be impossible to affect or remove. That would be so in the face of the overwhelming majority of the votes of the people. Therefore, this is no compromise and we will not treat any measure of this kind as being anything in the way of compromise. If this is what the Premier proposes as a basis of amendment of the Constitution, we tell him now that it will not pass. We will not submit to the hamstringing of Government in South Australia for the future so that this State is ruled not by the people but by a permanent minority in the Legislative Council denying to the people those things for which they vote at elections. It is clear that this amendment has been proposed in order to kill any Opposition amendment to the Constitution and to retain the present boundaries in South Australia. Apparently, that is what the Government is now determined on.

Mr. Lawn: They told us this Bill wouldn't go through.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: They told us that all around the lobbies. We had to find the trick. Although the Premier said that there was no trickery, now we know.

Mr. Virgo: The Premier gave you an assurance.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but it was not worth anything, obviously. We were told that there would be no mucking about in the Council.

Mr. Broomhill: This Bill didn't concern the Council.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. We were told that this was a redivision of the Lower House and that that was what the Government proposed, and when we insisted that the existing Legislative Council boundaries should be retained the Premier said, "Oh, well, it is necessary to make a few minor consequential alterations, but we believe that basically there should be no interference at this stage." He said that several times.

Mr. Virgo: We got sick of hearing him say it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: However, now it has gone to the other place we find that we now have a most inequitable and iniquitous proposal for redivision of the Council. Why has the Council demanded a redivision of Council districts in a Bill that concerns the electoral divisions of the House of Assembly? For Council purposes? Its members cannot believe that members on this side would agree that any future Labor Government should be faced with the fact that, no matter how the people voted and in what majority, that would be the end of the thing, because the Legislative Council would rule the State and the Government would not.

The present inequitable system has been condemned as one of the most reactionary systems of Upper House Government that the British Commonwealth has seen. It has been condemned widely by conservative newspapers throughout his State, Australia, and in Great Britain and the other Dominions. That is bad enough, but this! How can members opposite support a measure of this kind after what they said previously? Where is all the things they said about the undesirability of any large increase in the number of members of Parliament? I remind Government members that they are agreeing with a proposal for an increase of 12 in the number of members of Parliament, an increase that previously they said was much too much. Why is this increase to be provided in the Legislative Council, a Council that has amongst its members people who do not have the same relationship to electors as members of the House of Assembly have, who are not expected to give a service in the same way as agents of their district, and who, for the most part, are unknown to many of the electors in their districts?

Mr. Riches: Districts that were said to be too large are being made larger.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Exactly. There were protests about giving adequate service, but larger districts are proposed for the Legislative Council.

Mr. Hudson: There is a good reason why they put that up.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Of course: to gerrymander the Upper House. They are taking the three country districts and making them into two, so that a number of urban voters in the Legislative Council Northern District will be swamped out by the rural voters from Midland District, and the urban voters from Midland District will be in the metropolitan area in Central No. 1 District, which is already overwhelmingly Labor. No doubt the Premier is amused at the way in which his member in the Upper House has done this, but I cannot think that the honourable member was on his own in working out this little gimmick.

Mr. Clark: It wasn't just an accident.

Mr. Riches: It needs Cabinet support.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It may well be that the Premier has done a deal on this, because, if this measure went through, the Upper House would be so gerrymandered that it would not matter if there was adult suffrage for the Upper House and an entrenched clause about the referendum. Even with adult suffrage the system would be so gerrymandered that it would be impossible to get anywhere near a majority of people deciding on the majority of Council members, so that a Bill could never be passed to provide for a referendum.

Mr. Ryan: This is a disgrace to democracy.

Mr. Broomhill: I wonder what the Attorney-General feels about this?

Mr. Ryan: He is in on the deal.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Premier was apparently speaking for his side on this occasion, but we have seen occasions when this is not always so. It may well be that he has joined the backwoodsmen and has done this deal and is going in for the trickery that he said there would be none of. We assure the Premier that, if he thinks, as apparently he previously did think, the wind has been taken out of the Labor Party's sails over electoral reform, this is putting a considerable gale force back into the sails. If he wants to see something done publicly about electoral reform, he will hear about it now.

Mr. Virgo: Let him go to the people on it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I assure him that the people of South Australia will have it brought home to them what is being done by the Government: there will be no mistake about that. The extent of the base trickery that has been indulged in by the Government in this measure will be explained fully to the public. How people on the other side could talk about electoral principles and say that they were trying to do something in the way of a fair compromise, and then come in with this measure, is hard to understand. I wonder how they can face not only those in this Chamber but those outside. This is one of the most disgraceful actions I have seen from a Government, and I have no doubt that the people of this State will have their say on this question as soon as possible.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE (Attorney-General): We have just heard an exhibition of histrionic nonsense from the Leader.

Mr. Langley: Let's hear some sense from you for a change.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The honourable member will. The sole object of the Leader in what he has just said has been to impugn the sincerity and the actions of the Premier, because over and over again he used the phrase "base trickery" in reference to the Premier.

Mr. Broomhill: And about you, too.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I should like to put a few simple facts before the Committee, facts with which the Leader is completely familiar, but which it did not suit his object to face. He considered that this was an opportunity to make up some of the ground that he and his Party have lost in the last few months. We saw him in a return to his acting form, for which he has been known for many years. I should like to state a few facts rather more calmly than the Leader did. First, these amendments were not a decision of the Government, but were inserted on the motion of a private member.

Mr. Hudson: Your Cabinet Ministers voted for them.

Mr. Virgo: Purely by accident!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, it was not by accident. These amendments were introduced in another place by a private member and not by a member of the Cabinet.

Mr. Hudson: Are you telling us you have been sold out, too?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am stating facts. This amendment was introduced

in the Legislative Council by the Hon. Mr. Potter, who is not a member of the Government.

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: What is so specially private about it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If the member for Whyalla will contain his temper for a few moments, perhaps I could speak. The Government was then faced with the situation that these amendments had been introduced by a private member—

Mr. Burdon: What about your responsibility?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —and commanded much support in that Chamber.

Mr. Burdon: You don't take instructions?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: No, we do our best in the circumstances in which we find ourselves, and we tried to do our best with this measure.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Nankivell): Order! The member for Mount Gambier will please stop interjecting.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We faced the situation that the amendments were moved in another place and were given much support. Most important, we want to get this Bill through and set up a commission before Parliament rises for Christmas.

Mr. Corcoran: This is so barefaced that anyone could see through it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Only a week or so ago the Leader chided the Government for dragging its feet, not getting on with this matter and not having the commission set up.

Mr. Broomhill: That's why the plot was being cooked up?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is not true, and the honourable member does not believe it. The Government regarded it of the utmost urgency that the Bill be passed and the commission established so it could get on with its job, and the Opposition agreed with the Government on this. Only a week or two ago the Leader was trumpeting about this outside this place. The Government wants to get the Bill passed and to have the boundaries redrawn. Admittedly, when the Bill was introduced in August the Premier said that it should deal only with the House of Assembly districts, and it did.

Mr. Virgo: What a change now!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Yes, what a change now. I remind the member for Edwardstown and others of a few other facts of which they are well aware but which they choose to ignore at present to try to score some political points. Much water has flowed under the bridge since then.

Mr. McKee: That is what the Speaker said.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: True. Many things have happened since then that are intimately connected with this matter. A Bill has been introduced into the Assembly by the Leader on the question of the Legislative Council franchise, a Bill that was supported in an amended form by a majority of members on this side.

Mr. Clark: Because they knew this was coming.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Bill on the franchise was supported in an amended form by a majority of the members on this side. On the other hand, a Bill to alter the franchise in a different way was introduced in another place, passed, and sent to us. Members all know that this has been the subject of much controversy among members of the Liberal and Country League, in Parliament and outside. That was obvious when the debate took place in this Chamber, and it has been obvious from the debates in another place. The situation now is not the same as it was in August. We consulted, and the Premier made it clear that the question of redistribution of boundaries for the House of Assembly should be dealt with first and separately from a redistribution for the Legislative Council. However, for one reason or another (and I am not trying to allocate praise or blame for this) it has not been possible to do that, and the two have become mixed up. These amendments are a product of the situation that has arisen since August.

Mr. Broomhill: What nonsense!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It is not nonsense: the member for West Torrens knows it is a fact. The Leader said something about an increase in the size of the Legislative Council, proposed under the amendment, from 20 to 24 members. I can follow his line of argument, but on the other hand it is traditional and it is the case that in most bicameral systems the Upper House is about half the size of the Lower House.

Mr. Virgo: What about giving the same voting as for the Commonwealth House?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I will come to all those points. The Government proposes to increase the size of the Assembly from 39 members to 47 members. It is therefore certainly arguable that to keep the ratio with the Upper House the size of that Chamber should be increased from 20, which

is just a little over half the number of members of the House of Assembly, to 24, which is a little over half the number of members of the Assembly as it will be under the Bill. I put this as a valid argument in favour of an increase in the size of the Upper House.

Mr. Virgo: You say you did not sponsor the amendments in the Upper House, but now you are admitting it.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Edwardstown is a new member and tries to trick other members by putting words into their mouths.

Mr. Virgo: You're saying it's your proposal.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: I am not saying it is my proposal: I am merely addressing myself to one particular aspect of it and justifying, I believe adequately, an increase in the size of the Legislative Council. The Senate is about half the size of the House of Representatives, and when one looks at the other Australian Parliaments one will find the same thing. I will go on with some other aspects of this measure which I hope will be borne in mind and which were deliberately ignored by the Leader for effect, but I hope they will be borne in mind by other members when they speak. The question of a redistribution for the Legislative Council, although it has not been included in the amendments, is a separate matter entirely from the redistribution for the House of Assembly: the two do not stand or fall together in the ultimate, and the Leader knows this. They will be decided separately by Parliament, and simply because one is accepted and the other is rejected does not mean that the whole question of redistribution will be shelved. It is not unreasonable to ask a commission, which is already in existence, to go a little further than we would have asked it to do in the Bill as it left this place, namely, to redistribute the boundaries for another place as well as for the House of Assembly.

Mr. Clark: Provided the Government agrees.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Quite. I come now to the most important point in the discussion: it is one I have already made to an honourable member privately, namely, that it does not matter, for the purposes of the ultimate alterations to the Constitution, two hoots whether the Bill is passed in the form as amended or in the form as it left this place, because all members know there can be no alteration to the Constitution of the State without the assent of both sides of this Chamber.

Mr. McKee: You had better get used to that idea, too.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We have become used to it. Neither the Liberal and Country League nor the Australian Labor Party has a constitutional majority, so it does not matter what report the commission comes up with: unless it is supported in the form of a Bill by both sides of the Chamber it cannot get into the Constitution, so it is a pretty hollow protest the Leader has made.

Mr. Broomhill: Is that the best you can do?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The Leader knows that it does not mean that, because the Bill is passed, there will be a change in the Constitution of the State. He knows he has the numbers to block it, and we know that we have the numbers to block anything put up by the other side and that we must get the support of the Labor Party to get it through. What we are doing, in essence, by agreeing to the amendments is—

Mr. Virgo: To wreck the whole proposal.

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: —to make certain that the commission will be set up before Christmas so that it can start its work within a reasonable time in the new year. It will have to work not only on the House of Assembly boundaries on which, for all that the Opposition has said, there was substantial agreement between us, but on the Legislative Council boundaries as well.

Mr. Hudson: Gerrymander!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg can say "gerrymander" if he wishes; he knows we will all have the opportunity before there is any change in the boundaries in this State to scrutinize the work of the commission.

Mr. Virgo: What if we don't like it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If we do not like it, both sides can reject it.

Mr. Virgo: Why waste their time?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: Now we are getting to an argument in which there is some force, but it was not one the Leader used. However, it is the only argument against this if there is to be opposition to the terms of reference to the commission. But surely the justification for allowing these amendments to go through, even on the case which is being put up by the Opposition (and I am taking that now), is that it allows the commission to be set up and to get on with its job of redistributing the Assembly boundaries, something which

we all want and which less than a fortnight ago the Leader was asking us to get on with. We know there can be ultimately no change in the situation of the State without the agreement of both sides.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: If, when the report comes back to this place, we do not agree on the redistribution for one House or the other, it is out.

Mr. Hudson: We are telling you now. Why go ahead with it?

The Hon. R. R. Loveday: We've never heard so much rubbish from you before.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: That is saying something; the vinegary old member for Whyalla has said some pretty terrible things about me before in his time. The complete justification, as I have said three times now, is that it allows the Bill to go forward. If we disagree (and members opposite know this) on these amendments, there is a real danger that this Bill will not go through at all (certainly not before Christmas), and the work of redistribution in this Chamber will be held up indefinitely. That is the situation.

Mr. Clark: Who created it?

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: It does not matter who created it.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: We are in this situation and have to do the best with it. Members opposite can make up their own minds. If they genuinely want reform and a redistribution in the House of Assembly, they will allow this Bill to go through, knowing they can hold up any redistribution for the Legislative Council later if they wish. But if they do not really want any redistribution in this Chamber, they will continue to act as they are acting now and try to hold up the measure. If these amendments are not agreed to, there is, to put it at its lowest, a real danger that we will lose everything.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

The Hon. ROBIN MILLHOUSE: There is a real danger that we will lose everything that we have gained in the last three or four months. We have made great progress in this place, and in the other place, on a redistribution in respect of this Chamber. To me, this is of supreme importance, and this is why the Government asks the Committee to accept these amendments.

Mr. CORCORAN: We have heard the Attorney-General at a distinct disadvantage tonight: he has an unsavoury thing to deal with and that, of course, is the action of his colleagues in another place. The Attorney-General has virtually said to us tonight in this Chamber that we should support amendments that will provide for a redistribution to which we are totally opposed, but he is saying, "Support them, because this will enable the Bill to go through, the commission to be set up and its work to commence so that it can bring back its proposals to us." He has really unearthed a little plot that has been developed to try to put us in an awkward position and, indeed, to try to rescue the Premier from his backbenchers regarding the proposal for this Chamber. I cannot understand why the Attorney-General thinks we are so naive that we should accept his statement, carry on, and not raise a voice of protest; I cannot understand why he thinks we are not interested in one vote one value and in trying to get some semblance of democracy into another place. Apparently the only thing in which we should be interested is getting a Bill through so that the commission can get to work and redistribute the boundaries of this place, disregarding anything else that may happen.

Of course, what we started on this occasion in relation to another place would not be thrown back at us in later years! Let us cast our minds back to the arguments advanced, when the Bill was originally before this Chamber, concerning why we should not alter the boundaries in another place at all. We designed amendments to provide that there would be no change at all in the boundaries of another place on the basis that we did not want to interfere with them in any way at all, and this was basically agreed to. Both the Premier and the Attorney-General said at the time, "You must accept consequential amendments because of the difficulty of defining new boundaries under the Constitution." The Premier said:

The fears that have been expressed by members opposite are completely unfounded when one reads the initial part of subclause (8), which provides:

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

Paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) then provide for the consequential alteration of the boundaries. Indeed, paragraph (*a*) ties this up clearly. No accident can happen and there is no difference of opinion between the Parties on this question . . .

Yet we hear the Premier tonight supporting amendments; he has done a complete somersault. The Attorney-General said we on this side well knew that, depending on the commission's report, there could be a Bill requiring a constitutional majority and that we could block the passage of the measure. If this sort of performance is to be put up by the Government, how can we support any constitutional alteration in this Chamber? We know another place can amend a measure and send it back and that it can be accepted with a simple majority, but look at what the simple majority is doing on this occasion! If that is the sort of performance we can expect from this Government in the future, we will not see any electoral reform during the term of this Parliament. That is how serious it is.

We have heard almost continuously in this place over the past 12 months about the need for electoral reform. The Premier and every member of his Government, as well as the Opposition, have constantly canvassed this matter, and it has exercised the mind of practically every citizen of the State. As the Leader said, it was a major issue at the Millicent by-election, yet we have seen an effort to block the passage of this measure, which has obviously caused some embarrassment to the Premier, many of his backbenchers thinking he has gone too far in the matter.

As well as statements made by the Premier, other statements were made by the Attorney-General (with which, no doubt, other members will deal) about what it was proposed to do about the Council boundaries. Yet this evening, the Premier had the temerity to say that we should not worry about this matter. We are supposed to agree to something that would create not only additional members of Parliament but, as the Leader said, re-gerrymander the Upper House so that we could never govern in our own right in this State in the foreseeable future. The Attorney-General said that the situation in the Commonwealth Parliament is that if the number of members in the House of Representatives is increased the number in the Senate is increased correspondingly. I remind the Attorney-General that both his Party and my Party supported the breaking of the nexus when a referendum was held on the matter. It was held by the Leaders of both Parties that the nexus was not necessary.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: The people of Australia didn't agree.

Mr. CORCORAN: I am talking about what the Parties said. The Attorney has turned the point around.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: The people turned it down.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: At least the electors were given some right in that case.

Mr. CORCORAN: I can tell the Attorney-General what influenced the result of that referendum. It was influenced by a splinter group which said that the breaking of the nexus would lead to more members of Parliament when, in fact, the opposite was the case. I can see the result of the manoeuvrings that have gone on behind the scenes in this case. It is not sufficient for the Premier, the Attorney-General or any other Government member to say, "Tut, tut, fellows, let it go through; have a commission look at it and then you can throw it out." The Opposition will not take this sort of thing lying down. The Attorney-General said that this provision would mean two country divisions and two city divisions with 24 members. This would mean that 12 Legislative Council members would represent almost four times as many people as the other 12, and we totally oppose this and always will. I thought the Attorney-General had come around to believing in one vote one value, but we now see a completely opposite stand being taken because it suits his purpose on this occasion.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: He wants 91,000 people in one district and 214,000 in another, each district electing the same number of members and he says he believes in one vote one value.

Mr. CORCORAN: It is rather strange that another Bill before the Council has not been dealt with that I think would have been more appropriate to deal with, particularly in view of the statements of the Premier and other leading members of Cabinet that they do not want to unduly interfere with Council boundaries and that this should be the subject of another Bill. Surely members of their own Party in another place have some responsibility to see what their leaders are saying and will do, and to co-operate with them in some respect. However, members of another place are a law unto themselves and they intend to entrench this principle by doing what they have done in this case. They are not interested in the other Bill before that Chamber because they can do what they want to do in this way, yet the Attorney-General says that we should agree to these amendments. That is unthinkable and the Attorney-General knows

it. The arguments he advanced this evening were unsound, and we could not possibly support these amendments. That is all I have to say at present, but I am sure plenty more will be said.

Mr. HUDSON: I think that unless they are willing to change their attitude on this matter, the Premier and the Attorney-General have demonstrated that they are not men of their word. This may have been forced on them by reactionary deadheads in another place, who have no concern for the popular will of the people of the State and who think that there must reside in them the permanent power to determine what legislation should go through this Parliament and that people in general cannot be trusted. That is the attitude of these people in another place and it is these people who have led the Premier and the Attorney-General astray. Let me remind the Premier and the Attorney-General in more detail than the member for Millicent has reminded them of what was said by them when this matter was under discussion previously. At page 2305 of *Hansard,* when I was dealing with some suspicions I had about the members of another place and what their reaction would be, the Premier said, "You are too suspicious." I replied, "We have every right to be suspicious, having lived in a State where a gerrymander has applied since 1938." At page 2306, the Attorney-General said:

The Government is ensuring that the Council districts remain substantially as they are now . . . Opposition members were concerned last night—for the first time—about the relationship between this House and the Legislative Council. I can assure them that what they were worried about will not happen. We have made certain of this today by discussion with some honourable members of another place.

The member for West Torrens then interjected, "Did you discuss the other Bill, too?", and the Attorney-General replied:

No; we discussed only this Bill. The tender concern of the member for Glenelg need not worry us at all. There will be no difficulty over this.

The Attorney-General does not deny that those words were said.

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: Sometimes you can be wrong, I am afraid.

Mr. HUDSON: Wrong! The Attorney-General gave us assurances that we had no cause to be suspicious. He has been demonstrated not to be a man of his word in this connection. He should stick to his word and not be like these reactionaries in another place. Then came this remark of the Premier, which was quoted by the member for Millicent:

The fears that have been expressed by members opposite are completely unfounded.

That is what the Premier told us. He said:

No accident can happen and there is no difference of opinion between the Parties on this question.

Later, he said:

Surely that would preclude any capricious action or thought of intention to alter the existing Legislative Council boundaries.

They are the words of the Premier. At page 2309, the Premier said:

I am moving this amendment in an effort to allay some fears that have been expressed by the Opposition in respect of redrawing Legislative Council district boundaries.

He said that when agreeing to a certain amendment moved to his original proposition. We have been double-dealt on this.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: That is completely out of context, and you know it.

Mr. HUDSON: It is in relation to the adjustment of Legislative Council boundaries, and it is not out of context.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Read out the lot.

Mr. HUDSON: The Premier gave us an assurance that we need have no fears that there would be any mucking around with the Legislative Council boundaries.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: You know it's out of context.

Mr. HUDSON: It is not out of context at all. The Premier is trying to foist on us a complete gerrymander of the Legislative Council. He is prepared to put up to the people of this State that as between metropolitan and country areas in the House of Assembly we can have 28 metropolitan seats and 19 country seats and that that is a fair proposition. However, for the Legislative Council he says it can be 12 country seats and 12 metropolitan seats. Why cannot the same principle as we are adopting in respect of elections for the House of Assembly apply in respect of the Legislative Council? That was not mentioned when we last considered the Bill. The Premier and the Attorney-General went out of their way to assure us that any suspicions we had about double dealing or capricious alteration of boundaries were unfounded. The Attorney-General said that he had a discussion with members of another place and that there was no chance of anything going wrong. I tell the Premier and the Attorney-General that they are not men of their word. They have gone back on their word and have indulged in

double dealing. The members of the front bench have agreed to a dirty, rotten, crooked deal, not only because it involves a gerrymander, but also because it increases the number of members in each district from four to six. By that increase if one Party gets 51 per cent of the votes at two successive Legislative Council elections, it will get all six members, while the other Party, getting 49 per cent of the votes, will not get any members.

The only circumstance in which an increase in the number of members for each district can be increased is by proportional representation. Otherwise, support for an increase in a number of members is support for a crooked gerrymander, designed to retain for those who have control of the Legislative Council the permanent power over legislation. What confidence have those members and what method of selection puts them there? The people have virtually no voice in the selection of those members, some of whom would be better superannuated. This proposition is designed specifically to ensure for all time that, of the 24 members of the Upper House, 18 will be Liberal members and no more than six will be Labor members.

Ask yourself, Mr. Chairman, if you have any degree of impartiality in this matter, why the number of members in each Council district is being increased to six. The reason is that, if there were three Council districts in the country area, each electing four members, Labor could win one of those districts and, if there were three districts of four members each in the city, Labor could win two of those districts. Thus, Labor would be capable of having 12 of the 24 members. That would never do, because the members of the Legislative Council have a God-given right to represent the permanent will of the people! They know what is best for the Premier and they treat him as though he was a puppet. When they tell him to change his mind, he changes it and tries to sell us a crooked deal. They have done the same thing with the Attorney-General, who has the gall to say that the Government is merely trying to get the Bill to the Electoral Commission. He knows that the Opposition will not accept this proposal for the Legislative Council and that, when the commission reports, the report will be thrown out, and he will be able to tell the people another pack of lies and that the Labor Party prevented electoral reform.

Mr. Broomhill: Whom do they think they will fool?

Mr. HUDSON: I do not know, but they will have a painful time if they think they will get away with this. Will any Government member explain how he can justify having 12 members in an enlarged metropolitan area extending from Sellick Beach to Gawler and comprising 428,000 electors, and another 12 members representing the remainder of the State, comprising 182,000 electors? The Government cannot justify that and at the same time support a House of Assembly distribution of 28 city members and 19 country members. Was the Minister of Works a party to the deal? Why did no member of Cabinet support this Bill in the form in which it left this Chamber?

Mr. Burdon: It was a gerrymander, three overruling six.

Mr. HUDSON: If that is so, these six must have been the greatest lot of gutless wonders this State has ever seen, and it is about time they got out. If the three did not overrule the six, they have double dealt, not only with the Opposition, and their assurances are worthless. Why do they not stand up and fight the Legislative Council? I have been appalled at some things that have happened in this Parliament and in the Legislative Council, but never so appalled as I am on this occasion. The Legislative Council went quietly on this Bill, having one speech a day and adjourning the debate.

Mr. Burdon: For how long did they speak?

Mr. HUDSON: About 20 minutes or 30 minutes. That went on for weeks in that august Chamber. If ever there was an argument for the abolition of the other place it was the performance on this matter. Members of the Council have told the people and Cabinet, these gentlemen on the front bench, full of dignity and propriety, "You can have something approximating democracy, but in the Legislative Council we are superior people."

If Government members vote for the Bill as it stands they will show themselves to everyone as weaklings who can be pushed around. This is one of the angriest speeches I have made, but I consider that I have every right to be angry. All members should express their indignation in order to bring home to the Government that what it is doing cannot be supported. It is wrong in principle, and involves an increase in the number of members for each district which, on the system of voting, makes the set-up worse. It involves a recognition on the Government's part that the Legislative Council represents the permanent will of the people, that Government

members, as representatives of the people elected on a full franchise, are not to be trusted, and that we are not to be trusted, either. It seems that only the superior people, who somehow know the inner workings of the Liberal and Country League and who gain Party selection by a rotten system in the first place, have the right to determine what the laws of this State shall be, and have the right to determine the kind of electoral system that will operate. If this is not contrary to the principles as stated by this Chamber, I do not know what is, and I oppose this amendment.

Mr. CASEY: I support members who have criticized this amendment, and I am disgusted at the attitude of the Premier and the Attorney-General. Earlier, when discussing the Bill in this Chamber, we favoured electoral reform and I thought that the two political Parties could join in solving the problem. A genuine and honest attempt was made by members on both sides to reach a sane compromise. The compromise that we reached then did much for politics in this State, but immediately the Bill left this Chamber the Government started to play politics. Who is the Government of this State—the House of Assembly or the Legislative Council? The way these amendments have been accepted by Cabinet members in this Chamber indicates that this Chamber does not govern the State. The House of Assembly has always been recognized as the Government of the State: it is the working Chamber, and everyone eligible votes for members in this Chamber. The opportunity is not available to do that for members in another place, and I have always criticized this system. These amendments create the situation where one district in the metropolitan area will contain about 236,500 voters and the other district will have about 193,500 voters if there was universal franchise, but that does not exist at present. It would happen if the same roll was used for both Houses. The lowest number of voters in a country district would be 76,500, and this result seems to be completely out of balance. The Legislative Council always refers to itself as a House of Review.

Mr. Lawn: No it doesn't.

Mr. CASEY: It still does, but how can it be a House of Review when it is a Party House? The member who introduced these amendments is the Secretary of the Liberal Party in the Upper House, who spoke about the bicameral system of Parliament by saying that it applied in most elected Houses, but then referred to the situation in the mother of Parliaments. How hyprocritical can he get? We have based our system on that used at Westminster, but the honourable member readily admitted that the suggested system did not apply to that Parliament. Apparently, we are to form our own system in this State so that the Liberal Party will always control the Upper House. This means (and this was proved conclusively when the Labor Party was in Government) that financial measures would be ruthlessly rejected by the Upper House. This is the thing to which I violently object. I think it is a disgusting state of affairs.

Mr. Rodda: You sound as though you don't mean it.

Mr. CASEY: If the member for Victoria wants to interject out of his seat, I am quite happy to have a go at him. If he is a man that believes in a fair go, and I sincerely hope he does because he is a country man and usually country people are pretty level-headed fellows—

Mr. Virgo: There are exceptions.

Mr. CASEY: —he ought to realize that this measure is absolutely rotten. We went to much trouble to convey to the people of South Australia that at last we had come to some agreement, that we had reached some sanity in the political set-up of this State, and that we were going ahead with electoral reform. It is absolutely disgusting that now we have this tripe that has been cooked up by members of the Upper House to satisfy their own whims and so that they can stay in Government for goodness knows how long, perhaps for the next 50 years. We will never see a Labor majority in the Upper House under the conditions that have been proposed.

Of course, this is what the Liberal Party wants, because it knows that sooner or later the Labor Party will again triumph in the Lower House and become the so-called Government. Unfortunately, any measure that goes through this Chamber can be simply thrown out the window by another place, as has been proved previously, so this proves beyond any doubt that the Party that has the majority in this place is not and never has been the Government of this State, because the Upper House always has the final say. If that Chamber decides to let a measure go through, that is all well and good, but if it decides otherwise it throws a measure out. It has more power than this Chamber has, because it can alter money Bills.

I was amazed when I heard the Attorney-General speak tonight. I thought he was going to say something of consequence more or less to back up the argument that was raised in

the Upper House on this matter. In all my time in this place I have never heard such a weak speech from the Attorney. He could not substantiate any argument, and to me he was most unconvincing. That gentleman has said on numerous occasions in this Chamber that he supports the principle of one vote one value, and for him to turn around and accept this just goes to show that he has been absolutely forced into accepting this measure. It cannot be that he was able to make up his own mind on this matter, because if he were he would not have supported this proposal. Why does he support this measure?

Mr. McKee: He has to support everything that is done up there; he is a puppet.

Mr. CASEY: It is high time the people of this State were told that the Upper House is the Government of this State and that it is elected by a minority. Unfortunately, the people do not realize this. Some people do not have the right to cast a vote for that House. One member of the Upper House said that a person only had to own a little piece of land in order to get his name on the roll and that this was only a little qualification that was neither here nor there. Well, it is a pretty big thing today for a person to own a block of land. There are more people on the basic wage in this State today than there are in the higher income bracket, and many people in this State will never own a block of land. As a result, those people have no say whatever in the election of members of the Upper House, yet that House can dictate terms to this Chamber. It did this for the last three years, and now it is telling six Cabinet Ministers in this Chamber exactly what to do. The Premier said that the Bill as it left this Chamber was designed as a short cut to agreement. He went on to say that it was based on a single-member system for the House of Assembly. He said:

I am adopting the same principle as was adopted by the Australian Labor Party in its last published Bill of dealing only with the House of Assembly. The Bill is therefore concerned with the constitution of the House of Assembly, the election of whose members decides the type of Government that will govern South Australia.

I have never heard anything so stupid in all my life, bearing in mind what the Premier had to say tonight. He does not govern this State, and he never has done so. The Upper House has called the tune and it will continue to do so, and the sooner the people of this State realize what is going on in this Parliament the better it will be for them. It is high time members opposite realized exactly what they are letting this State in for if they vote for this measure. They all agreed when this Bill went through originally that there had to be some sort of compromise to bring political stability to this State, for we have been held up as the laughing stock of Australia since the last election, when the Labor Party received a greater percentage of votes yet could not govern.

We have heard that said in this Chamber on numerous occasions, and it is a fact. What we attempted to do was see that that would never occur again. The Hon. Mr. Potter has only just returned from a trip overseas during which he toured Canada. The honourable member should have taken notice of the provinces in Canada, which do not have a bicameral system of Parliament even though they are within the British Commonwealth of nations. One can roll up arguments all the way along the line, and one can quote places which have a bicameral system of Parliament and other places which have not. I have always said (and I say it again tonight) that I believe in a two-House system only on condition that the Upper House is a House of Review. Members of the other place say that it is a House of Review. However, it is complete and utter mockery to make a statement like that, because it never has been and never will be a House of Review: it is purely and simply a Party House.

Mr. Burdon: A protection House for the Liberal Party.

Mr. CASEY: It cannot be called a House of Review because it is composed of a Liberal Party and a Labor Party. The members in the Upper House do not want too much publicity about that Chamber, for they do not want the people outside to know exactly what its functions are in the Parliament of this State. The more they can hush it up, the better it is for them. On the other hand, the sooner people see some publicity about that Chamber the better off they will be. I sincerely hope that details of the debate tonight will be conveyed to the people of South Australia so that they will find out the rotten state of politics that exists here at present and the rotten way in which the Liberal Party is going about remaining in Government. If it is not in Government in this Chamber it is in Government in the Upper House and it can throw out any legislation introduced by a different Party in this Chamber. It did it three years ago and will do it again. I shall not be afraid

to go out on to the highways and byways of this State and tell the people just how rotten the political set-up is in this State.

When I entered this Parliament I admit I had no idea of the powers of the Legislative Council, and I think honourable members opposite had no idea when they first entered this Parliament; but, having been here for only a few months, I realized that the Upper House was there for one reason and one reason only—to support a small minority of people in this State and to see that legislation was introduced to protect it. It is unfortunate for us that we have this set-up in South Australia; every other State in the Commonwealth has a better system of electing the Upper House. Queensland has no Upper House and does not want one. It was interesting to hear the remarks of a gentleman from New Zealand some time ago, at a Commonwealth Parliamentary Association dinner, when the question was raised whether New Zealand would reintroduce the Upper House it had abolished many years previously. He was interviewed but, strangely enough, his comments were never printed, because he said that his Government, a Liberal Government, would favour an Upper House provided it was a House of Review, and a House of Review only. That is the feeling of a sister member of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, just across the Tasman Sea, which probably thinks more like Australians than anybody else does and which at some time in the future will no doubt be linked politically with Australia. Trying to hoodwink the people of South Australia into believing that the Upper House is a House of Review is what I am complaining about. It never has been, it is not likely to be and, if this measure goes through, it never will be.

Every member on this side is entitled to get heated in a debate like this. I never thought it possible that a measure like this would be supported by members of a Government Party who had already passed a Bill that did not refer to this matter at all but dealt only with the House of Assembly. I remember several years ago when a Bill dealing with Parliamentary salaries (which were then fixed by Parliament itself) passed through this Parliament and members of the Upper House complained bitterly because they did not think they would get enough. The Premier at that time (the late Mr. Frank Walsh) said, "If you are not satisfied, you introduce your own Bill over there." He called their bluff and they went along with it because they were afraid that, if they did not, they would get adverse publicity outside Parliament, and people would begin to ask, "Exactly what is the function of this Upper House?" They did not want publicity and have never wanted it. They have always wanted to hoodwink the public of South Australia because the less one knows about a place the less one worries about it. That is why many people are not worried about our Upper House: they do not know enough about it. This measure will hit the headlines. The sooner it does, the better it will be for the people and the Parliament of this State. In no circumstances will I support these amendments.

Progress reported; Committee to sit again.

BUSH FIRES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

PUBLIC EXAMINATIONS BOARD BILL

The SPEAKER: Message No. 58 from the Legislative Council:

The Legislative Council insists on its amendments in the Public Examinations Board Bill—

Mr. McKee: Insists!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Jennings: The Speaker is on his feet.

The SPEAKER: If the honourable member interjects again, I shall have to take the drastic action I have threatened before. The message continues:

to which the House of Assembly has disagreed. The Bill is returned herewith.

LICENSING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 1)

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

At 11 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, December 11, at 2 p.m.