

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, July 14, 1970

The House met at 11 a.m. pursuant to proclamation issued by His Excellency the Governor's Deputy (Sir Mellis Napier).

The Acting Clerk (Mr. A. F. R. Dodd) read the proclamation summoning Parliament.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT

At 11.5 a.m., in compliance with summons, the House proceeded to the Legislative Council, where a Commission was read appointing the Hon. John Jefferson Bray (Chief Justice) to be a Commissioner for the opening of Parliament.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The House being again in its own Chamber, at 11.12 a.m. His Honour Mr. Justice Bray attended and produced a Commission from His Excellency the Governor's Deputy appointing him to be a Commissioner to administer to the House of Assembly the Oath of Allegiance or the Affirmation in lieu thereof required by the Constitution Act. The Commission was read by the Clerk, who then produced writs for the election of 47 members for the House of Assembly.

The Oath of Allegiance required by law was administered to and subscribed by all members except the honourable member for Mallee (Mr. Nankivell), who was absent.

The Commissioner retired.

ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I remind the House that it is now necessary to proceed to the election of a Speaker, and I nominate the member for Semaphore (Mr. R. E. Hurst) for that position.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I have much pleasure in seconding the nomination.

Mr. HURST (Semaphore): In compliance with Standing Orders and in accordance with the tradition of this Parliament, I humbly submit my nomination to the will of the House.

There being no other nomination, Mr. Hurst was declared elected.

Mr. Hurst was escorted to the dais by the mover and seconder of his nomination.

The SPEAKER (The Hon. R. E. HURST): Standing here on the upper step, which is the traditional approach to the Chair, I thank the honourable Premier and the honourable Leader of the Opposition and

acknowledge the confidence that has been placed in me. I express my gratitude to members for the honour conferred in the call to this high office. Confidence in the fairness of the Speaker is an indispensable condition of the successful working of Parliamentary procedure and, therefore, I shall at all times endeavour to give the utmost protection to members' rights, collectively and individually. The majority get the decision, and the minority must be given their rights. The assistance and wholehearted support of all members on both sides are required to maintain the prestige and dignity of the Chamber.

[Sitting suspended from 11.42 a.m. to 12.10 p.m.]

The SPEAKER: It is now my intention to proceed to Government House to present myself to His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, and I invite members to accompany me.

At 12.11 p.m., attended by a deputation of members, the Speaker proceeded to Government House.

On the House reassembling at 12.26 p.m.:

The SPEAKER: Accompanied by a deputation of members, I proceeded to Government House for the purpose of presenting myself to His Excellency the Governor's Deputy and informed His Excellency that, in pursuance of the powers conferred on the House by section 34 of the Constitution Act, the House of Assembly had this day proceeded to the election of Speaker, and had done me the honour of election to that high office. In compliance with the other provisions of the same section, I presented myself to His Excellency as the Speaker and, in the name and on behalf of the House, laid claim to members' undoubted rights and privileges, and prayed that the most favourable construction might be put on all their proceedings; whereupon His Excellency was pleased to reply as follows:

I congratulate the members of the House of Assembly on their choice of a Speaker. I readily assure you, Mr. Speaker, of my confirmation of all the constitutional rights and privileges of the House of Assembly, the proceedings of which will always receive my most favourable consideration.

[Sitting suspended from 12.28 to 2.15 p.m.]

SUMMONS TO COUNCIL CHAMBER

A summons was received from His Excellency the Governor's Deputy desiring the attendance of the House in the Legislative Council Chamber, whither the Speaker and honourable members proceeded.

The House having returned to its own Chamber, the Speaker resumed the Chair at 2.53 p.m. and read prayers.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That Mr. S. J. Lawn be Chairman of Committees of the whole House during the present Parliament.

Motion carried.

GOVERNOR'S DEPUTY'S SPEECH

The SPEAKER: I have to report that, in compliance with the summons from His Excellency the Governor's Deputy, the House attended in the Legislative Council Chamber, where His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, of which I obtained a copy, which I now lay upon the table.

Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

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

- Islington Sewage Farm Development,
- Reorganization of the South-Western Suburbs Sewerage System and Provision for Sewerage of the Blackwood, Belair, Eden Hills and Flagstaff Hill Areas (final),
- South-Western Suburbs Floodwaters Drainage Scheme (Stage II) and Additional Improvements to Patowalonga Basin.
- Strathalbyn to Victor Harbor-Milang Railway (final),
- Thebarton Primary School.

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTIONS

NATIONAL SERVICE

Mr. HALL: This morning the Fortieth Parliament assembled for the first time, and members swore an oath of allegiance to the Queen. On June 29, on a television programme the Premier said that he would advise 20-year-olds to disobey the laws of Australia and not register for National Service. The National Service Act was passed by the Commonwealth Parliament in both Houses in November, 1964, and approved by His Excellency the Governor-General, as Her Majesty's representative, on November 24, 1964. I therefore ask the Premier whether he holds the same view now in relation to the National Service Act as he held on June 29.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the Leader of the Opposition has not quoted what I said on the occasion in question, I will repeat what I said then. I said that, if my son were to ask me whether he should register for National Service, my reply to him would be that that was something about which he would have to make up his own mind. I also said that, if he thought it was wrong to be involved in National Service in support of an undeclared war of the kind in which he would now be required to be involved, he should make up his mind whether he would take the consequences of his failure to register. I told him that if I were in his position I would have to say that I would not register. Because I am in public life, I do not believe it is right for me simply to say that that was private advice which I give only to members of my own family. If I am asked whether that is my view, I will state it publicly. That is what I said then, and it is what I say now. Also, I do not believe one is supporting patriotism when one says, "My country, right or wrong." The only patriotic attitude to take is that it is a citizen's duty to see that his country is right.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I was fascinated by the explanation given by the Premier of the remarks attributed to him some weeks ago. If I understood his explanation correctly, the advice that he would give to his son and to others in the community would be to break the law and accept the consequences, provided that this was in accord with the lawbreaker's conscience. How the Premier can reconcile that advice with the doctrine of the rule of law that has guided lawyers and others in the community for over 80 years, I do not know. Where such a theory would end, I do not know, unless it was in chaos and the breakdown of the whole community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must ask his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier therefore say whether he would advocate such a course of action with regard to any particular law to which a person had a conscientious objection? For example, does he advocate that those who object to voting at elections should defy the law that makes such voting compulsory, and, if such persons do not vote at elections, does he intend that proceedings should be taken against them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reply to the first question is "No" and that to the second question is "Yes".

Mr. RODDA: In view of the Premier's statement, which he has repeated today, that as a matter of conscience he would advise young men to break the law rather than to register for National Service, and in view of the other references by the honourable gentleman regarding the Returned Servicemen's League, which references must be an embarrassment to those distinguished ex-servicemen on his side of the House as well as to those on this side, will he say whether, because of the strong views he holds, he intends to refrain (as it is his undoubted privilege if he so desires) from attending functions arranged in this State by ex-servicemen's organizations?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I do not. The remarks I made relating to the R.S.L. were in reply to remarks that Brigadier Eastick saw fit to make. I pointed out to him that, since he made a blanket statement about law-abiding citizens in this State, there were many instances in which R.S.L. clubs for a considerable period had seen fit to defy a particular law in this State, as he would well know and as every member of this House would know. That was what I said about that matter and in defence of my right to make the statement of conscience that I made. I do not intend to refrain from attending R.S.L. functions: in fact, I was at some of those functions when the law was broken.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Premier said that he would, if a 20-year-old, defy the Commonwealth law on National Service but I understood him to say, in reply to the member for Mitcham, that he would not defy any other law. Will the Premier say what distinction he can see between this law and any other?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The distinction between this law and other laws, as far as I am concerned (and I emphasize here that this is a personal attitude of mine: I do not seek to bind anyone else to it), is that I believe that this country is utterly wrong in being involved in the war in Vietnam and that I could not involve myself in support of our continued presence there.

SOCIAL STUDIES TEXTBOOKS

Mr. CLARK: As the first questioner from the Government side I extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my most sincere congratulations on your elevation to the Speakership. My question relates to the recent meeting that was held, according to newspaper reports, at Cummins, at which the chief speaker was, apparently, Mr. John McLeay, M.H.R. At the meeting it was alleged that two books, which I believe are

part of the social studies course in South Australian schools, namely, *The Australian Society* and *Within a Community*, had something radically wrong with them. The words I have seen used were that they were "anti-family", "pro-Communist" and, worst of all, (and I say this with bated breath) "anti-Liberal".

Mr. Jennings: With a capital "L", too.

Mr. CLARK: As I understand that the Minister of Education has been examining these books and I believe has now had time to complete that examination, will he state his findings as a result of such examination?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I thank the honourable member for his question, because I believe this is a matter that needs to be clarified. The first of these textbooks, *The Australian Society*, is a first-year book, and the second, *Within a Community*, is a third-year book used, in the main, in technical high schools for a terminal course for those students doing social studies who are likely to leave school at the end of their third year; it is a book for a track 2 course in the third year of secondary study. The books have been produced by an organization known as the Social Studies Textbooks Association, and they have resulted from the fact that these courses have existed for some time without any appropriate textbook being available. The track 2 course for social studies for third-year students has existed since 1964. It is worth noticing that the period from 1964 until now covers effectively the three years of Labor Government and three years of L.C.L. Government. The book *Within a Community* has been written to match the syllabus provided for that course. The nature of the course taught in technical high schools and in some area schools for track 2 students has been unchanged over this period of six years. In general, the preparation of curricula and textbooks is a matter which involves the professional competence of teachers and administrators within the Education Department and which is carried out independently of the Minister of Education, and so it should be and so it has been in the past under previous Ministers—Mr. Loveday, the present member for Davenport, and the present member for Torrens. I am certain that the members for Davenport and Torrens would fully support my statement that this procedure was the only proper way in which curricula and textbooks could be produced. If we, as politicians, start to interfere with matters that are within the professional competence of teachers it will not be long before we break

down the standards of education within South Australia.

A very thorough investigation has been undertaken into this matter over the weekend and yesterday, and I am satisfied that the charges laid by Mr. McLeay against certain textbooks in use in South Australian Government schools are wholly without foundation. At a meeting, which I believe was called by members of the League of Rights and the Eyre Bible Fellowship at Cummins on Friday night, Mr. McLeay alleged that the books *The Australian Society* and *Within a Community*, although they were not identified by those names in the press, showed anti-family, pro-Communist and anti-Liberal Party biases.

I believe the claims are based on a sad misunderstanding of the books, of social studies courses in South Australian schools and of a modern education system. Mr. McLeay and the League of Rights are critical of any progress or innovation in education; they show, I believe, a complete lack of understanding of modern methods of education which are designed to encourage students to think for themselves. Their actions in implying that anyone who does not espouse their own views is communistic in outlook are to be deplored. The social studies courses are undertaken to foster, by means of thorough discussion of relevant issues, fuller understanding of the kind of society we live in. For example, the whole question referring to the advantages and disadvantages of our marriage system follows on from a description of the family life of the Eskimoes and bushmen of the Kalahari and is intended to help students appreciate the reasons behind the marriage system in each type of community.

The whole purpose of this is to enable students to understand our own arrangements, by means of a comparative study, and to suggest that questions asked about the marriage system or the family arrangements in Australia are, therefore, anti-family is completely and utterly wrong. Much of the purpose of this chapter and of other sections of the book is to get students to appreciate that the family is important in maintaining the values of a society and that there must be law enforcement in families as in any group in society or there will be chaos. Nowhere in the book is there anything to suggest defiance of law and order; in fact, the reverse is the case. Hence, I believe that Mr. McLeay's claim is both irresponsible and grossly unfair. The book complained of as being pro-Communist does, in fact, give a balanced introduction to the

ideals and malpractices of one of the world's major systems of Government and cannot be interpreted as extolling the virtues of that system.

Of the 271 pages of the book, seven pages are given to Communism in the section dealing with the main systems of Government of the world, and there are some adverse comments on that system in that section; five pages are provided for the discussion of dictatorships, and 23 pages contain a description of democracy and what democratic Government means in Australia. If there is any bias in this section it is to get the student to see the value of our own democratic system of Government. The complaint that the books carried more information about the A.L.P. than about the Liberal Party is probably due to the inclusion of an outline of the social history of the labour movement in Australia. I ask members again to consider the particular course for which this book is provided: track 2 students at the third year level.

Within a Community is used, as I have said, by track 2 students in their third year who are not expected to receive further formal education. Consequently, the book, following the curriculum that has been in existence for six years, gives significant space to questions concerning the labour movement, the determination of wages, the arbitration system and the settlement of industrial disputes, and to explaining how Australian institutions have developed historically. Mr. McLeay has chosen to presume that this section of the book is devoted to the Labor Party. The aim is to present to students material which they will read critically and discuss and from which they will ultimately form considered and intelligent opinions.

The General Editor of the books (Mr. D. G. Tulloch, Subject Consultant to the Education Department in social studies) has been for many years the leading figure in the development of social studies in this State. Conscious of the lack of suitable textual material for our various courses, he organized a group of teachers to contribute towards the writing of a series of books directly related to the courses. The group formed itself into an independent, non-profit-making organization called the Social Studies Textbooks Association. Excess money gained from sales has been distributed, in the form of library reference books and equipment, to schools. I suppose that Mr. McLeay might also object to some of these library reference books being distributed to schools.

This is a unique contribution to education by a publishing group of teachers. The General Editor and members of the editorial committee are held in the very highest esteem, as also are the Headmaster and staff of the Cummins Area School. I am appalled at the attack that has been made on their integrity and professional competence. It should be made clear that textbooks are recommended by committees convened by the Education Department; they are never prescribed. Heads of schools are free to augment or, indeed, replace books that happen to be on approved lists if more suitable publications come to light. I do not intend to interfere with that practice. It has been reported to me that, on the day of the Cummins meeting, the school committee sent a circular to parents saying that it had every confidence in the ability of the staff to present a balanced course. The Chairman of the school committee is Mr. Ian Pearson, son of Sir Glen Pearson, the former Treasurer and member for Flinders.

Within a Community itself best answers Mr. McLeay and those who are behind him in this matter when it states the following:

Any group that deliberately refuses to increase its knowledge and awareness of the problems facing human beings is surely not going to be capable of governing a country. Thus, before we can have a truly democratic country, its citizens must be capable of understanding what problems that country has and of expressing intelligent and helpful views about their solution.

I recommend the study of page 249 of the book to Mr. McLeay and to those who were associated with him in organizing the meeting held at Cummins last Friday evening.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I listened attentively to the long and obviously carefully prepared answer the Minister of Education had ready for this question, and, whilst I do not necessarily endorse the criticisms of the book *Within a Community* made by my Federal colleague the member for Boothby (Mr. McLeay) and others, I agree with the Minister that the object of the book is obviously to provide material on which students may make up their own minds on the issues raised in it. Bearing that in mind, I notice that there is a very large amount of material in the book on the Australian Labor Party but scant mention of the Liberal and Country League, the Liberal Party in Australia, or indeed of all other Parties represented in the Parliaments of Australia. For example, in chapter 3 (this is headed "Labour" with a "u" so I make no complaint about that) on page 68 the objective

of the Australian Labor Party is set out, and there is a sub-heading on page 78, I think, entitled "The Australian Labor Party" followed by two pages on the A.L.P. Appendix 1 to that chapter gives what is described as a fuller account of the A.L.P., and that runs from page 96 to page 103. As I have said, the only mention of the L.C.L. is at page 250, where there is one paragraph of about six lines.

Mr. Jennings: It must have been padded.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, it may be padding but, if it is, it is quite inaccurate padding. I do not agree with the viewpoint expressed in that lone paragraph. Incidentally, there is one straightout inaccuracy which I noticed on page 33 and which can be corrected quite easily. This refers to the Greek civilization evolving in about 3,500 B.C.; that is about 3,000 years too early, as the Minister will agree. However, that is just by the way. I know that, irrespective of Party, the Minister would agree with me that there should be a balanced presentation of material, certainly on the major political Parties. That being so, will he discuss the matter with the curriculum committee, which I understand is responsible for the book, with a view to the book's revision so that there is a more balanced coverage of political thought and of the political Parties which represent that thought?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer to the question is "No". The Minister does not have any direct powers in relation to these matters. As the member for Mitcham will know, these matters come purely within the professional competence of departmental officers under the Director-General. I do not think it is proper for the political representative in the Parliament to intervene in relation to this type of matter. I believe we can leave this sort of thing to the professional competence and integrity of those who write these books and of those who use them as teaching aids. Having said that, I point out that those who are responsible for the book and those responsible for the particular curriculum had a specific section of the curriculum syllabus dealing with the labour movement as a separate topic, as the honourable member will be aware from his study of the book. As the honourable member will also be aware, the people who have been associated with the preparation of the textbook say sincerely that this section is mainly concerned with an account of the development of trade unions, wages systems, the arbitration system and so on. It is pointed out that the

Labor Party developed initially as a political arm of the trade union movement.

The purpose of political Parties is dealt with in the most summary fashion in a separate chapter, and the Australian Labor Party, the Democratic Labor Party, the Australian Country Party and other Parties are dealt with similarly. It is purely a question of acquainting students with what the main aims of these Parties are, rather than of acquainting them with anything else. It may interest honourable members to know that I received a telephone call from one of the panel concerned with the book (although his name does not appear) who told me that he was responsible for writing the section on labour. He said that it might amuse me to know that he was a financial member of the Liberal and Country League.

PAYNEHAM ROAD CROSSING

Mr. JENNINGS: I take this opportunity of expressing to the Minister of Roads and Transport my congratulations on his recent elevation to Cabinet and of expressing the view that, if he is not a better Minister than was his predecessor, he should grab an axe and shoot himself, difficult as that may be to do in this technological age. Before the last election I wrote to the then Minister of Roads and Transport about providing a pedestrian crossing on Payneham Road near the Lutheran cottages for aged people. This area is no longer in my district, it now being represented by my distinguished friend the member for Gilles. When I wrote to the former Minister I asked him for certain information that I could use during this present session of Parliament. I did not get the information in time to use it for the then forthcoming election, and I still have not got it. Will the Minister find out whether a pedestrian crossing will be provided on Payneham Road near the Lutheran cottage homes? I will transmit the Minister's reply to the member for Gilles.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am rather disturbed at what the honourable member has said and I assure him that I will ask that this information be found. I fear that it may be in a big box known as the "too hard to handle" box, which is almost full. However, I will try to get this docket out and give the honourable member a reply as soon as possible.

COMPULSORY VOTING

Mr. CUMBE: Recently, the Premier said that he considered compulsory voting was necessary to achieve a democratically based decision at elections. Paragraph 31 of the

Governor's Deputy's Opening Speech, delivered a few minutes ago, states that the Government intends to introduce legislation providing for compulsory voting at council elections, whilst another paragraph of the Speech states that much industrial legislation will be introduced this session. Therefore, will the Premier say whether this industrial legislation that he intends to introduce will ensure that, in respect of industrial matters under this State's jurisdiction, compulsory voting must apply to any union election, particularly where any decision relating to strikes is to be made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, I do not, and I do not intend to introduce compulsory voting in the Liberal Party branches, either.

POLDA-KIMBA MAIN

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Works say what stage negotiations for Commonwealth aid to expedite construction of the Poldakimba main have reached? If no assistance can be obtained, will the Government consider increasing its allocation to this urgent project?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I know that the department has taken steps to make a submission to the Commonwealth Government in relation to this scheme which, incidentally, does not fall within the \$50,000,000 that the Commonwealth Government made available previously. Members may be interested to know that the Commonwealth Government has made available a further \$100,000,000 in this area, from which the funds for this scheme will be drawn. I cannot answer the honourable member's question directly; it is a matter that I will have to examine. However, I shall be happy to obtain for him a report as soon as possible, maybe this week.

LONSDALE PASSENGER SERVICE

Mr. HOPGOOD: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when a passenger train service will operate to Lonsdale, and how comprehensive such a service will be?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I regret that I cannot at this stage indicate the date of operation the honourable member is seeking. Suffice to say, however, that planning is proceeding and that earthworks have been undertaken with a view to extending this line. The Government regards this extension as the first step towards its ultimate aim of extending the railway system through the whole of the coast area to serve the rapidly expanding areas of Christies Beach, Port Stanvac and surrounding

districts. This is consistent with this Government's policy, which it has continued to enunciate, namely, that emphasis should be placed on the upgrading of public transport to solve some of our problems. This could be regarded as a first step in the right direction, and I hope soon to be able to inform the House of something slightly more specific concerning this project.

INTAKES AND STORAGES

Mr. LANGLEY: During the last few weeks there has been plentiful rain in various parts of the State, particularly in the hills. As the South Australian water supply is a matter of interest to people in the community, can the Minister of Works indicate the present holdings of reservoirs?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although the member for Angas is not now with us, I was certain that someone would ask me this question, so I am prepared to answer it. The present metropolitan reservoir holdings, compared with holdings 12 months ago, are as follows:

	Capacity 000,000 gall.	13/7/70 000,000 gall.	13/7/69 000,000 gall.
Mount Bold ..	10,440	4,993	7,657
Happy Valley ..	2,804	1,555	2,036
Clarendon Weir ..	72	64	67
Myponga ..	5,905	3,853	4,813
Millbrook ..	3,647	904	859
Kangaroo Creek ..	5,370	730	—
Hope Valley ..	765	525	501
Thorndon Park ..	142	112	118
Barossa ..	993	614	809
South Para ..	11,300	6,710	9,320
Totals	41,438	20,060	26,180

At present we are operating two pumps at Mannum during off-peak tariff hours to augment the Torrens River system by about 800,000,000 gall. a month. It is intended to continue with this rate of pumping for the present and to vary the pumping rate in the future depending on the amount of natural run-off water received into the various reservoirs. With the present reservoir storages and anticipated intakes it is expected that the metropolitan consumption for the 1970-71 summer can be met with moderate pumping from the Murray River.

FOOTBALL POOLS

Mr. McRAE: I note that the Premier has given notice that he intends to introduce a Bill to amend the Lottery and Gaming Act, and I gather that those amendments may eliminate current provisions in the Act which prevent the holding of quizzes. At present, the South

Australian National Football League is conducting, for the benefit of this State and particularly for the youth of the State, football clinics and training. As the league is in dire need of financial assistance, and both the State and the league would greatly benefit from the league's having its own headquarters, will the Premier consider amending the Lottery and Gaming Act to permit the South Australian National Football League to conduct a football pool on a fairly large scale, as has been suggested by certain private individuals? At present, as I understand it, these pools are not considered to be legal but, whether they are called quizzes or whether or not there is a test of skill, there seems to be an exemption in the case of the *News*, for some reason that I do not understand. Will the Premier consider an amendment of the kind to which I have referred?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This matter has not been considered by Cabinet. If the league intended to make a submission of that kind, we would certainly examine any submission that came to us. However, at this stage I cannot forecast what answer Cabinet would give. We would have to have the submission in full, examining it as against the situation now facing the State lottery.

WHEAT CHARGE

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Minister of Marine say whether the charge of 2.5 cents now imposed at Port Giles for harbour facilities will be removed before the 1970-71 harvest intake and, if it is to be removed, whether this will necessitate an amendment to the Harbours Act?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The answer to the honourable member's second question is that the legislation does not require amending. The answer to the first question is that Cabinet has already approved the removal of the charge. I take it that Executive Council will therefore move tomorrow to revoke the charge imposed in the legislation.

MOUNT GAMBIER OFFICER

Mr. BURDON: Before asking my question, I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Labour and Industry, to whom my question is addressed, on your appointments. From discussions we have had, the Minister will be aware that, as a result of the rapid development in the South-East in the last few years (and the potential for future progress, including the establishment of additional industries, is unlimited), it has become

impossible for the officer of the Labour and Industry Department in the area to provide the service required. Can the Minister say what plans the department has to increase its staff in the area so that awards and other provisions applying to factories can be fully policed?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I agree with the honourable member that a need exists to increase the staff of the department in the Mount Gambier area. From recent discussions with officers of my department, I understand that there are problems in relation to inspectors' training, which must be carried out in Adelaide. At present, I understand that the department is considering training an officer at the State head office for the position at Mount Gambier. However, I will obtain further information for the honourable member and give him a full report later.

NURSES

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary, say whether the present Government intends to continue the work of the committee set up by the previous Government in May to inquire into all aspects of nursing and, if it does, when a report from that committee can be expected?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will speak to my colleague about the matter and furnish a reply.

ROADSIDE SALES

Mrs. BYRNE: On recent weekends I have observed children selling fruit, chiefly oranges, on main roads on the fringes of the metropolitan area. These children who have no shelter from the prevailing weather, are forced to sit for long hours in the one spot. This matter was raised in this House previously by the present Minister when he was in Opposition, and the then Minister of Labour and Industry, although sympathetic, said that each investigation had revealed that the persons serving from these roadside stalls, both inside the Adelaide metropolitan area and on the outskirts, were either the proprietors or members of proprietors' families and that there was therefore no control over the hours they worked. As I am far from satisfied with the present position, will the Minister reopen this matter with a view to having this practice discontinued, either administratively or by legislation?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: As the honourable member has said, I have shown interest in this matter in the past and I agree with the member's statement, particularly as

it seems that the incidence of children selling fruit on roadsides increases during the winter months, doubtless because of the sale of oranges during that period, and it is unfortunate that so many young children are subjected to being out in all weather during the winter months. It is also true that the former Minister told me that one of the difficulties associated with this matter was that the children generally concerned were members of the proprietor's family and that therefore no control could be exercised in this direction. However, this matter could be reconsidered to find out whether the position could be improved. I shall be pleased to reconsider this matter and to reply to the honourable member soon.

NEPABUNNA MISSION

Mr. ALLEN: Last week I visited the Nepabunna Aboriginal Mission, an inter-denominational mission about 35 miles east of Copley, in the north of the State, which has about 26 children attending the school and, I understand, a total population of about 100 Aborigines. When the former Minister of Aboriginal Affairs (Mr. Millhouse) visited the mission during his term of office, he expressed pleasure at the standard at the mission. He was told that several additional houses, a 240-volt lighting plant, an electric petrol pump, and a replacement motor vehicle were necessary at the mission. As I understand that these requests were passed on to the appropriate department by the then Minister, can the present Minister say whether action has been taken to comply with them?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will take up with my departmental officers the matter raised by the honourable member, find out what has happened regarding it, and give a reply.

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Mr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say how many professional staff members were in his various departments at the commencement of the financial years 1966-67, 1967-68, 1968-69, 1969-70, and 1970-71? In addition, will he say how many professional staff members were appointed, how many left as a result of reaching the retiring age, and how many died during each of these years?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member cares to go to the Parliamentary

Library and read the appropriate reports, he will find all the information contained therein.

WATER POLLUTION

Mr. McANANEY: Many dairy farmers in the Hills district are being told by the Engineering and Water Supply Department that they will have to go to considerable expense to prevent pollution of streams in the district. Since the Government plans to spend \$144,000 on sewerage extensions to a factory in the South-East, can the Minister of Works say just what extra cost this will mean for the factory that is having its waste removed by the Government?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I point out to the honourable member that it was during the term of office of the previous Government that the pea factory was established in Millicent, and the residents of Millicent and surrounding districts are very grateful for its establishment. The quantity of effluent that would flow from that factory was grossly under-estimated. As a result of further information becoming available, it is now apparent that the treatment works that had been installed at Millicent are incapable of taking the effluent that will flow from the pea factory. Because the previous Government and the company entered into an arrangement in this connection, it is now incumbent on the Engineering and Water Supply Department to provide additional works at the plant and to ensure that the effluent is taken care of. Regarding the department's attitude to watersheds in the Hills district, I received a deputation (last week, I think) from residents of that district. The deputation expressed concern about certain controls that had been implemented (not by this Government but by the previous Government). Although these controls may be long overdue and necessary, they do materially affect people in certain areas. The points made by that deputation are now being considered by my department.

Mr. CURREN: As a report by the Drainage Advisory Committee and some of the recommendations in it concern the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Lands Department, the Local Government Department, the Tourist Bureau, and the Public Health Department, I direct my question to the Premier, as Leader of the Government. Because the report deals particularly with pollution of the Murray River, will the Premier give an assurance that, before Government policy is decided and regulations are framed, all councils concerned will be consulted?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, they will be consulted before any regulations are brought down.

LAND TAX

Mr. VENNING: I was very pleased to notice in His Excellency's Speech that it is recognized that financial relief is necessary for the rural community. I believe that the Government plans to introduce legislation to give relief in respect of land tax on rural properties. Can the Treasurer say to what degree such relief will be given?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this stage I cannot give details of the Bill that will be introduced later in the session. We intend to give relief, but, as I cannot outline the precise nature of the proposals at this stage, the honourable member will have to be patient until the Bill is introduced.

NURIOOTPA HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In view of the Labor Party's stated policy of removing temporary classrooms, will the Minister of Education initiate moves to construct a new high school at Nuriootpa, as this school consists mainly of temporary wooden classrooms?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am pleased that the honourable member has referred to this matter. One of the first pieces of information I was given by officers of my department was that the total cost of replacing all the unsatisfactory accommodation to be found throughout our school system would be \$216,000,000 and that the current rate of replacement expenditure was just over \$1,000,000 a year, so it would be appreciated by the honourable member and others that, at the current rate of progress that we inherited, it would take 200 years to replace all the unsatisfactory school accommodation in this State. However, one early action I took as a consequence of this information was to make an immediate approach to the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science in relation to a survey and an emergency capital grant for South Australia for this financial year. On June 12, I wrote to the Commonwealth Minister requesting that South Australia's grant for capital buildings, which the previous Government had asked to be a special grant of only \$4,500,000, be increased to \$7,000,000, because the Commonwealth Government's credit squeeze which was having an impact on the South Australian economy would, in my opinion and in the opinion of Cabinet, permit a higher rate of expenditure. As the

honourable member probably knows, I met Mr. Bowen in Sydney two weeks ago to discuss this and other matters but I received no reply from him about the attitude of the Commonwealth Government. However, the honourable member should be able to appreciate that if we increase from our own sources the rate of replacement expenditure from \$1,000,000 a year to about \$3,000,000 a year or more, and if we obtain from the Commonwealth Government a further annual grant for this purpose, we may, in the foreseeable future, be able to raise our rate of replacement expenditure to about \$10,000,000 a year and, therefore, expect to replace the unsatisfactory school accommodation in South Australia within 20 to 21 years. I ask the member for Kavel to write to the Commonwealth Minister for Education and Science and fully support South Australia's case, and to help organize his constituents and former fellow teachers, so that additional pressure can be brought to bear on the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. Goldsworthy: There was no mention of this in your policy speech.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It was mentioned in the policy speech that we would bring maximum pressure to bear on the Commonwealth Government to ensure that the necessary Commonwealth aid for education was obtained. I ask the honourable member, who is an ex-teacher and is therefore aware of the problem of education in this State, to support this campaign to ensure that the request of the previous Minister of Education, the member for Torrens, is at least fully met and that, if possible, my request is met so that we can get on with the replacement of school buildings. To my knowledge, the school buildings at Nuriootpa are not at present on the design list. However, I will ask my officers to look into the matter with respect to Nuriootpa and see what the current position is so that I can inform the honourable member.

PORT ADELAIDE WATERFRONT

Mr. WELLS: For many years the members of the labour force on the waterfront at Port Adelaide have had to suffer a lack of suitable modern amenities in respect of toilet blocks, rest rooms and weather shelters. I am aware that representations have been made in this House on other occasions but, so far, very little has flowed from them. The labour force at Port Adelaide concerned about these amenities should not and cannot be expected to tolerate the position very much longer. The buildings

they are required to use are of substandard manufacture and quality and I am certain there must soon be a change in the conditions under which these men are required to work. Will the Minister of Marine undertake to investigate the situation I have outlined and do everything in his power to rectify it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to have arrangements made for inspection of the facilities mentioned by the honourable member and to invite him to accompany me (together with the member for the district, of course) to inspect them. As a result of that, I hope I shall be able to decide what to do to see that conditions are made more satisfactory.

OUTER HARBOUR TERMINAL

Mr. HALL: On April 14, exactly three months ago, there was an announcement in the morning press in the name of the then Minister of Marine (Mr. Rodda) in an article headed "Harbour terminal in two years—Rodda" which gave some detail of the Government's decision to build a new passenger terminal at Outer Harbour. It was, therefore, with some surprise that I read in this morning's paper a similar announcement—"Outer Harbour terminal ready in two years". If there is any lesson to be learnt by the new Minister, it is that one gets a better announcement on the second run than one does on the first run. If he searched through the records of decisions and progress made by the previous Government and the announcements it made, the Minister would find material for some magnificent announcements that he could make. There is a discrepancy between the two announcements. The announcement made in April by the previous Government was that \$1,600,000 would be spent on the construction of this terminal. The re-announcement today in the name of the new Minister of a new Government concerns an expenditure of \$1,200,000. It may well be there is some good explanation in departmental accounting for this discrepancy but, because of the previous Government's interest in this first announcement, I should appreciate some explanation by the Minister of the difference between the two sums. Does this mean that the second project is to be something less than the first?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: First, I remind the Leader that there is a new Government in office and that that new Government is responsible for compiling the Loan Estimates.

The Government decides whether certain things will go ahead under the Loan Estimates, and it decided to proceed with the project which started, in fact, in 1964, which was again announced in 1966, which was then announced, as the Leader has said, in April this year, and which has now been announced again by me and will be acted upon this year and completed in about two years. Work is already proceeding on fabrication of the steelwork, etc., that will be required in the construction. The Leader compared the announced expenditure of \$1,200,000 with the \$1,600,000 that he said his Government intended to place on the Loan Estimates had it been in office during this financial year. I remind him that, as \$400,000 has already been spent on the project, it is necessary to spend only \$1,200,000 in order to complete it at a cost of \$1,600,000.

KANGAROO ISLAND TRANSPORT

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The report of the committee that inquired into the transport problems existing between Kangaroo Island and the mainland, including Eyre Peninsula, reached the previous Government a few days before the recent election and was referred to the Treasury for inquiry concerning the capital outlay required. Since the report was handed in and since the new Government took office, I have spoken to the Minister of Roads and Transport on several occasions, and I have observed the Government's intention to implement the committee's recommendations. Having recently been discussing the matter with residents of Kangaroo Island, I find that there has been much discussion on the project but that this discussion has been hampered by a lack of information concerning the reasons leading up to the committee's report. I well understand the Minister's position, and I do not dispute that there may be good reasons why he may not wish to release the report at present. However, on the other hand, I suggest that the report be made available as soon as possible. Has the Minister of Roads and Transport further considered releasing the report? Would he consider perhaps releasing what might be termed the general or background material contained in the report? I know that basically there is nothing to suggest that there is any mystery about the matter, but the people who are most concerned at the moment simply do not know the reasons for the committee's recommendations.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will certainly further consider the matter in so far as it relates to compiling a precis of the report and

to making this available. I am sure that the honourable member will realize (in fact, I think he indicated this in his explanatory remarks) that some information in the report has been given on the basis of the report's being made to the Government. Without attempting to convey the impression that this is a secret document, I point out that it contains certain information which, I believe, was given to the committee in an air of confidence to assist it in its deliberations, and I think the Government would be acting improperly if it were to release this information. I am somewhat at a loss to understand the clamour for the release of the report. When I say "clamour", I am referring not to the question the honourable member has asked but rather to the numerous approaches made for the release of the report. I am sure that the honourable member will know, perhaps from a position of privilege, that the report is a valuable document in that it is an evaluation of the position in relation to transport.

As I have said before, I believe the committee is to be complimented on the way it has tackled the job, and naturally the Government endorses the committee's recommendation in that it has announced that it will proceed with the recommendation for introducing the ferry service, and at this stage it is working towards that end. However, I will give some further thought to seeing whether it is practicable to produce a precis of the report, and if it is I will certainly make it available to the honourable member. In a few weeks' time I shall be going to Kangaroo Island and discussing several questions, including this one, with the councils in the district. I have already arranged for the honourable member to be notified of our movements, and I sincerely trust that he will be able to accompany us and join in any discussions that take place on that occasion.

ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That three members of the House be appointed, by ballot, to the Council of the University of Adelaide as provided by the University of Adelaide Act, 1935-1964.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, Messrs. Goldsworthy, McRae and Simmons were declared elected.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA COUNCIL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That three members of the House be appointed, by ballot, to the Council of the Flinders University of South Australia as provided by the Flinders University of South Australia Act, 1966.

Motion carried.

A ballot having been held, Messrs. Hopgood and Payne and Dr. Tonkin were declared elected.

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Sessional committees were appointed as follows:

Standing Orders: The Speaker, the Hon. D. N. Brookman, the Hon. L. J. King, and Messrs. McRae and Millhouse.

Library: The Speaker and Messrs. Becker, Payne and Simmons.

Printing: Messrs. Crimes, Gunn, Keneally, Mathwin and Slater.

JOINT HOUSE COMMITTEE

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That it be an order of this House that, in view of the creation of the Joint House Committee under the Joint House Committee Act, 1941, a Sessional House Committee be not appointed under Standing Order No. 404.

Motion carried.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That, pursuant to section 4 of the Joint House Committee Act, 1941, the Speaker, the Hon. D. N. Brookman, and Messrs. Ryan and Slater be elected members of the Joint House Committee.

Motion carried.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That the House request the concurrence of the Legislative Council in the appointment for the present Parliament of the Joint Committee on Subordinate Legislation in accordance with Joint Standing Orders Nos. 19 to 31, and that the representatives of the House on the said committee be Mrs. Byrne and Messrs. McKee and McRae.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I am disturbed at the practice, which began in 1965, of denying the Opposition in the House of Assembly a rightful place on this committee.

The SPEAKER: Is the honourable Leader demanding a ballot?

Mr. HALL: I repeat that I am greatly disturbed that this procedure is to be repeated and that the Government in power (the Labor Party) is once again going to use sheer power and overwhelming numbers to deprive this side of its rightful representation on one of the most important committees that this Parliament has.

Mr. Lawn: What about the Legislative Council?

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, you know full well that the right of the Houses is separate in relation to the work of this committee; either House has the right to move for the disallowance of any legislation that this committee has to study and report on. If the Premier's motion is carried his side will have three representatives and this side will have none, and yet as a responsible Opposition we are supposed to fulfil a proper role in this House. Now we are supposed to fulfil that role without having a direct representative on that committee to report to us just what representations have been made to it.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: I suppose the members opposite who interject so loudly approve of that undemocratic process. It comes very lightly and easily to their lips after so many years of the cry "gerrymander" from them. I heard today the word "gerrymander", yet it just does not fit this time; it is good fun to use the overwhelming number of Government members to deprive this Party of its rightful representation on that committee!

I remind members opposite that it is too early in their new, bright Government to deny democratic procedures in this fashion. Why is this done? We will hear directly that there is some reason for it because of the Legislative Council numbers. However, this is a furphy put up by members opposite, who use their vindictive process of pursuing the Legislative Council as an excuse. They know full well that my Party in this House does not meet in Party meetings with the Liberal and Country League members of the Legislative Council, for we work entirely separately in our procedures and in meeting our separate responsibilities in this Parliament. Despite the fact that members opposite know full well that we do not meet together, they, as indicated by their attitude, will pursue this matter and support the Premier in this undemocratic move and no doubt will still cry "gerrymander" to the people of South Australia. They can have their dual attitudes and go to the people and justify them in due course. I ask for a ballot,

for all the little good that it will do me and my Party, knowing that there are 26 members opposite who do not care one hoot for the democratic processes of this House.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I most strongly support the Leader of the Opposition in his protest on this matter. However, it comes as no surprise to me that the Government intends to deprive the Opposition of its representation on this committee because, as the Leader said, the Labor Party when it was in office in 1965 did exactly the same thing. As the Leader has pointed out, the Subordinate Legislation Committee's action of allowing a regulation or a by-law to go through after it has laid on the table for 14 sitting days, or its disallowance, is a matter for this House and not a matter for Parliament as a whole. It is therefore of the utmost importance that both sides of the House should be represented on that committee. I point out to the members of the Government who are so smug in their majority in this place at the present time that it is an advantage to the Government as well as to the House as a whole that both sides should be represented on the committee so that we as an Opposition know the reasons which have prompted the making of a regulation or a by-law and, in the appropriate case, the reasons which have prompted the committee to move for its disallowance in this place. Now we are to be denied that opportunity by being excluded from this committee.

Of course, the Government with its majority of six members on the floor of the House could have denied us representation on every Parliamentary committee if it so wished, and perhaps we should be grateful to the Government for allowing us representation on any committee. But that, Sir, is not in the tradition of this Parliament or of this House, and when we have been in Government we have never done that: it is only the Labor Party when it comes to office that denies the Opposition access to and a seat on the various committees. It has happened now for the second time. When I heard you, Mr. Speaker, say this morning that the minority must be given their rights I entirely agreed with what you said, and I believe that every member of this House agreed at that time, yet only a few hours later the members of the Australian Labor Party, now the Government of this State, have denied us our rights by tradition to representation on this committee. I most strongly protest at this lack of fair play.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why don't you protest to your members in the Legislative Council, who brought this situation about?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Education knows that that is the only argument he can possibly drag forth, and it is entirely irrelevant in this House; it does not matter who is on it from the other place.

Mr. Lawn: It doesn't matter when it is your members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Honourable members opposite know that what I am saying is right. They know as well as members on this side know that, when we are in Government, they are represented on this committee. Now that we are in Opposition why are we not represented on the committee? The Leader and I have said that these decisions are taken in this House; they are not taken in the other House jointly with this House; they are taken separately. I most strongly protest at this lack of fair play by the Government. If this is to be a forerunner on the way in which the Government is to treat the Opposition whenever it feels like it, this Parliament will be a most unsatisfactory place indeed.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): The Subordinate Legislation Committee has been one of the most successful committees of the House. If it was not the first committee of its type to deal with this kind of legislation, it was at least a pioneering committee in Australia. Its success has been due entirely to the fact that it is an advisory committee having on it representatives of the various Parties in the House. The committee has an increasing amount of work to do. We all know that, as legislation builds up, almost all Acts have some regulation-making power included in them. We all know that the work of the committee must increase and that the committee must be more vigilant and conscientious than before in studying subordinate legislation. We also know that the average private member has no chance whatever to examine carefully all subordinate legislation but that the committee is able to do it. It can examine the legislation in a cursory way, having satisfied itself that the legislation is along good lines, or it can call witnesses, examining them in great detail.

Having once been a member of the committee, I know that a great many regulations go through without being given much attention at all but that on other occasions much attention is given to regulations and many

witnesses are called. Because of the conduct of the committee in the past, there has been general confidence amongst members of the House that the committee is giving them good advice. The only exception to this rule that I can recall occurred a few years ago when the Labor Party was in Government and our Party was not represented on this committee. The member for Port Pirie (Mr. McKee), who was Chairman of the committee at the time, will remember an occasion when members on this side were most dissatisfied with a recommendation of the committee and did not know the reasons for the committee's support of various regulations. Surely it is important to a Government that supports the principle of a Parliamentary Opposition that that Opposition should have every opportunity given to it constitutionally to examine subordinate legislation. It is not good enough for the Government to say, "Well, every private member can examine these regulations and make his own inquiry, or he can go looking for a member of the other place and ask him." That is a thin, shallow and shameful excuse.

There should be representation from both sides of this House on the committee, and, because apparently there will not be, I can only say that much time is likely to be spent this session discussing subordinate legislation. It stands to reason that members who have not access to this information through a committee will have to try to get the information from Government members in the House. We have not had a very good example set already on this first day of the session, because the Minister of Roads and Transport suggested to one of our new members that he should look in the Parliamentary Library for information he desired rather than ask the Minister to get it for him. Incidentally, the member was told to look in the Parliamentary Library for a 1970 report that is not available there. I think the Party in office ought to consider this matter and have regard to its own interests.

If it expects a reasonably easy passage of legislation in this House and expects the Opposition to accept Government recommendations about legislation, the Government should examine its attitude towards the Opposition's ability to obtain information. We are being denied that information and, if this denial continues, naturally we shall be asking more difficult questions in the House. That will be our only recourse.

Another aspect of this matter irritates me greatly. Members of the Subordinate Legisla-

tion Committee are paid for their services, and that is satisfactory: there is every reason why they should be paid, because members have much work to do on the committee. However, if we were not dealing with a committee on which the members were paid, there would have been no argument and the Government would not have tried to keep a member of our Party off the committee. Because members are paid, however, Government members say, "We want that job," and they try to connect membership of the Upper House with members of the Opposition in this House when considering the matter. Members opposite say, "There are members in the other place of the same political Party as the Opposition in the House of Assembly, so the Opposition can get information from the members in the other place." We know very well that, praiseworthy as those members of the other place are, there is no chance whatever of our having consultation, as a Party, with those members.

In previous years of Labor Government we have had this difficult situation relating to subordinate legislation. Members know there have been many arguments in this House about subordinate legislation, simply because we on this side have been without representation. I do not think that that is a fair thing. I am not surprised that the Government has taken this attitude, but I deplore it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): One would be a little more impressed with the fulminations of members opposite if one heard them address them to their colleagues in another place. This is a joint committee. It is not a committee of this House alone: it is a committee of the two Houses. We on this side of the House, as is shown by what we have done in the appointment of all other committees, are concerned to see that the minority in this House is represented on the committee. However, at the same time, as a Government, we assert our right to at least equality in joint committees. When members opposite were in Government (those that were here then) they insisted when this committee was constituted in the last Parliament that they, on their side of politics, have four out of the six members—not three. They were not then heard to say, "We have got to see that there is an adequate representation on the same basis by the minority".

Mr. Millhouse: Both sides of both Houses were represented.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We should be very happy to see that now if members

opposite could induce their colleagues in another place to be reasonable and could ensure that their colleagues in another place would give representation on this committee to the minority in that House. Then, the minority here would get exactly the same treatment. If members opposite get an undertaking from their members in the Upper House that they will put a member of the Government on this committee, we shall be happy to make arrangements about it. We endeavoured to get that arrangement in a previous Parliament in 1965, but we could get nowhere. We could get no undertaking of any kind, nor can we now. If we can make an arrangement of that kind with members in another place, we shall be happy to accord with the wishes of Opposition members here. However, at present we cannot do that and, consequently, the Government cannot be in a minority on a joint committee of this kind and of this importance. In these circumstances I suggest to members opposite that the Government is entirely in accord with the view that minority opinions in both Houses should be represented on the committee and, if they can get accord with their members in another place, we shall be happy to comply.

Mr. Clark: But they do not associate with members of another place.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is hardly appealing to members on this side when members opposite address to us pleas that a minority voice should be heard but are not prepared to

address the same opinions to members of their own Party in another place. So, I am afraid we have seen a pretty sham fight this afternoon. If members opposite are prepared to stick up for what they are saying here and if they are prepared to work in co-operation with the Government to get minority representation from both Houses on this committee, they can have their way. However, if they stay silent and address the things they have said only to the Government and not to members of their own Party, we will see how sincere they are in the things they have said this afternoon.

The SPEAKER: A ballot having been demanded, in accordance with Standing Orders it will be necessary to conduct a ballot.

A ballot having been held, Mrs. Byrne and Messrs. McKee and McRae were declared elected.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) moved:

That a committee consisting of the Hon. J. D. Corcoran, the Hon. L. J. King, Messrs. Crimes and Langley, and the mover be appointed to prepare a draft address to His Excellency the Governor's Deputy in reply to his Speech on opening Parliament, and to report on July 15.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.21 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, July 15, at 2 p.m.