

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 13, 1970

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. R. E. Hurst) took the Chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: RECEIPTS DUTY

The Hon. D. A. **DUNSTAN** (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. **DUNSTAN**: Following the conference that the Prime Minister called in Canberra, the following arrangements have been arrived at in relation to receipts duty: The Commonwealth will legislate within the next few days to validate the duty which is of the nature of an excise and which applies to receipts from November 18, 1969, to September 30, 1970. Both Commonwealth and State receipts stamp duties will cease from October 1, 1970. Legislation will be introduced shortly to ratify the cessation of State receipts stamp duty. All duties which are of an excise nature (that is, which relate to payments for new goods produced in Australia) on receipts from November 18, 1969, to September 30, 1970, and which have not already been paid to the State must be paid as returns fall due and should be paid immediately on the passing of the Commonwealth legislation if already overdue. All duties which are not of an excise nature on all receipts since the commencing date of February 1, 1969, up to September 30, 1970, and which have not already been paid to the State must be paid as returns fall due and immediately if overdue.

Those persons not registered to pay duty under the return system, who have not already stamped all records of receipts of \$10 or more since the commencing date of February 1, 1969, up to September 30, 1970, must do so forthwith. The Commonwealth will reimburse the State for the duty that the State will not be able to collect during 1970-71 as a consequence of the cessation of all receipts stamp duties from October 1, 1970. The amount involved is yet to be agreed between the Commonwealth and State Treasuries, but it is expected to be about \$4,000,000. For the subsequent four years the Commonwealth will reimburse the State by incorporating in the base financial assistance grant the estimated aggregate revenue derivable from receipts stamp duty for a full year in 1970-71, and will increase that amount in accordance with the formula applying to the grant. The base amount is yet to be agreed between the Commonwealth and State Treasuries but

it is expected to be nearly \$7,000,000, and to increase by about 10 per cent to 12 per cent per annum.

The Commonwealth and the States may in due course consult on whether any portion of receipts stamp duty may be reimposed on a common basis, and any revenues derived thereby will be an offset against the reimbursement grants. In accordance with the undertaking given by the previous Government the State will refund any duty of an excise nature that was paid under protest or objection and related to receipts prior to November 18, 1969. It will also treat any duty of an excise nature that related to receipts after October 28, 1969, and prior to November 18, 1969, as paid under objection whether formally notified as so paid or not, and will make refunds upon application. The aggregate of these refunds may be about \$400,000 in total. Refunds will be made upon application giving an adequate analysis of the transactions involved and certified either by a statutory declaration or in such other fashion as the Commissioner of Stamps may deem proper.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: DROUGHT RELIEF

The Hon. D. A. **DUNSTAN** (Premier and Treasurer): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted..

The Hon D. A. **DUNSTAN**: I have received a reply from the Prime Minister, following my representations for Commonwealth participation in drought relief measures. I also took the opportunity of discussing the matter personally with Mr. Gorton whilst in Canberra last week. The Prime Minister indicated that Commonwealth policy was to assist in such relief when the disaster was upon such a scale as to require large expenditures beyond the reasonable capacity of the State. Consistently with what had been agreed for other States, the Prime Minister offered to share with the State expense in excess of \$1,500,000 for drought relief upon the same terms and conditions as applied in the case of the previous drought.

As a result of the recent rains, the South Australian situation has been improved considerably but there still remain areas where assistance will undoubtedly be required. It seems fairly certain, however, that the necessary costs will be less than \$1,500,000. The State Government has accordingly decided that it will make available, as necessary, carry-on finance for drought-affected farmers upon substantially the same basis as during the previous drought. The finance will be available only to farmers who, with the assistance provided, have a

reasonable chance of recovery and of becoming again self-supporting. Government loans will be made only where the finance is not available through the normal banking and rural finance houses. Interest will be payable upon the normal basis at 6½ per cent per annum, and any question of concessions in interest or repayment will be considered in individual cases on their merits as payments fall due.

In appropriate cases Government departments will defer, without penalty, payments due by drought-stricken farmers for Crown rents and taxes, treating each case on its merits. At the present time there would seem to be no substantial justification for special fodder or water subsidies, or subsidies on the transportation of starving stock. There are no prospects of there developing any large pockets of unemployment of farmers which would call for special unemployment relief works, but councils and the Highways Department are being asked to give reasonable preference in employment and in petty contracts to farmers seeking local work, and, where particular applications are made they will be considered in each case. I expect that the banks will, as in previous cases, continue to make carry-on loans under normal conditions to viable farmers so that the relief problem falling upon the Government would be kept to a minimum, and I appeal to the banks to continue to grant such loans in all appropriate cases. All applications for drought assistance should be addressed to the Lands Department in Adelaide. The Commonwealth Government has pointed out that all applications will be considered on a Commonwealth-wide basis, not in relation to a particular State.

QUESTIONS

PORT PIRIE SEWERAGE

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Works a reply to the following questions that I informed him during the recess I would be asking today:

- (a) When did tenders close for contract 8269 for the construction of stabilization lagoons for the Port Pirie sewage treatment works?
- (b) How many tenders were received?
- (c) What was the amount of each tender?
- (d) Which tender was accepted?
- (e) On what date were tenderers notified of the acceptance or rejection of their tenders?
- (f) On what date did work on the site begin?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the notice that the Leader has given me, and

I have for him a copy of my reply. The replies to the specific questions are as follows: Tenders closed on May 7, 1970. Five tenders were received, but it is not the department's policy to reveal tender prices. The tender accepted was that from Arthur Hall, Ackson and Company, and tenderers were notified of the acceptance or rejection of tenders on June 30. Work commenced on the site unofficially on June 12, ceased on June 19, and recommenced on July 13. As it was brought to my notice that the successful tenderer commenced operations on the site prior to being formally notified that the tender had been accepted, I immediately called for an urgent departmental investigation, which revealed that the initial work had been done without departmental approval.

When the matter was brought to the attention of the Assistant Engineer for Water and Sewage Treatment, the plant of the contractor concerned was removed from the site—on June 19, the date that work ceased initially. I understand that an officer of the company concerned suggested to a departmental officer that he be allowed to start work on the understanding that, if the company did not obtain the contract, work would cease immediately. However, the departmental officer concerned should have realized that he had no authority to give approval for the work that took place initially, and he has been censured by the Director and Engineer-in-Chief regarding his action. I brought this matter to the notice also of the Auditor-General.

ELIZABETH SCHOOL FIRE

Mr. CLARK: Has the Minister of Education any information on the fire that unfortunately occurred at the Elizabeth Field Infants School on the afternoon of Friday last, when the school was not occupied because of the half holiday for Conservation Day? Grave disquiet exists in this area, particularly among parents, children and their teachers, because it seems on first evidence that this fire may have been caused by arson.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have no further information relating to the possible cause of the fire and to the police investigations being conducted in relation to it. However, the necessary arrangements have been made to ensure that there is no unreasonable interruption of the lessons of the children involved. About seven classrooms were destroyed or damaged in the fire, and from our observations it seems that two of these classrooms may be fit to be re-occupied after

cleaning, as it appears that the main damage to them resulted from smoke and water. However, five classrooms will need complete replacement, and we will try to ensure that the necessary replacements are made available as soon as possible. We are making a check at the moment to find transportable classrooms that may be placed at the Elizabeth Field Primary School. As the honourable member will know, by making use of activity rooms in both the primary and infants schools, together with a remedial classroom and a small modified cloak area, it has been possible to accommodate four of the seven classes at the Elizabeth Field Infants School. Two of these classes have been transported to the South Downs Primary School, and one class is being accommodated in a spare room at the Smithfield school. All of the children who are being taken out of the infants school are in grade 2 and, of course, transport is being provided. Transport has been arranged by the Headmaster with Transway Services Proprietary Limited, and the transport of the children to the South Downs school happens to fit in conveniently with transport of technical high school students. The transport officer of the department is looking at the availability of departmental buses, and we understand at present that the main difficulty here relates to providing drivers. The Netley supply branch of the Public Buildings Department has been asked to make more furniture available. However, there will be only a limited need for this because some supplies of furniture can be made available at the Elizabeth Field Infants School, as well as at South Downs and Smithfield, by using the surplus furniture there. In addition, replacement of textbooks, stationery, library books, and the personal belongings of both the students and the teachers is being examined.

Being concerned about the fire at this school, I discussed the matter with the Director-General of Education this morning. We have prepared a memorandum that is to be issued to the heads of all schools, drawing their attention to the standard circular issued by the department dealing with the need for fire drill to be undertaken on a regular basis. That instruction requires that, in the case of solid construction school buildings, fire drills involving the evacuation of the classrooms by the children should be held annually, while in the case of all wooden school buildings fire drills involving the evacuation of the children from the classrooms, using the emergency exits provided, are to be held once each term.

I point out also that Fire Prevention Week is to be held during the last week in October. This is a campaign that has been undertaken by the Bushfire Research Committee in recent years to reduce fire risk as much as possible by removing accumulations of vegetation and rubbish that could aid the spread of fire, and schools are being asked to participate in the campaign by ensuring that their own properties are cleared and by giving publicity to the matter through their students. The notice at page 314 of the October issue of the *Education Gazette* lists addresses from which the publication entitled *Fire Drills in Day Schools* may be obtained. Generally, the department is trying to ensure at the Elizabeth Downs Infants School that appropriate arrangements are made and that the school will be able to return to a normal working basis as soon as possible. Regarding the wider question of fire drill, the provision of adequate firefighting equipment within schools and fire prevention activities, everything possible is being done to ensure that every school in this State is as well placed as possible to cope with any problem it may face. Regarding the general problem of arson, the full co-operation of the South Australian Police Department is being obtained.

MORATORIUM ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General say whether the Government will reconsider its decision and take action accordingly in circumstances that I now seek your permission, Sir, and the concurrence of the House to explain. My question concerns the appointment of Mr. Connor, Q.C., as senior counsel assisting the Royal Commissioner on the moratorium disturbance, a matter which I earlier raised in the House. During the last two weeks disappointment and resentment has been expressed widely throughout the legal profession in South Australia at the precipitate action of the Government in retaining senior counsel from outside this State, without, so far as I am aware, even approaching any seniors of the South Australian bar. The Premier told me in the House that he had seen Mr. Connor in his chambers on the Sunday afternoon following the day of the disturbance. The disappointment and resentment that has been expressed culminated this morning in Mr. Sangster, Q.C., instructed by the Law Society, opposing Mr. Connor's appearance as counsel. I understand that the Commissioner has not accepted Mr. Sangster's contentions. I have also seen the comments of the Attorney-General that the profession took this stand

only in its own economic interests—a reaction by the Attorney insulting to legal practitioners and one which a few months ago I should have found quite unbelievable, coming from him. In view of the feeling and the actions of the Law Society, as well as the public interest that has been generated in the matter, I also ask whether the Attorney-General will table correspondence on this matter between the Government and the society.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Regarding the reference of the honourable member to my comment that the decision of the Law Society to contest the legality of the appointment of Mr. Connor was the result of an obligation which the council felt it had to advance or protect the economic interests of its members, I can only say that I attended a meeting of the Law Society and I have discussed the matter with its President. I should be very much surprised if any member of the Law Society council or the President were to contest what I had said. I think that the Law Society council has taken the stand it has because of a desire, as it was put to me, to protect the interests of its members, a right that society has, the same as any other body in the community, to protect the interests of its members. It is a perfectly proper thing to do, but whether the decision it took is a wise one is a matter for more than one comment. However, that the decision was taken to protect the members' economic interests is hardly open to doubt. The Government has a wider obligation to the public interest, which is to secure the services of counsel who will be of the greatest assistance to the Royal Commission. The Premier has explained the reasons for that, and I have explained them in considerable detail both to the President of the Law Society in person and also to a meeting of the Law Society council which I attended. I do not intend to repeat the explanations in detail in this House because I think it is an invidious and unsatisfactory procedure to discuss in detail why a brief is offered to one counsel rather than to another. The Government is satisfied that the action it has taken is in the best interests of the operation of the Royal Commission and in the best interests of the people of South Australia and it does not intend to reconsider the matter.

Mr. Millhouse: What about tabling the correspondence?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am prepared to consider that and to discuss it with the President of the Law Society. I would obviously have to do that.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My question to the Attorney-General is about legal assistance for persons involved in the Royal Commission. I understand that the Government (I think quite rightly) has agreed to provide legal assistance for the Police Commissioner at the Royal Commission. He, of course, was charged with carrying out an act and trying to keep order.

The SPEAKER: What is the honourable member's question?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I want to ask the Attorney-General about the Government's attitude to legal assistance for persons involved in the coming Royal Commission because I understand that the leaders of the moratorium—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am asking leave to make a statement to explain my question.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member seeks leave.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What's the question?

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I understand that the leaders of the moratorium have now made what might appear to be the rather fantastic request to the Government for their legal costs to be paid by the community. Can the Attorney-General say whether, in fact, this request has been made and, if it has, what is the Government's attitude? Indeed, if the request has been made, it seems rather surprising that some immediate reaction to quash this sort of rubbish should not have been forthcoming from the Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING: A request has been made by the Vietnam Moratorium Committee that the Government pay for legal representation on the committee's behalf at the Commission hearings, and a similar request has been received from the South Australian Police Association. Having considered both requests, Cabinet this morning made a decision on each of them; that decision will be communicated to both bodies by letter, which I hope to get away this evening. At this stage, I think it would be inappropriate and discourteous for me to say—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Why?

Mr. Millhouse: Why?

The Hon. L. J. KING: If members will wait until I have finished the sentence, they will hear the reason. I consider that it would be courteous of the Government to communicate

its decision to the bodies concerned before discussing the decision publicly. The decision will be communicated by letter, which will be posted this evening. As the Government's decision will be released tomorrow, I shall be most happy then to answer the honourable member in relation to that decision.

SALARY CHEQUES

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Education ask his department to expedite the payment of salary cheques to relieving teachers, as I understand there is considerable delay in making such payments?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: This matter has not been brought to my attention, but I will investigate it and see what can be done.

FILM CLASSIFICATION

Mr. PAYNE: Can the Attorney-General say what is the current position in South Australia with regard to the admittance of children to public film shows that are advertised as being for "adults only"?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Of course, the present category of "adults only" is a purely advisory category, there being no legal sanction if a theatre proprietor admits children to such a show. The Government's policy is that there should be a legally enforceable restricted classification for films. The matter has been discussed at a conference of Commonwealth and State Ministers concerned with this matter. I shall be making a specific recommendation to Cabinet on the point probably next week or, at the latest, the week after; and I hope that, following that and a further discussion with the Commonwealth Minister and other State Ministers, I shall be able to inform the House of specific proposals to bring into effect a legally enforceable restricted classification.

BED SHORTAGE

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Chief Secretary a reply to my recent question about the shortage of nurses and of hospital beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that consideration has not been given to the employment of married trained nurses, as it is difficult to see how their employment on a short-term basis or on a stand-by emergency basis would enable the opening of additional beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. To open a 32-bed ward, there must be a guaranteed work force of at least three trained nurses and 23 trainee nurses available. The bed establishments of individual wards are not varied

according to the availability of nursing staff. Difficulties are encountered from time to time because of above-normal absence through sickness. In such circumstances, if the hospital finds it necessary to obtain the services of trained nurses on a temporary basis, it uses the services of nurse call depots. This appears to be a more satisfactory means of obtaining such assistance than by the hospital attempting to maintain its own register of on-call staff.

PORT PIRIE HOUSING

Mr. McKEE: As the Minister in charge of housing, will the Premier take up urgently with the General Manager of the Housing Trust the matter of speeding up the construction of rental houses at Port Pirie where eight double units have been in the course of construction for the past 12 months? In view of the way work is progressing, I imagine they will take another 12 months to complete. The demand for rental houses at Port Pirie is increasing, with applicants having to wait for 10 to 12 months for a house. Also, the persistence of this situation tends to retard decentralization: if we cannot give people houses in country areas, they will not have much incentive to go to such areas.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. GUNN: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about wheat quotas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that the policy in relation to short-falls in wheat quotas will be decided from year to year by the Australian Wheatgrowers Federation, and the Wheat Delivery Quotas Advisory Committee will review the position in relation to short-falls in South Australia in accordance with that policy. In South Australia, growers are in the fortunate position of receiving full recognition in 1970-71 for short-falls on their 1969-70 quotas; but in other States allocations of only a portion of short-falls are being made for the 1970-71 season.

PARENTAL CRUELTY

Mr. RYAN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question dealing with comments made by a magistrate in relation to a prosecution made under the children's protection legislation?

The Hon. L. J. KING: If, under section 105 of the Social Welfare Act, a child is charged

with being a neglected or an uncontrolled child and the charge is proved the court does have the power to punish the child's guardian (or parent) and, subject to certain procedural requirements, any such inquiry into the responsibility of the guardian can be interpreted as the hearing of an alleged offence on the part of the guardian for which he may be convicted. This being the case, the general provisions of the Justices Act would apply to the hearing and to any conviction and punishment resulting from it. The significance of this is that under the Justices Act a court may order a person convicted of an offence to undergo a psychiatric examination. Thus, in my view, the court does have sufficient power to order the psychiatric examination of a guardian convicted under section 105 of the Social Welfare Act. However, the way in which this power may be exercised is perhaps not very obvious and may be cumbersome. A special magistrate who suspects that a psychiatric examination would prove useful may order a defendant to have such an examination. The question of a person undergoing psychiatric treatment is another matter, for there is no way of forcing a defendant to undergo medical treatment that he is not willing to accept. This sort of thing is usually dealt with by the court making the treatment a condition of a bond. Adequate facilities are available for psychiatric treatment. There are free clinics for outpatients and a liberal means test is applied to inpatients at mental hospitals. No-one would be denied treatment because he did not have the means to pay for it.

PORT LINCOLN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Minister of Education say whether construction of an open-space unit at Port Lincoln Primary School is planned, to replace some existing classrooms? If it is, when is construction expected to commence?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A six-teacher open unit is planned for Port Lincoln Primary School, and that was part of the original announcement. I cannot give immediate information to the honourable member about the precise date on which this project will go to tender. I will get the information that the honourable member asks for about the likely date of completion of this unit but, as he will appreciate, at this stage the actual timetabling of provision of these open-space units is flexible, as it depends, at least in part, on the assistance we get from the Commonwealth Government and when we get it.

ISLINGTON POLLUTION

Mr. JENNINGS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked recently about pollution caused by burning off diesel oil at Islington railway workshops?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The nuisance that occurred on Saturday, September 19, 1970, was caused by the burning of a small quantity of oil sludge. This sludge collects in a dam in the Islington workshops yards and on rare occasions it has been found necessary to burn off the residue which has not been disposed of by seepage and, indeed, had not been burnt off since Saturday, September 13, 1969, a period of 12 months. The burning-off day was selected when a strong easterly wind was blowing, so as to divert smoke on to the old sewage farm area. The Northern Districts Fire Brigade was advised before the lighting, and the duration of the fire, which was under the control of the Islington works fire brigade, was about 30 minutes. Nevertheless, I agree that even if it happens only rarely the burning of this sludge does constitute a nuisance, and equipment is now being prepared to burn the sludge in such a way as to minimize smoke.

MORGAN SLIPWAY

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on September 22 about work on the Morgan slipway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is a definite need to improve the dockyard facilities at Morgan. The matter is currently receiving very careful consideration, because the Government realizes the possible effect its decision could have on Morgan and some of its residents. I emphasize that no firm decision has been made, and I give an assurance that the interests of Highways Department employees at present living in Morgan will be given every reasonable consideration.

SALISBURY INTERSECTION

Mr. GROTH: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of August 20 about improvement of the intersection of Bolivar Road and Waterloo Corner Road at Salisbury?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The intersection is typical of a large number of roads within the Salisbury council area which have good visibility on the approaches and are situated within the semi-rural conditions. This particular location has warning signs and safety bars delineating the intersection, and to any prudent driver the chance of involvement in an

accident should be negligible. In circumstances such as at this intersection where the sight distance available to the motorist is good on all approaches and where the speeds are high, it has been found in the past that the erection of regulatory signs such as "stop" or "give way" has only salutary effect upon the occurrence of accidents unless the erection of the sign is coupled with extensive policing. The most satisfactory solution of the problem would be a complete re-design of the intersection. This could take the form of a roundabout or one of the arms of the intersection could be closed or deviated to form a T junction. I have asked the Road Traffic Board to write to the Salisbury council and suggest that the council investigate the re-design of the intersection. As an interim measure, the Road Traffic Board is considering the installation of "stop" signs on both arms of the Bolivar Road approaches.

STROLLER TRANSPORT

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider providing free transport of shopping strollers for all elderly people, whether or not they are pensioners? A report in the *Advertiser* of October 8 states:

New aid to pensioners: Pensioners will soon be able to take shopping strollers free on South Australian trains. The Minister of Roads and Transport (Mr. Virgo) said yesterday that the Government appreciated that pensioners had to use strollers.

Many elderly people, whether they are pensioners or not, need public transport, because they are either too old to drive or do not own a motor car.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In making a decision on the request by the Pensioners Association to provide free transport for shopping strollers, the Government was swayed by the fact that the pensioners have received an extremely raw deal from the Commonwealth Government over many years.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not trying to blame the Government, but if members opposite want to stick up for the pittance of 50c that was given to pensioners last month, I am pleased that they, not I, are doing that. In addition to the treatment of the pensioners to which I have referred, persons who are fit and able are permitted to carry bags, such as large kitbags and sugar bags, full of weekend groceries and vegetables, on the trains, without charge, whereas elderly people, who have not the physical capacity to carry such heavy loads, and must use strollers, are required to pay. The Govern-

ment considered that this concession was another way in which we could relieve, at least to a small extent (and it is a pretty small extent), the present financial burden on pensioners. However, the Government does not intend to extend this concession beyond the field to which it has extended it.

AIR POLLUTION

Mr. KENEALLY: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Minister of Health to the question I asked recently regarding the air pollution nuisance at Port Augusta?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states:

At a meeting comprising the Clean Air Committee, the Mayor of Port Augusta, and the Town Clerk in 1965 the following questions were asked in regard to the fall-out:

- (1) Is the Port Augusta "smog" injurious to the lungs of residents?
- (2) Would it cause or aggravate sinus troubles, so that those affected or susceptible would be well advised to leave the area?
- (3) Rain water for drinking is polluted by washing of deposited ash from roofs and guttering. Has this any public health significance?

The following answers were given:

- (1) Ash from the power station furnaces contains silica, and a significant proportion of the particles is within the size range which is harmful to the lungs; but harmful effects depend not only on the presence of silica particles of suitable size, but also on their concentration in the atmosphere breathed and the time during which they are inhaled. People vary greatly in their susceptibility to lung damage of this sort, and it is common in groups of hard rock miners to find a few susceptible persons affected before the bulk of people similarly exposed show any effects. From experience with groups exposed in industries with a silicosis hazard, it would not be expected that the people of Port Augusta or the workers in the power house were inhaling enough silica for long enough periods to produce silicosis in even the most susceptible. This view is supported by the fact that in chest X-ray surveys in the area, no evidence of silicosis has been found.
- (2) Sinus troubles are common in Australia, and other advanced countries, and are caused and aggravated by a wide variety of known irritants and probably by many other unrecognized factors. Some people suffer when living at the seaside and improve on moving to a high inland locality, while others have just the opposite experience. It is difficult to assess the extent to which dusts and gases of various kinds affect such a common condition with so many known and

unknown causal factors. It is probable that any dust or irritating gas will aggravate the condition to some extent, and may even cause it in susceptible people; but on the basis of past experience one would be very cautious before advising people to make a permanent move from a locality which appeared to be affecting them in this way. There are so many other factors which may be involved, and an expensive and disturbing move may often not have the desired effect.

- (3) Analyses have been made of the material washed into rain-water tanks. While it is realized that this will be unpleasant at times, it will not harm those drinking the water.

In a recent chest X-ray survey of the Stuart electoral district, 19,900 persons were examined. Two possible cases of silicosis were discovered in Port Augusta and three in Whyalla. This does not indicate any undue prevalence of the disease in the area. A full assessment of these X-rays is being made to determine whether any other type of chest disease or abnormality is more common among Port Augusta residents than persons from other parts of the State. It is expected that full information will be available in several months time.

SHEEP DISEASES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked on September 22 about sheep diseases?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture has informed me that the Chief Inspector of Stock (Dr. W. S. Smith) reports that the adult tapeworm (*taenia ovis*) which causes *cysticercus ovis* is commonly found in the intestines of dogs and foxes, and no reliable information is available at present in this State on the degree of infestation in either of these species of animal. Dr. Smith points out that, as an adult tapeworm produces several hundred thousand eggs a day, one dog or fox is capable of infesting many sheep in any area. There is strong evidence, however, that sheep, which have once been infested with *cysticercus ovis*, become resistant to further infection. In view of the widespread distribution of the adult tapeworm in dogs and foxes, it is considered that there is little real hope of controlling infestations in sheep. Obviously, the treatment of infected dogs and the destruction of foxes would involve a huge expenditure of manpower and money. The possibility of immunizing lambs at an early age is now under investigation. Meanwhile, however, sheep farmers are being encouraged to de-worm their dogs, to feed them only cooked meats and offal, and to destroy foxes.

In regard to *caseous lymphadenitis* (C.L.A.), Dr. Smith states that this organism enters the body through any wounds. Owners are encouraged to mark and tail their lambs on clean ground, to cleanse sheds and yards before shearing, crutching or mulesing, and to sterilize instruments. However, it is accepted that these recommendations can be of limited value, and will be adopted by only a proportion of sheep-owners. Earlier work on the production of a vaccine did not produce any worthwhile result, but this is being re-examined.

HOSPITAL CRECHES

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Attorney-General received from the Chief Secretary a reply to the question I asked on September 17 regarding creches at Government hospitals?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that the Board of Management of the Royal Adelaide Hospital has, during the past 12 months, given much consideration to the establishment of a child-minding centre and has also consulted the Kindergarten Union of South Australia in this regard. The fact that there are vacancies for children of kindergarten age in the Grey Ward kindergarten in the city is passed on to applicants for nursing positions who require such facilities. During recent months a survey by that board has revealed that there is some doubt as to the value of such facilities in the staffing of the hospital. At the Royal Adelaide Hospital there is no shortage of trained nurses to work day shifts only, Monday to Friday: the difficulty is to obtain staff for the evening and night shifts and for weekend work. A survey revealed that, in general, married nurses with children are not prepared to work other than day shifts on week days during hours suitable to themselves irrespective of whether child-minding facilities are available or not.

The Administrator of the Queen Elizabeth Hospital has reported that the same situation obtains at that hospital. He states that there is a creche and a kindergarten close to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and that the facilities afforded thereby are hardly ever used by hospital staff. These reports relate to the present position only. As circumstances could change with the employment of greater numbers of nursing staff in the future, the development of a child-minding centre at the Royal Adelaide Hospital is still proposed. Present indications are that any vacant places in such a centre would assist in the recruitment of paramedical and ancillary staff members who could

be given the opportunity to use the centre after nursing needs had been met.

POLLING BOOTHS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Attorney-General see whether something can be done to prevent a recurrence of the position that I will outline if I am granted permission to explain my question? The usual polling place at Tanunda has been the band hall, and during the recent—

The SPEAKER: Order! What is the honourable member's question?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister see whether something can be done to prevent a recurrence.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must ask his question properly.

Later:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Attorney-General see that something is done to prevent a recurrence of this position? With your permission, Sir, and the concurrence of the House, I seek leave to explain my question.

The SPEAKER: What position?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The whole point of asking permission to explain my question is—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: On a point of order—

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I take a point of order. The way in which the honourable member—

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That the member for Kavel is in order in framing his question in the way he has framed it. It is in accordance with your ruling, Sir, of September 24. He has framed his question and he has asked your leave and the concurrence of the House to explain it. I have done that twice today and you have allowed me to do it, and it is in conformity with your ruling as I have it here in *Hansard*.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Later:

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Attorney-General see that something is done to prevent a recurrence of the position which obtained at Tanunda during the recent Midland by-election? The usual polling place at Tanunda has been the local band hall, but this time there was a change of polling place because the hall had been let and this led to some confusion. Indeed, some people missed voting because

there was no notice erected at the band hall indicating the change of polling place.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I know nothing of the facts referred to, but I will obtain a report and let the honourable member have a reply.

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question regarding polling booths in the District of Bragg?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The matter referred to in the honourable member's question has been investigated by the Commonwealth Electoral Officer for South Australia and the Returning Officer for Bragg. Both advise that the existing booths are the most suitable in the area. An absent vote can be obtained at any polling booth outside the subdivision for which the elector is enrolled. It is not considered necessary to change the present arrangements.

RAILWAY REVENUE

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport obtain a report on railway revenue so far this financial year? During the last financial year record earnings were received by the Railways Department, during which time greatly improved facilities were made available to farmers and industry generally. This means that the railways are still making progress.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am pleased to be able to inform the House, and I am sure all members will be delighted to know, that the Railways Department is not only making more progress than it made last year, when it received a record income of \$3,000,000 more than in the previous year, but it is also improving on last year's figure.

Mr. Venning: Thanks to the wheat industry!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I agree completely with the honourable member. Much of this progress is due to the wheat industry, and I hope the honourable member will continue to encourage wheat farmers to consign their grain by rail rather than by road when a rail service is available. Railway revenue for this financial year up to September 14 increased by \$551,000, which is a most significant increase. Later figures are available but, unfortunately, I do not have them with me. However, I assure the House that the department has received well over \$600,000 more than it received last year.

HYDATIDS

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked on August 20 regarding the occurrence of hydatids in humans?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Minister of Health reports that only two cases of hydatid disease in humans have been notified in accordance with the provisions of the Health Act since 1965, that is, one in 1965 and one in 1968. The disease in humans is a notifiable condition, but the number of reports received do not give a true picture of prevalence as in some the condition has existed for many years. However, records of cases of hydatid disease have been made available to the Public Health Department by hospitals, for example, from the Adelaide Childrens Hospital (since 1943), the Royal Adelaide Hospital (since 1960) and the Queen Elizabeth Hospital (since 1963). At these latter hospitals, for varying periods up to 1968, 80 patients with hydatid disease have been treated. Among these were 10 patients who were thought to have contracted their infection overseas. Among the Australian-born patients, 40 had lived at some stage on the land, coming into contact with dogs and sheep. Of these, 16 had their residence in the South-East of the State, which has always been regarded as an area of fairly high endemicity. Compulsory chest X-ray surveys have produced very little evidence of unsuspected hydatid disease. A small number of calcified cysts in the liver has been seen, perhaps four or five in a 10-year period. In the past year, two lung abnormalities due to hydatid disease were seen in a total of about 110,000 persons examined. In each case the disease had been diagnosed before the survey film was taken.

HORMONE SPRAYING

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the detection in the atmosphere of hormone sprays?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: During his recent study tour of the Continent and America, Mr. A. Tideman (Senior Weeds Research Officer of the Agriculture Department) discussed off-target spray damage, including that resulting from application of hormone sprays, but was not made aware of the existence of any effective devices for the detection of hormone sprays in the atmosphere. On present knowledge, the most suitable action that can be taken is to educate farmers in the Murray Bridge area to avoid the use of volatile herbicides, and an active campaign has been arranged to achieve this.

TELEVISION COACHING

Mr. WELLS: Has the Premier considered making coaching facilities in television techniques available to members of this House?

The following article, headed "Corners Man to Coach Gorton", appeared recently in the press:

A top Australian Broadcasting Commission producer has been co-opted to coach the Prime Minister, Mr. Gorton, in television techniques in preparation for this year's Senate election. He is Mr. Allan Martin, Executive Producer of the A.B.C.'s top-rating current affairs programme *Four Corners*. Mr. Martin was reportedly recommended for the position by the General Manager of the A.B.C., Mr. T. Duckmanton, after a request from Mr. Gorton's Canberra office.

I suggest that many of us in this House—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is not permitted to comment.

Mr. WELLS: Many members of this House will probably be called upon to make television appearances in respect of the forthcoming Senate election. I admit that the capabilities of the Leader—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot comment: he must ask the question.

Mr. WELLS: I suggest that I have asked the question.

The SPEAKER: Would the Premier like to reply?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not have any plans to make such coaching available on a Governmental basis. Most members on this side do not require assistance, but I believe that great expenditure would be needed for members on the opposite side. I am afraid, however, that they will have to meet such expenditure from their own resources.

NORTHERN RAIL SERVICES

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question on Northern rail services?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There is no intention to close the stations at either Caltowie or Yongala. Rail services will be identical with those that have applied in the past, the only difference being that in the light of the level of business obtaining at these two stations, their proximity to Jamestown and Peterborough and the difficulty in obtaining qualified station masters there has been no alternative but to leave these stations unattended. However, despite the staff difficulties, should the business at these places improve, consideration of re-instatement of the station masters will be considered. In the meantime, however, customers may be assured that the level of service available will not be found wanting.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr. SIMMONS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question of August 6 on a common charge for public transport?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member will realize that this matter has required much investigation and this explains my tardiness in replying to the question. If the existing suburban rail passenger service were retained and common fares applied instead of the current fare structure, the annual loss would escalate from \$4,600,000 to \$5,200,000 if the common fare was 10c; if, however, a 20c fare applied and patronage remained unaltered the loss would drop to \$4,100,000. However, this fare would inevitably drive the short-journey passengers away from rail.

If the frequency of service were increased to provide for a five-minute headway in the peak periods, and a 20-minute headway in the off peaks, and at the same time there were increased patronages of alternatively 50 per cent and 100 per cent, the estimated railway losses would be as follows:

50 per cent increase in patronage—	
10c fare	\$9,800,000
20c fare	\$8,100,000
100 per cent increase in patronage—	
10c fare	\$9,200,000
20c fare	\$7,000,000

The increased frequency of service would involve capital expenditure exceeding \$20,000,000. It would also introduce serious operational problems, particularly in the Adelaide station and yard. It is difficult to assess what increased patronage might result from the increased level of service and the altered fare structure. I feel that, at present population levels, there would be no increase; on the other hand there could well be some long term community benefit accruing from such a plan.

With regard to the Municipal Tramways Trust, it is estimated that if adult passengers were charged a flat fare of 10c and children and pensioners half this fare, the loss of revenue based on the current level of patronage would amount to about \$2,700,000 a year, equivalent to a reduction of approximately 43 per cent. A fare reduction of this magnitude would require an 80 per cent increase in passengers to yield the same revenue as the trust is now receiving. Experience in other cities has shown that reduced fares inevitably result in a reduction in revenue, and this has only recently been confirmed by an experiment in Auckland, New Zealand. Any increase in patronage during daylight hours on week days would mean a substantial increase in operating

costs to provide the additional services to carry the extra passengers.

A standard flat fare of 20c would represent an increase on the present average fare and while this could improve the trust's financial position it could also lead to a drop in patronage, especially in the case of short-distance travellers whose fare would be increased 100 per cent. It is apparent that the honourable member's suggestion could well be self-defeating and cause larger deficits to be accrued by our public transport undertakings. However, the suggestions are attractive in providing better services for the public and this will have to be closely examined in any future proposals.

TRADE AGENCY

Mr. RODDA: My question, addressed to the Premier, relates to the agency which the Premier is reported to have set up in Singapore.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: What's the question?

Mr. RODDA: It relates to an agency set up in Singapore to represent this State.

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr. RODDA: If I am allowed to explain it I will develop the question. I ask the Premier whether he can explain to the House the nature of the appointment and say what it will do on behalf of this State. During the Premier's stay in Singapore he issued a press statement that this agency would probably represent South Australia with regard to the products of this State, and I also understand that the Premier said that this representation of the State had not hitherto been properly undertaken.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The terms of appointment of the agencies in Tokyo, Hong Kong and Singapore are similar. In each case the commercial concerns involved will treat this State as they treat their other clients—as a client. Information concerning the possibilities of the supply of goods from South Australia will be supplied by the agency. In addition, tourist promotion activity (not tourist servicing in the form of bookings) will be undertaken and information will be channelled out concerning investment opportunities in South Australia. Information will also be sent to South Australia regarding market possibilities and investment potential in the area. This will be done on the basis of a yearly retainer at a moderate figure. Beyond this work, which gives the general information I have outlined, the agencies will from time to time be

requested to undertake assistance which will be on a fee-paid basis. The agencies will also provide services for the officer of the Industrial Development Branch who will be appointed to deal with work in the Asian region and who will visit the agencies from time to time in the course of his investigations of the opportunities of the area, which investigations will be in more detail than the inquiries of the agencies. If the honourable member wishes to see it, I shall be happy to show him the correspondence that has passed between the State and Elder Smith Goldsbrough Mort Limited in relation to the appointment of an agency of that firm in Tokyo and it provides the basis on which agencies in Hong Kong and Singapore are being established.

CHRISTMAS HOLIDAYS

Mr. BECKER: Can the Premier say what days will be declared public holidays during the Christmas and new year period?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The matter is still being considered. Questions should be directed to the Minister of Labour and Industry, who has the matter in hand.

AGRICULTURAL DISPLAY

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about the Agriculture Department's display at the Royal Show?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states that the fee paid to Rodney N. Robertson Proprietary Limited for the preparation of plans and specifications and for the erection of the Agriculture Department's Royal Show exhibit this year was \$4,100. Since 1962, following frustrations over a number of years when contractors (other than the present contractor) failed to complete exhibits on time, Ministerial approval has been given to waive the normal procedure for calling tenders for the exhibit. The preparation by the department of its own plans and specifications for annual exhibits at the Royal Show proved costly and complicated, and it was discontinued in 1962. The reason for this alteration was that, in the previous year, three contractors were asked to prepare plans and specifications for a display at a fixed cost. The submission of Rodney N. Robertson Proprietary Limited was far superior to the other two, and in 1962 that company was asked to present plans and undertake presentation of the display at a fixed sum. This procedure has been followed in each subsequent year, and the department considers that the company has given satisfactory service.

ART UNIONS

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to approve regulations under the Lottery and Gaming Act to enable an art union to be conducted from South Australia on an Australia-wide basis? I read with interest columns dealing with racing and trotting that appear in the daily press. With great interest, I read the following item in one of those columns:

South Australia will have Australia's first memorial burial ground for famous pacers and trotters. The burial ground has been set aside at the South Australian Trotting Club's future headquarters at Globe Derby Park, Bolivar.

I understand that the club will also build a hall of fame. The secretary is reported as having said that the first general meeting of foundation members of the hall of fame will be held this week. The article continues:

Among the items to be submitted by the steering committee to this meeting is a proposal to conduct an Australia-wide art union raffle. This will be launched as soon as necessary legislation permitting the raffle in South Australia is passed by Parliament.

Having heard some statements made recently about the Lottery and Gaming Act, I am interested to see that this committee intends to run an Australia-wide art union.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have heard nothing of the suggestion, and the Government has formed no policy of developing an art union for providing for the fame of Hall or the hall of fame, or anything else of that kind. The only provision for an art union about which the Government has made any announcement is that, if the John Bishop Memorial Trust, which is proposed to be set up in relation to the development of a performing arts centre at North Adelaide, wished to conduct a *bona fide* art union (that is, not something of the kind known in the other States as an art union but a form of lottery that involves prizes that are genuine works of art and the like), an amendment to the Lottery and Gaming Act to clear up the present provision in that Act relating to an art union and to allow such a trust to conduct one would be made. However, after its consideration by the proponents of the John Bishop Memorial Trust, that proposal is not at the moment being proceeded with. I know of no other proposal to conduct an art union; certainly the Government has not made any decision to grant in relation to Globe Derby Park legislation for the conduct, on an Australia-wide basis, of what are known as art unions in the other States.

DRUGS

Mr. CLARK: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Minister of Health a reply to my recent question about statements made at a drug seminar held at Elizabeth and about press headlines dealing with the matter?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am informed that Sergeant J. F. Silverblade of the police drug squad attended a drug seminar at Elizabeth on August 9, 1970. During the evening, in reply to a question as to what drugs were being used in Elizabeth, he simply stated that marijuana (Indian hemp) was circulating and could be bought in Elizabeth. He further drew attention to the fact that it was known that young people were purchasing from pharmacists' shops slimming products named *tenuate* and *tenuate dospan*. Later, another question was directed to him about the exact situation on drug abuse in Elizabeth. He stated that he did not know the exact position in regard to Elizabeth and that there was no way of knowing, but that it would be fair to say that the drug problem would be no higher in Elizabeth than it was anywhere else in South Australia. The following day a press report quoted him as saying that the drug problem in Elizabeth was as high as that anywhere else in Australia. Sergeant Silverblade subsequently appeared on a television programme for the express purpose of correcting the incorrect newspaper report.

INDIAN-PACIFIC

Mr. McKEE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the Indian-Pacific?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Requests have been made to the Commonwealth Government to provide finance for the construction of modern passenger carriages for use on the Broken Hill to Peterborough line. To date these requests have met with little response, and I have again written to the Commonwealth Government asking that early and favourable consideration be given to our earlier requests. The carriages currently in use were converted 500-class and 600-class cars that were first put in service in 1936. Although they are in reasonably good condition they are not air-conditioned and, consequently, they provide a level of service far short of that required on this line. However, these carriages are the best available and we had no choice but to place them in service pending the provision of finance from the Commonwealth Government. If the honourable member raises this matter again later in the session, I will tell

him of any further progress made in respect of our current submission.

EMPIRE TIMES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask the Attorney-General whether he intends to take any action in the circumstances, and I seek your permission, Mr. Speaker, and the concurrence of the House—

The SPEAKER: What is your question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Whether the Attorney-General intends to take any action in the circumstances that I desire to outline, and I ask your permission and the concurrence of the House to explain those circumstances. I have been shown a copy of the Flinders University publication *Empire Times*. I may say that several times during the period when I was Attorney-General this publication was referred to me and on each occasion, after consideration, I decided that, although there was objectionable matter in it, I would not take any action or cause any action to be taken. I have looked at this particular issue of the publication, which has been on the front of it the words "Pig city" and above it a photograph, certainly, of a police officer, and I should think that the photograph probably was taken at the corner of North Terrace and King William Street. However, I am not certain of the background. I have looked inside the publication and I consider that much of the material, both photographic and letterpress, is so objectionable as to warrant serious consideration of taking action. I telephoned the Attorney's Secretary on October 1 concerning this matter and told Mr. Langcake that I understood a lady who had spoken to me had already formally complained, through the Police Department, about this particular issue and that the complaint had gone to the Attorney-General's office. I said that I intended to ask the Attorney today whether he had considered the matter and whether he intended, in all the circumstances, to take action. As this happened 12 days ago, I assume that the Attorney is now able to answer the question.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I regret to say that the honourable member's assumption is incorrect. This matter has not been referred to me and I know nothing of it. However, as it is now referred to me, I shall certainly consider the matter, if the honourable member will be good enough to give me the copy of the publication.

TORRENS BRIDGES

Mr. SIMMONS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on September 23 regarding bridges over the Torrens River?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Highways Department generally accepts financial responsibility for the construction of bridges across the Torrens River to relieve the problem of north-south traffic, where these form part of the principal network of arterial roads. Bridges have recently been constructed by the department, without financial contribution from councils, at Findon Road and Holbrook Road on the western side of the city and at Portrush Road extension on the eastern side of the city. The construction of footbridges is considered to be the responsibility of the councils concerned.

BUTTER

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question about the spreadability of butter?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The spreadability of butter is influenced by seasonal factors, feed consumed by cows, and the physical processing cream receives in the course of manufacture into butter. Green feed such as is available to the cow in spring and from irrigated pastures produces a "soft" butterfat which, when manufactured, produces a very spreadable butter. On the other hand, cream produced during the dry-grass period or when supplementary dry rations are being fed has a "hard" butterfat, which reduces spreadability of butter. The conditioning of cream during processing by appropriate temperature treatments that ensure superfine crystallization of fats can also be used to improve spreadability of butter. While South Australian dairy companies have no control over the feed consumed by cows and likely to affect "softness" and "hardness" of butterfat, they do all within their power by appropriate processing techniques to ensure butter of the best quality and spreadability from the creams received. In this regard it is of interest to report that sales of butter in South Australia increased during the winter period. Research sponsored by the Australian Dairy Produce Board is being conducted by the South Australian Agriculture Department into blending and processing techniques, to produce a butter more acceptable to the consuming public. With improvements in the technology of manufacture in South Australia, the industry will be

able to implement very quickly any new techniques likely to have a significant effect on butter quality, spreadability, and sales.

AIR RIFLES

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply from the Chief Secretary to my question about air rifles?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague states that Cabinet is at present considering introducing legislation to control the use of air rifles.

KIMBA MAIN

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works take the necessary action to have the Kimba-Polda main so far completed and gazetted as to enable landholders adjoining the main to be connected?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be pleased to examine the matter and find out what can be done.

ALAWOONA-MERIBAH ROAD

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question asked by the member for Mallee on September 18 about work on the Alawoona-Meribah road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Tenders will be called soon for the construction and sealing of the seven miles between Paruna and Meribah in conjunction with the realignment and construction to open-surface standard of the 12-mile section of the Lamerloo-Alawoona Main Road No. 246 between the Billiatt wild life reserve and Alawoona. Subject to the availability of funds and completion of all pre-construction requirements, it is expected that construction will commence in May, 1972.

BREAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Attorney-General received from the Minister of Health a reply to the question I asked first on August 25 (I have asked questions many times since) regarding the return of unsold bread? I repeat that this matter is most urgent to shopkeepers and the general public.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have a note with my papers to the effect that a report has been received by the Chief Secretary's Department from the Public Health Department but, as at the time when I came to the House today, the Chief Secretary's Department had not been able to get the report across to me. I understand that a message has been left with the Chief Secretary's Department to forward the report, which I hope will be available tomorrow.

ST. LEONARDS INFANTS SCHOOL

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Education say why the subsidy for the St. Leonards Infants School was reduced this year?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Although I shall be happy to examine this matter for the honourable member, I point out that the subsidy allocations made to various schools differ from year to year. He will probably find that the subsidy allocation for the St. Leonards Primary School has been increased or that the St. Leonards Infants School may have had a special project last year which is not being carried on this year. Concerning the Budget, there has been no cut in the overall subsidy allocations for schools throughout the State, and the provision of subsidies on Loan Account for capital purposes such as swimming pools, assembly halls and canteens has been increased by \$100,000. By the end of the financial year, we will probably have to exceed that level of increase. However, I will look into the matter concerning the St. Leonards Infants School and bring down a reply as soon as possible.

STRAY DOGS

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Attorney-General a reply to the question I asked on September 1 last about stray dogs?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The problems caused by dogs straying into schoolyards has become a matter of concern and I am asked to express an opinion on the law relating to seizure of dogs. The question involves a consideration of both statutory provisions and the common law. The only statutory provision which deals with seizure of straying dogs is section 20 (1) of the Registration of Dogs Act, 1924-1968, which provides:

Any dog found at large in any part of the State may be seized by any member of the Police Force, special constable or Crown lands ranger, or by any person authorized in writing by any municipal or district council to seize dogs found at large.

The provision relates only to dogs "found at large" but under section 20 (2) it includes both registered and unregistered dogs. In the case of *Ramage v. Evans*, 1948 V.L.R. 391 at 397, Mr. Justice Duffy, when discussing the words "found at large therein" contained in section 19 of the Dogs Act 1928, said:

This section from its context would appear to give a protection to the owner or occupier of those places from the immediate danger which generally arises from the presence amongst sheep, cattle or poultry of an unattended dog not subject to restraint or control.

The words "found at large" in section 20 (1) of the Registration of Dogs Act appear to bear a similar meaning and the section applies to unattended dogs not subject to restraint or control. The section is phrased in such wide terms that a stray dog may be seized both on public and private property anywhere in the State provided that the seizure is by the persons designated. Although the Act authorizes seizure on private property, it does not give a right of entry to effect seizure. Entry on to private property for this purpose can only be with the consent of the owner or his agent. The section also provides that after four days from time of seizure, unless the dog has been claimed meanwhile, it may be sold or destroyed. At common law the only person who can seize and impound a dog trespassing on private property is a landowner or a person who has an interest in the land sufficient to entitle him to maintain an action of trespass to protect it. Such a person can seize and impound trespassing animals, including dogs, to secure compensation for damages, provided that the seizure is made on the occasion that the damage is incurred. This right would not appear to have any practical application to the question of dogs straying in schoolyards.

A person is entitled, at common law, to take such action as is necessary to protect his person or property from injury or the reasonable danger of injury by a dog even to the extent of injuring or killing it. He would certainly be entitled to restrain the dog by tying it up while the danger remained. In the net result it appears that dogs found straying in schoolyards and constituting an immediate threat could be tied up by schoolteachers who could then advise a person empowered under the Act to seize the dogs. Alternatively, the school authorities could advise an appropriate person designated by section 20 (1) of the Registration of Dogs Act to enter the school premises and seize stray dogs. Such dogs would then be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of section 20.

Mr. WARDLE: Does the Minister of Education believe that schoolteachers will readily accept the responsibility for tying up dogs and informing the local inspector that they have a dog in the schoolyard, or will he issue a directive to that effect? In his reply the Attorney-General has said that in the net result it appears that dogs found straying in schoolyards and constituting an immediate threat could be tied up by schoolteachers. I understand that, although there have been

many stray dogs in schoolyards, not all of them have constituted a threat to the children; one of the biggest problems is the straying friendly dog that wanders into schoolyards at lunch times.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The answer to both parts of the honourable member's question is "No". I point out that the Attorney-General, in his reply, said that alternatively the school authorities could advise an appropriate person designated by section 20 (1) of the Registration of Dogs Act to enter school premises and seize stray dogs and that such dogs would then be dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the section. If the dog in question is a friendly stray dog, as described by the honourable member, I am sure that most people would be willing to tie it up, if it were a nuisance, and contact the authorities. However, some teachers will not do this, for example, those who get hay fever as a result of contact with dogs or those who have an extreme fear of dogs. It is not possible to lay down a general rule. The question at issue is to create the condition whereby sufficient people employed by local authorities are available for this purpose.

JAMESTOWN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Education consider inspecting the Jamestown Primary School when he is in the area on October 30? Bearing in mind that the Minister will be visiting Jamestown at the end of the month to open additions at the Jamestown High School, I point out that the primary school consists of a fairly aged building, and it would be appreciated if, while he is in the area, the Minister would consider inspecting this school. If his answer is in the affirmative, will the Minister notify the council and the local member of his itinerary?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Although I will look into the matter, I point out that on that day I have to be back in Adelaide for an evening function, so that any inspection that I make of the Jamestown Primary School will have to take place prior to the ceremony at the Jamestown High School. Whether or not I can arrange it so that this can take place, I do not know at this stage, but I will look into the matter and let the honourable member know.

GREENHILL ROAD

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question

I previously asked about installing traffic lights at the intersection of King William Road and Greenhill Road, across which intersection the Glenelg tram line runs parallel to King William Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Traffic signals will be installed at the Greenhill Road and King William Road intersection in conjunction with its reconstruction, and it is expected that this work will be completed by late November.

SHEEP TRANSPORT

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport have an investigation made into, and a report prepared on, a delay that occurred in transporting sheep by rail from Yunta? On August 17 last, a certain pastoral company, the name of which I shall give the Minister if he requires it, was told to load, on that date at 5 p.m., sheep to be railed to the city. Although this was carried out, the company was amazed to find that at 11 o'clock next morning, 18 hours after being loaded, these sheep were still in the yard.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

RUN-OFFS

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on September 16 regarding the safety of run-offs in the Adelaide Hills?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Following the honourable member referring again to the construction of run-offs in the Adelaide Hills, I spoke with the Deputy Commissioner of Highways, who has informed me that, although the department is sure that the run-off complained of by the honourable member is completely safe as it is, the department will endeavour to make it even safer by paring down the rock face referred to.

EGG PRODUCTION

Mr. McANANEY: I understand that the Minister of Works has received from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I asked regarding egg production. I hope that this reply is from a better informed source than the last reply I received.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I guess it is from a similar source—the Agriculture Department. This matter was considered at the meeting of the Australian Agricultural Council held earlier this year, and the council decided that no action would be taken at this juncture. It is believed that a poll held in Western Australia returned an overwhelming vote by producers in that State for production controls;

however, Western Australia is in a unique position because of its geographical situation and its separation from the Eastern States by the Nullabor Plain, which counteracts to a large degree the impact of section 92 of the Constitution. Obviously, however, South Australia could not act in isolation on a proposal such as this, and it would be expected that any decision affecting South Australia and the Eastern States would be made by the Agricultural Council following a unanimous approach from the industry itself.

HINDMARSH INTERSECTION

Mr. RYAN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport ask the Highways Department when traffic lights will be installed at the Hindmarsh roundabout, which is near the banks of the Torrens and the Hindmarsh bridge? On numerous occasions constituents have asked me to ascertain what priority this intersection has, because it is one of the busiest intersections in the metropolitan area, requiring the services of a police constable to direct traffic through it each morning and afternoon. Although a policeman is stationed there on traffic duty at these times, terrific bank-ups occur to as far back as the police barracks.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes.

UNLEY INTERSECTION

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question regarding the completion date of work being carried out at the intersection of Unley and Greenhill Roads?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is expected that the reconstruction of the intersection of Greenhill Road and Unley Road will be completed in August, 1971. This is subject to completion of land acquisition in time to permit the necessary work to be done by that date.

COLLEAGUE'S STATEMENT

Mr. HALL: Did the colleague of the Minister of Labour and Industry inform him of this before September 30?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not a question.

Mr. Millhouse: Of course it is.

The SPEAKER: The Leader should ask his question.

Mr. Millhouse: He has asked his question.

Mr. HALL: That is my question: the rest is entirely explanation. My question is

as follows: "Did the Minister's colleague inform him of this before September 30?" The rest is in the explanation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Question!

The SPEAKER: Order! That is not a question.

Mr. HALL: That is my question. There is nothing more to be asked. I have been prevented from asking my question.

MEDICAL HONORARIES

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about medical honoraries?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Agreement in principle has been reached which will enable the phasing out of the honorary medical system in the Government teaching hospitals in this State, to commence on January 1, 1971.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary what method of phasing out of the honorary medical specialist system in the Government teaching hospitals in this State is to be employed, and whether it is intended to pay all honorary medical officers from January 1, 1971?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will obtain a reply for the honourable member.

CAR FREIGHTING

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the carrying of cars by the Railways Department? In my original question I may have got mixed up between Albury and Mildura, because I may have been thinking about the best place to build a dam on the Murray River.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Victorian Railways carry passengers' cars to Mildura and a nightly service operates between Melbourne and Mildura. I am advised that only limited success has been achieved and that on the average approximately two cars per train are handled. The South Australian Railways has not lost sight of the practicability of introducing a similar arrangement in South Australia. However, only two routes appear to warrant study. These are Adelaide to Mount Gambier and Adelaide to Broken Hill. In respect of the former, the relatively poor level of sleeping accommodation provided does not appear to justify the introduction of a "car-o-train" service. On the other hand, this could be worthwhile to Broken Hill after standardization is achieved into Adelaide. At the present time bogie exchange at Peterborough would be involved and this would endanger the practicability of such a movement.

RIVERTON BUS SERVICE

Mr. ALLEN (on notice):

1. How many passengers were carried on the Riverton-Jamestown co-ordinated bus service for the year ended June 30, 1970?

2. How many parcels were carried for the same period?

3. What were the costs of running this service?

4. What revenue was obtained from the service?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. 9,248.

2. 36,281.

3. \$20,789. (Road bus costs only. Rail costs are indistinguishable from Adelaide-Peterborough and Riverton-Spalding rail costs)

4. Passengers \$18,213

Parcels \$13,941

\$32,154

(Revenue obtained from both road and rail portions of journey)

SOUTH-EAST LINE

Mr. RODDA (on notice):

1. How many miles of re-ballasting of the Serviceton-Murray Bridge railway line are proposed in the financial year 1970-71?

2. When is it intended to complete the re-ballasting of this line?

3. Is it intended to procure all of the ballast material from the Mount Monster quarry at Keith?

4. What tonnage of aggregate has been contracted for supply from the Mount Monster quarry at this date?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. 106 miles.

2. September 30, 1971.

3. No.

4. 70,000 cub. yds.

DENTAL SERVICES

Mr. GUNN (on notice): What plans has the Government to provide dental services to country areas which do not have them at present?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The present situation in regard to the School Dental Service of the Public Health Department is as follows:

A. Present Status of Static Clinics:

(1) Whyalla—

- 3 dental clinics.
- 1 regional dental officer.
- 6 dental therapists.
- 4 dental nurses.

(2) Port Augusta—

- 2 dental clinics.
- 1 regional dental officer.
- 4 dental therapists.
- 3 dental nurses.

(3) Port Pirie—

- 3 dental clinics.
- 1 regional dental officer.
- 6 dental therapists.
- 4 dental nurses.

(4) Peterborough—

- 1 dental clinic.
- 2 dental therapists.
- The regional dental officer at Port Pirie attends Peterborough for one day each week.

(5) Renmark and

(6) Loxton—

- 2 dental clinics.
- 1 regional dental officer divides his time between the clinics as he is needed.
- 3 dental nurses.

(7) Murray Bridge,

(8) Millicent, and

(9) Kingscote—

- 1 dental clinic in each town (3).
- 1 regional dental officer in each town (3).
- 2 dental therapists in each clinic (6).
- 2 dental nurses in each clinic (6).

Planned Development of Static Clinics:

1971 Mount Gambier Primary School.

Port Lincoln Primary School.

Ridley Grove Primary School.

Taperoo Primary School.

Each clinic will accommodate two dental therapists, and regional dental officers will be required in Mount Gambier and Port Lincoln.

1972 Christies Beach.

Elizabeth.

Cummins.

Mannum.

The Christies Beach and Elizabeth clinics will accommodate six dental therapists and come under the control of a regional dental officer in Adelaide. The other

clinics will be controlled by the regional dental officers in Port Lincoln and Murray Bridge.

1973 It is expected that there will be 25 clinics in operation by the middle of the year, 18 of them being sited in country areas. The clinics will accommodate 50 dental therapists. It is not likely that more therapists will be retained in employment unless the programme for their education is expanded to include more than the current figure of 16 students per year.

B. Present Status of Mobile Clinics:

The current programme is based upon the employment of seven field dental officers, and is dependent for its maintenance on that number being retained. The objective is to examine and provide treatment once a year for the maximum number of children. Children from the following areas are being treated:

Eyre Peninsula No. 1—

Kimba.

Iron Knob.

Iron Baron.

Darke Peak.

Eyre Peninsula No. 2—

Streaky Bay.

Minnipa.

Wudinna.

Lock.

Murray Mallee No. 1—

Pinnaroo.

Lameroo.

Geranium.

Murray Mallee No. 2—

Karoonda.

Purnong Landing.

Swan Reach.

East Murray Area School.

Northern Area No. 1—

Wilmington.

Quorn.

Hawker.

Northern Area No. 2—(2 dentists)—

Booleroo Centre.

Melrose.

Murray Town.

Wirrabara.

Laura.

Appila.

Orororo.

Terowie.

Yunta.

Olary.

Cockburn.

This activity cannot be expanded unless more dentists seek employment in the School Dental Service. The establishment is 12 field dental officers.

The above services are limited to primary schoolchildren except in cases of emergency and for children of parents in necessitous circumstances. To provide a dental service to the whole community, some local authorities are attempting to attract private dentists to their area, and advice and assistance has been sought in this connection from officers of the Public Health Department. An example of this is at Pinnaroo. The Government is also investigating the possibility of providing certain services to pensioners with assistance from the staff of the School Dental Services in collaboration with the staff of the Dental Department of the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When will school dental clinics be established in the District of Eyre?

The Hon. L. J. KING: At present it is not possible to establish static school dental clinics in the District of Eyre because the number of children available for treatment in any of the towns in the area would be insufficient to justify the establishment of static clinics. However, dental services are provided in the area and, in fact, have been provided for some years by mobile clinics. At present mobile clinics are serving the following areas: Eyre Peninsula No. 1: Kimba, Iron Knob, Iron Baron, and Darke Peak. Eyre Peninsula No. 2: Streaky Bay, Minnipa, Wudinna, and Lock.

STATE FINANCES

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What is the total sum of items listed in the Estimates of Expenditure for 1970-71, the cost of which is recoverable from the Commonwealth Government?

2. What is the total sum of items listed therein which attract subsidy from the Commonwealth Government, and what is the total amount of those subsidies?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. \$2,074,190.

2. \$21,825,384.

Total amount of subsidies: \$9,389,010. In addition, the Government expects to receive

a further \$147,703,632 from the Commonwealth Government by way of general purpose grants. For the purpose of these calculations no account has been taken of Commonwealth payments to the State for hospital benefits, pharmaceutical benefits, child endowment, or age or invalid pensions. The Commonwealth regards these as being in the nature of a social service, as they are paid to the various State institutions on behalf of individuals. A table summarizing the Commonwealth contributions is available if the honourable member desires a copy.

CHAFFEY IRRIGATION AREA

The SPEAKER laid on the table the final report by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence, on Chaffey Irrigation Area (Rehabilitation of Irrigation Headworks).

Ordered that report be printed.

CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1968. Read a first time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

After consultation with the appropriate organizations, a review has been undertaken of the provisions of the Cattle Compensation Act, 1939-1968, which provide for compensation payments. At present, section 6 of the principal Act provides that, where after slaughter an animal is found to be diseased, the compensation payable will be about 25 per cent less than it would have been if the animal were found not to be diseased. In addition, for the purposes of calculating compensation payments the upper limit of the market value of stock slaughtered is, at present, fixed at \$120.

Clause 2 recasts section 6 (1) to relate that subsection more closely to the provisions of the principal Act that set out the circumstances in which compensation is payable. In addition, this clause provides for the abolition of the 25 per cent deduction in the case of animals found to be diseased, since it is felt that this deduction is no longer warranted. Clause 3 amends section 7 of the principal Act and provides for the lifting of the upper limit of market value from \$120 to \$200, thus recognizing the generally higher cattle prices which have prevailed since 1951 when the upper

limit was last fixed. Since these proposed amendments will result in some increase of payments from the Cattle Compensation Fund, the position will be continually reviewed to ensure that the fund remains financially sound.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CITY OF WOODVILLE WEST LAKES LOAN) BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Local Government) 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 Local Government (City of Woodville West Lakes Loan) Bill, 1970, has the honour to report as follows:

1. Your committee met on two occasions and took evidence from the following persons: Mr. P. R. Tonkin, Mayor; Mr. R. A. Kerr, Town Clerk; Mr. D. A. Hamilton, Deputy Town Clerk, and City Treasurer; and Mr. J. J. Vreugdenhil, City Engineer, representing the Corporation of the City of Woodville; and Mr. E. A. Ludovici, Parliamentary Draftsman, Crown Law Department, Adelaide.
2. Advertisements inviting interested persons to give evidence before the committee were inserted in both the *Advertiser* and the *News*. In addition, a similar advertisement was inserted in the *Weekly Times*, a newspaper which circulates in the local government area administered by the Corporation of the City of Woodville. There was no response to these advertisements.
3. In evidence to the committee the representatives of the Woodville council indicated that the proposed legislation met the requirements of the council and that no objections had been made to the council from ratepayers on the proposed loan arrangements.
4. No objections to the Bill were brought to the notice of the committee.
5. In the opinion of the committee the proposed legislation is desirable, and your committee recommends that the Bill be passed without amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATE GOVERNMENT INSURANCE COMMISSION BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 5, line 42 (clause 12)—After "amended" insert "and, if it does become an approved insurer, the Commission shall become bound by the provisions of that Act in the same manner and to the same extent as other

approved insurers are bound by those provisions".

No. 2. Page 5 (clause 12)—After line 42 insert new subclauses (3a) and (3b) as follows:—

"(3a) Notwithstanding any provisions of any Act or regulation to the contrary, a person who, in terms of any law or by contract with any department or instrumentality of the Government of the State—

(a) is required to insure any risks, whether in his own name or his name and the name of the Crown, any Minister of the Crown, department or instrumentality of the Government of the State;

or

(b) is obliged to pay the premium on any such risk, shall not be obliged to insure with the Commission.

(3b) The Public Trustee shall not, upon acquiring an insurable interest or thereafter, insure with the Commission any risks currently or previously insured with any other person carrying on the business of insurance in South Australia, unless such person is unable or unwilling to insure or continue to insure such risks on reasonable terms, or unless for prudent reasons associated only with his duty as a trustee, the Public Trustee is unwilling to insure or continue to insure such risks with that person."

No. 3. Page 6, line 6 (clause 12)—After "and" insert ", subject to subparagraph (iii) of paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of section 17 of this Act, but otherwise".

No. 4. Page 6, line 8 (clause 12)—After "department" insert ": But no school teacher employed by the Government of the State shall act as an agent for or on behalf of the Commission, and no member of the police force shall act as an agent for or on behalf of the Commission for the purpose of arranging contracts of insurance (excepting contracts of insurance complying with Part IV of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1959, as amended, in relation to permits to which section 16 of that Act applies) or of making inquiries concerning insurance claims, unless such inquiries concern any accident or offence or suspected offence, or any contravention or suspected contravention of, or any non-compliance or suspected non-compliance with, any law and such inquiries are of such a nature as a member of the police force would ordinarily make in the discharge of his duties as such".

No. 5. Page 6, line 39 (clause 13)—After "behalf." insert—

"The rights transferred and vested in the workman by virtue of section 13 (1) of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1932, as amended, shall apply in respect of policies issued by the Commission in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to and in respect of policies issued by other persons engaged in the business of insurance in the State."

No. 6. Page 7, lines 21 to 27 (clause 17)—Leave out subclause (1) and insert new subclause as follows:—

(1) The Commission shall pay to the Treasurer annually—

(a) as an underwriting or trading charge, such amount as the Auditor-General certifies is, in his opinion—

(i) the equivalent of all rates, taxes and fees, other than income tax, which the Commission would not be liable to pay but would, if it were any other person engaged in the business of insurance, pay to any State or Commonwealth Government department or instrumentality or to any local government authority;

(ii) the difference between the actual purchase price of goods and commodities purchased by the Commission and the price for which such goods and commodities would be purchased by any other person engaged in the business of insurance, but only to the extent that such difference is due to exemptions in force under any acts of the State or Commonwealth relating to sales tax, customs and excise duties and levies in respect of goods sold to any department or instrumentality of the Government of the State;

(iii) the value of office accommodation, goods and services supplied by any department of the public service or the Government or any instrumentality of the Government of the State computed in relation to the service of any particular officer or employee on the basis of his salary or wages, allowances or other remuneration with such additions for pay roll tax, workmen's compensation, superannuation, sick pay, holiday pay, and annual and long service leave, as will meet the cost to the Government of employing him for the period employed on the business of the Commission and, in relation to office accommodation, goods and all other services, on the basis of what any other person engaged in the business of insurance would pay for similar accommodation, goods or services to a landlord or supplier that is not a department of the public service or the Government

or any instrumentality of the Government of the State;

and

- (b) as an appropriation of profit, such amount as the Auditor-General certifies is, in his opinion, the equivalent of income tax which the Commission would, if it were any other person engaged in the business of insurance, be liable to pay.

No. 7. Page 8 (clause 19)—After line 21 insert new subclauses (2a) and (2b) as follows:—

“(2a) The report of the Auditor-General shall include a separate statement showing the net profit or net loss made in respect of each of the following in each year:—

- (a) policies of insurance taken out with the Commission by the Government;
- (b) policies of insurance taken out with the Commission by Government instrumentalities;
- (c) policies of insurance taken out with the Commission by local government authorities;
- (d) policies of insurance taken out with the Commission by other persons.

(2b) Where in the opinion of the Auditor-General the Commission has in any year charged persons or departments or instrumentalities of the Government with premiums for insurances in excess of the average rate charged for such insurances by companies commonly known as tariff companies, carrying on the business of insurance in the State, the Auditor-General shall include in the report a statement to that effect.”

No. 8. Page 9 (clause 20)—After line 18 insert new subclause (6) as follows:—

“(6) On each advance made by the Treasurer to the Commission, the Commission shall pay to the Treasurer interest at such rate not lower than the long term bond rate within the meaning of subclause (4A) of clause 9 of the 1956-1966 Housing Agreement referred to in the Housing Agreement Act, 1966, as the Treasurer may determine.”

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

I intend to deal with the amendments briefly and in order. The first amendment is to clause 12, and the proposed addition to subclause (3) is quite unnecessary, as the clause already makes adequate provision to ensure, by implication, that the commission has all the obligations that a private insurer may have under the Motor Vehicles Act. As to the second amendment, again to clause 12, it is likely that these things will cause difficulties in particular cases, Circumstances necessarily arise from time to time where a department or instrumentality may

find it proper to insist on a particular insurance, and private enterprise does this in circumstances that are wholly proper and occasionally in other circumstances where there is a financial or other interest with the nominated insurer.

State Government instrumentalities now specify particular insurance. The Superannuation Department, the State Bank and the Savings Bank do, and to suggest that these instrumentalities of the Government may not now designate their own insurance company, the State Government Insurance Commission, is to place that commission in a position that no other insurance company in South Australia is in. The amendment is designed deliberately to cripple the work of the State Government Insurance Office and the business it may properly derive from the Government.

As to the amendment referring to page 6, line 6, clause 12, if the amendments relating to clause 17 were to be accepted, this amendment could go in, but if seems unnecessary, for the Auditor-General will, in any case, call for a full and proper reimbursement to be given by the commission and to be required by the department providing the relevant services.

That is his practice now and, therefore, this amendment is quite unnecessary. The same applies to the amendment in line 8 on page 6. There will not be any proposal to use teachers or members of the Police Force in this matter as agents for the Government. As to the amendment to clause 17, so far as rates and taxes are concerned, including the equivalent of income tax, the clause in the Bill is adequate. Whatever may be the strict law on the subject, it is certainly not proposed that the commission should claim exemption from council rates, water and sewerage rates, etc., and there is no necessity to provide that the commission shall not be so exempt. It would be quite impracticable to apply subparagraph (ii) as submitted and, in any case, the commission, being a trading concern, would not ordinarily qualify for exemptions from sales tax, etc.

So far as concerns free service from other departments or any indirect subsidy on account of particular charges not rendered in full, this would be contrary to present practice, and in any case the Auditor-General would not condone any significant undercharge or indirect subsidy, and he has made that perfectly clear. The proposals in the amendment to clause 13 are extremely badly drafted. They provide for a vesting in the workman but provide for no vesting in the commission of the rights of the insurer. In consequence, the Government

cannot agree to the amendment as it stands. In fact, we think that the position is covered.

The amendments to clause 19, too, are unnecessary. The Auditor-General would have regard to all proper considerations and should be trusted to include in his report all matters that in his opinion should be reported to Parliament and it is quite improper to provide that this sort of provision be made. In fact, on the report to me, the proposal is utterly impracticable. We cannot separate out the amounts that are provided in this section of the amendment.

As to the amendment to clause 20, it is intended that all advances from the Treasurer to the commission are to carry interest at a rate not lower than the long-term bond rate, but there may be occasions where a lower rate of interest would be appropriate, and the Treasurer should be free to make advances at such rates of interest as are appropriate in the circumstances. This matter was canvassed fully when the Bill was before us, and the proposals in this amendment were rejected.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): The Premier, in his hasty dismissal of the Council's amendments, seems obviously intent on having a disagreement with the Council. Although he dealt with the amendment to clause 17 and came back to the amendment to clause 13, in a manner that was a little confusing, his major criticism of the amendments was that most were unnecessary. This may well be but, surely, if he desired to get this Bill through in the shortest possible time, he would look more carefully at some of these so-called unnecessary amendments and perhaps find time to justify them a little better or at least to accept them with a little more grace. Some of the things that the Premier has said are unnecessary are apparently (in his view, at any rate) already included in the legislation by implication. If they are included, I see no reason to defy the other place and to say, "It is already there; we are not going to accept the certainty that you want to provide by including these amendments." I oppose the motion and I will therefore vote against it, because in my opinion it is essential to show good faith and a co-operative attitude towards companies already engaged in insurance business.

Members know that this measure merely sets up another insurance office, which will not offer lower rates or some trading or business advantage compared with what firms already existing offer. If it is to fulfil its responsibilities without subsidy from the Government,

the commission will have to seek premiums comparable with those of existing reputable companies. Therefore, the Council has adopted a responsible attitude in asking that there should be safeguards to ensure that the Government does not go beyond the bounds of normal business activities and that no sort of subsidy will be involved. Without going into detail, which could open up all aspects of this unnecessary legislation, I oppose the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Mr. Acting Chairman, am I to understand that these amendments are being taken together, or are they being taken *seriatim*, as I think is customary?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): The Premier has moved that the Legislative Council's amendments be disagreed to.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Is it not more usual for them to be taken one by one? Do you intend to divide them and take them one by one? As I understand it, they concern different matters; certainly, they involve different clauses.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I do not object if the honourable member wants to vote on them separately.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I understand it, this is the way it has always been done previously.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The Premier has agreed to deal *seriatim* with the Legislative Council's amendments.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I presume that is your ruling.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I accept that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is your ruling, fortified by the Premier.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The member for Mitcham asked whether that was the ruling, and I said "Yes".

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Very well, Sir, I am content.

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I understand the Premier's explanation, he merely said that this provision was in the Bill by implication and that it was unnecessary to insert it specifically in the Bill. If that is so, it can just as easily be argued that it is wise to put explicitly what is there implicitly. If the Premier's only objection to this amendment is that it makes explicit something that is implicit in the Bill, I think there is good reason to accept the amendment, and, if I

understand his explanation correctly, I hope the Premier will reconsider his opposition to this amendment, certainly in the interests of good relations between the two Chambers.

Mr. COUMBE: During the previous debate on this matter, the point was made by the Government that no undue advantage was sought for the commission over any other similar type of insurance office. If we accept that explanation as being fair, surely this amendment, which spells out the conditions, will do no harm in principle to the Government's contention. The amendment is saying that the commission shall be bound by the provisions of the legislation in the same manner and to the same extent as other insurers are bound by these provisions. In other words, this amendment merely ensures that the commission shall work in exactly the same way and under the same conditions as would apply to any other similar office.

I suggest that the Government should, in all equity, accept this amendment, because it fortifies the principle advanced during the second reading debate and subsequent debates by the Premier and by members who supported this measure, namely, that the commission was to operate on the same basis as and would have no advantage over any other similar office. I suggest that this amendment could be accepted by the Committee.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): That the amendment be disagreed to?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Are we not getting some further explanation from the Premier?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I see not the slightest reason for putting into the Bill what is obviously surplusage, and the honourable member as a lawyer must know that it is surplusage.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (23)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wells.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Lawn. No—Mr. Nan-kivell.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.
Amendment thus disagreed to.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

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

Mr. McANANEY: This is an important amendment because it will stop the Government from telling a person entering into a contract with it to insure with the Government Insurance Commission. This is something that must be avoided at all costs, particularly if the Government is sincere in its statement that the office will compete equally with existing firms. I support the amendment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member must know from that practice in accounting of which he so often tells us that it is standard practice for every mortgagee to designate the insurance company with which he requires the insurance of the mortgaged property to be effected.

Mr. McAnaney: Rubbish!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can only say that the honourable member obviously has not read a mortgage. It is normally designated in every mortgage, and I suggest that the honourable member consult with the member for Mitcham, who has drawn mortgages. I have drawn many, all of which have designated a specific insurance company.

Mr. McAnaney: I have never been asked to do it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can only tell the honourable member what is standard commercial practice in this State and what companies are designated by some of the State instrumentalities. I refer particularly to the Mercantile Mutual Insurance Company. Designations such as this are now included in the mortgages issued by State instrumentalities in South Australia. The honourable member now wants to provide that what is standard practice for every business that lends money in South Australia shall not apply to the State Government Insurance Commission. In other words, that office is to be under a disability that applies to no other commercial concern in this State.

Mr. Coumbe: I do not think that is what he meant.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is what the amendment provides. The honourable member is saying that, although the State may now designate a non-government insurance company, that situation should not obtain in the future.

Mr. Coumbe: Should it be obligatory?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At the moment the Government makes it obligatory for persons to insure with certain insurance offices. The point is that the person entering into a contract is not to be obliged to insure with the commission, although the Government may (and, indeed, does) now oblige him to insure with someone else. At present, if a person wants to obtain money from Government instrumentalities, he is obliged to insure with the designated insurance company. If the honourable member goes to any mortgaging interest in South Australia, or to anyone else who lends money, he will find that it will designate the insurance company with which the insurance is to be effected, yet that is not to apply to the State Government Insurance Commission!

Mr. Becker: They do not do that at my bank.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I can show the honourable member bank documents in which an insurance company is specifically designated. This has been done by both Government and commercial instrumentalities in this State.

Mr. McAnaney: I have never been asked to do it, and I have had enough of them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will not go into the honourable member's mortgages, but I can show him my own, in each of which I was obliged to insure with a specific insurance company, and it is standard commercial practice in South Australia that that be done. I see no reason why this limitation should be placed on the Government Insurance Commission in this State.

Mr. HALL: The Premier uses a most peculiar argument indeed. He has justified the introduction of this Bill by saying that private insurers have many faults; he has said that they do things that are restrictive and that they do not pay out as they ought to.

Mr. Langley: He says anything!

Mr. HALL: That's right.

Mr. Langley: You do.

Mr. HALL: For once the honourable member for Unley is correct.

Mr. Langley: You say anything. Don't try and twist me!

Mr. HALL: The amendments have been drawn up for reasons other than simply the broader ones the Premier uses. We on this side are deeply disturbed about the Minister of Roads and Transport, who now requires certain action to be taken by Government contractors before they get the job.

Mr. Jennings: What has that got to do with it?

Mr. HALL: If the honourable member listens he will find out, because this is the sort of thing we do not want to see applied to a Government commission. What would happen if the Minister of Roads and Transport had included on the end of contract forms a provision that, unless the owner of the machine involved insured with the commission, he would not get the job?

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That would not be done.

Mr. HALL: It is no good the Premier saying it would not be done, because the Minister of Roads and Transport has done it regarding compulsory unionism, and he has not publicly revoked that order in any way. I support the amendment, as it will prevent the practices to which I have referred.

Mr. CUMBE: I listened intently to what the Premier said about mortgages. I am perfectly aware of the obligation in relation to insurance companies. I am referring particularly to the phrase "shall not be obliged" that appears in the amendment. The Premier is erudite enough to know that what these words really mean is that no-one will be compelled to have insurance in relation to mortgages conducted by the Government Insurance Commission; people may or may not have this business done by the commission. One of the contentions of the Government in bringing forward this Bill was that the Government Insurance Commission would compete on an entirely equal basis with other insurance companies. Instead of paying a tax, a certain sum would be paid by the Government Insurance Commission to the Treasury in certain cases. The other place has carried an amendment that will mean that no company or person will be obliged to insure with the commission. People may insure with the commission if they wish to do so. As this amendment merely safeguards the principle that the Premier postulated in this regard, I suggest that it would be reasonable for the Premier to accept the amendment.

Amendment disagreed to.

Amendment No. 3:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

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

Amendment disagreed to.

Amendment No. 4:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

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

Mr. McANANEY: There is also an important principle involved in this case. A year or two ago I was in Queensland, where I learned that members of the Police Force had to collect insurance premiums, and I understand that it has been the practice there for some years. People there were upset about this compulsion. As the tendency among young people today is towards freedom to do what they like, I think that, in the interests of the people, we should support this amendment.

Amendment disagreed to.

Amendment No. 5:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

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

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Premier tell the Committee what is his specific objection to this amendment, which deals with insurance under the Workmen's Compensation Act? The amendment provides that a person who is obliged under the Workmen's Compensation Act to take out a policy may conduct this business with the commission or with any other insurance company. I am aware that in Queensland the Government office has a monopoly of insurance connected with the Workmen's Compensation Act: there is no choice whatever. Although I do not want to see that happen here, I am not sure what the Government wants. When this matter was debated in this place, members of the Government said that they wanted the commission established on the same basis as other companies were established. Why does the Premier object to this amendment which provides, in effect, that a person who is obliged to take out insurance under the Workmen's Compensation Act can take it out with any company, including the commission? In other words, the commission will be on equal footing with other companies.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What is happening here is that, instead of leaving the general provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act to apply to the State Government Insurance Commission as they apply to any other insurance business, a specific provision is proposed to be written in, stating:

The rights transferred and vested in the workman by virtue of section 13 (1) of the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1932, as amended, shall apply in respect of policies issued by the commission in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to and in respect of policies issued by other persons engaged in the business of insurance in the State.

What then derives is that we are confined to this provision of the Workmen's Compensation Act, and only in relation to rights transferred and vested in the workman but not to the rights transferred and vested in the commission. In other words, it is an extremely badly worded provision which, instead of leaving the law at large, will get us into trouble by the expression of one section of the Act being written in, impliedly excluding the rest.

Mr. Coumbe: The commission will handle the business under this Act.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, and the Workmen's Compensation Act will apply to it just as it applies to any other company, but this amendment would result in a very difficult situation in law. It is an extremely badly drafted provision; it is far better to leave the law at large under the Workmen's Compensation Act to apply to the commission.

Amendment disagreed to.

Amendments Nos. 6 and 7:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 6 and 7 be disagreed to.

Amendments disagreed to.

Amendment No. 8:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 8 be disagreed to.

Mr. COUMBE: In his opening remarks the Premier damned all the Legislative Council's amendments without dealing with them in much detail. It would greatly assist members if he would explain his specific objections to this amendment, which deals with advances made by the Treasurer.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The intention is that, where advances are made, they will be made at the long-term bond rate, but there may be special circumstances in which that should not apply. There may be cases where I have to make advances to other State instrumentalities at other than the long-term bond rate. That would be done very rarely, but there may be occasions when it is done. I say frankly that I see no reason why, since the commission may at times be depositing money with the Treasurer, we should not be able to provide it in certain circumstances with an advance in the short term at a rate lower than the long-term bond rate. While it will be rare, I still want the flexibility to be able to do that. The Under Treasurer has reported that this is desirable.

Amendment disagreed to.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the Legislative Council's amendments make the operations of the State Government Insurance Commission commercially impossible and impose conditions not applicable to any competing non-government insurance office.

BRANCH FROM SANDERGROVE TO MILANG RAILWAY (DISCONTINUANCE) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 23. Page 1617.)

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the Bill. Being conservative, I do not like to see something taken away that is at present in existence. However, we must not stand in the way of progress. A line must be closed when it becomes obsolete. Many other lines should be examined for the same reason. However, some lines should be modernized and developed so that they can give efficient service. However, where alternative means of transport are cheaper, quicker, and more efficient, a railway line may need to be closed. In the vicinity of the line from Sandergrove to Milang there is an area of mallee and other species of trees that will greatly benefit our reserves. When the land is disposed of, I hope the Minister of Lands will see that some of it is retained for the future benefit of South Australians. I support the Bill, because it is desirable that the line be closed. Its closing will not deprive anyone of any convenience.

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ADULT FRANCHISE)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 23. Page 1623.)

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): In 1968 the following words were spoken:

It is to members on this side of the House and to the overwhelming majority of the people of this State a fundamental proposition of democracy that every citizen in the State should have an equal and effective say with every other citizen in what the law in the State should be.

Those words were spoken by the present Premier in support of a previous Bill along lines similar to those in the Bill that I now rise to support. I wish to support this Bill. As the Attorney-General stated in his explanation, the Bill sets out to make the franchise of the Legislative Council the same as that for the Lower House in this State. In accordance with our election policy, we seek to introduce democracy to the denizens of that murky mausoleum just down the corridor. Sir, that place is referred to as the Upper House! Let

those self-dedicated divine righters who inhabit that Upper House act in an upright way for a change and not interfere with, block, or in any other way hamper the passage of the Government's Bill.

Sir, some of the divine righters are more divine than their fellows. Of course, their Leader there (not the Government Leader) claims, I understand, to have this talent, above all. I remember a recent newspaper report in which he blandly mentioned "the permanent will of the people" as being justification for interfering with legislation from the Lower House. He did not explain how he and his cronies get their sensing of this permanent will of the people, but I suspect that he means the will of that minority he represents, not the will of the majority.

Members interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: I am receiving several interjections but, in accordance with previous rulings you have given, Mr. Speaker, I shall try to continue with my speech. Several members have spoken before me in this debate and I wish to comment on some of their speeches. First, we had the Leader, who spoke on September 2, if I remember correctly. He said:

Nothing is more irksome to a Labor Party Government in South Australia than to have its legislation proceed through a House of Review.

Well, he was wrong there, as usual. What irks us more is the way that lordly body he has mentioned is obstructing the wishes of the majority of the people, and the wishes of the majority of the electors of this State, if anyone cares to recall May 30, which is not so long ago. The Leader would know that I am right here, because members of the Upper House have been known to obstruct Liberal Governments, too, even if those Governments had not been elected by a majority of the people at that time. There were times when Sir Thomas Playford had to crack the whip really hard, as in the case of the Bill dealing with the Electricity Trust. Of course, that type of whip cracking will not occur in connection with this Bill, because the Liberal and Country League now has two Leaders or three Leaders (or, one and a half Leaders and a wishful thinker). I am not sure what is the position about that Party's Leaders: that depends on which newspaper one reads. The Leader, in his speech on this Bill, also said:

One problem of this House (and I speak generally of the House and not of a divided opinion) in presenting reforms to the Legislative Council based on Labor Party thought is

that the Council is naturally suspicious that the Government or the Labor Party is aiming to achieve its abolition.

I believe that, when the Leader said that, he gave the game away, really. The Council is supposed to exist to do the best that it can for the people but, of course, members of the Council are there to do the best they can for themselves.

Mr. Becker: They do the best, by being there.

Mr. PAYNE: That is what the honourable member says.

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. PAYNE: As far as members of the Legislative Council are concerned, the Parliament does not exist for the people: the people exist for the Parliament. However, those members will never realize that that attitude is wrong. The remainder of the Leader's remarks were a build-up for the threatened big chop the Bill will get. He said, "You will get the big chop in this Bill if you do not mend your ways." He told us that we must change our attitude and crawl a bit to the Upper House, and that then we may get on. He said that we must not upset members of the Council, otherwise they will give us the stick. The Leader advises us to compromise with the Legislative Council members and not to bother about what the people want. He says, "Let us do what the Council wants." That is the cry that he always puts up. He says, "Let us have voluntary voting, voluntary enrolment and, just in case that is still not placatory enough to the Upper House, let us vote on Friday afternoon or on Shrove Tuesday, but never on the same Saturday as that on which an election is held for the Lower House."

Members upstairs are getting very windy and really want to make sure of their position. These people claim that they are against Government insurance Bills. We have just listened to a debate dealing with that matter. If the Leader and the Hon. Mr. DeGaris had their way, they would turn this Bill into a real Legislative Council Insurance Bill, one that would guarantee that they could never lose. However, they will not get away with it this time. The people are awake-up. They have given us a majority to do what is right in this case, and we intend to do that. Although the reason that the L.C.L. is afraid to offer the full adult franchise for the Upper House has been stated previously, it needs to be spelt out again. This is the essence of this matter. Why are

they so afraid of everyone over 21 years of age having a vote for the Legislative Council?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: They want class distinction.

Mr. PAYNE: Yes, and they know that they would lose it in this area. Our Party is not trying to impose limits or to rig the set-up at all. We say, "Let everyone have his democratic right in this matter." We are confident of the choice of the people and no amount of blaring or boloney will hide this fundamental fact.

Mr. Gunn: Do you believe in—

Mr. PAYNE: I believe in one House. That will clear out any cobwebs. Apparently, the honourable member has not heard about how we feel.

Mr. Gunn: Who wrote your speech?

Mr. PAYNE: I wrote the speech. I do not have to get instructions from headquarters as members opposite have to.

Mr. Rodda: Tell us about that high grass.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PAYNE: This is the way members opposite operate. When they are in trouble, they dodge the issue, instead of facing it. That is the way they act. Back in 1857, they had stiffbacks, too, as they have still got them. They are sitting on the other side of the House. In that year, the stiffbacks knew that they were in the minority but wanted to ensure that they would rule the majority. They set up the Legislative Council in about 1857. We know how well they have succeeded until now, but today the people are crying "Enough", and we are listening to them, even if the L.C.L. is not. I repeat that the L.C.L. members are afraid to let all the people have a say in this matter, because if they do, they will be done like a dinner, just as they were on May 30 last.

Mr. Venning: What about trying your luck again now?

Mr. PAYNE: I will get around to the honourable member, let him have no worry. The member for Playford pointed out earlier that the Leader begged us not to be inflammatory towards the Council when dealing with that place, otherwise we might upset the members of it. That honourable member said that we in the Labor Party will go on upsetting them and he had good reason for saying that, because as long as members of the Council obstruct the will of the people, we will upset them. The honourable member for Playford showed how a basic, elementary

right had been denied the people of this State for a long time, and it must not continue any longer.

Mr. Simmons: It's been too long.

Mr. PAYNE: Too long is right. In 1964, my mother died at the age of 59 years, and during the whole of her 59 years she had never received a vote in this State for the Legislative Council. That is not right and, no matter how often members opposite say that it is right, they will never justify this situation.

Mr. Simmons: It's a disgrace.

Mr. PAYNE: Yes. During my mother's adult life, the Legislative Council was functioning, making laws and helping to create the conditions under which she lived but in which she had no say whatsoever. Try to answer that statement at some time! Where is the funny guy on the other side now? Where is the justice in such a state of affairs? The voices of the dead as well as those of the living would reproach the Liberal and Country League in this regard. The L.C.L. has buccaneered its way through the franchise all these years, and it is time to stop it. The member for Playford further described the situation as a trap, and I agree that it is. It is like a game of pontoon and, when the L.C.L. is dealing, it does not even pay all the 21's.

Mr. Clark: It likes to have the joker running wild, too.

Mr. PAYNE: It pays only the ones it wants to pay. I turn now to the remarks of the member for Mitcham. I am glad to see that he is in the House, and I should like him to listen. Since I have been in the House, I think he has made some speeches that have contained a grain of common sense, and I think I might be able to get something over to him in this matter. The member for Mitcham said that he regarded this Bill as of fundamental importance, and I could not agree more; that is certainly the way that my Party sees this Bill. The member for Mitcham then went on for a few hundred words in this vein, and for a while I thought I was listening to a Labor bloke; I thought, "Something has gone wrong here." The honourable member talked about liberty, equality and fraternity, and then he suddenly realized where he was. While he thought out what he was going to say about the matter, he gave us a reasonably educated dissertation about the two-House system and the one-House system, and we went on a little Fitzpatrick tour to places around the world, including Canada.

He then said that the proof concerning the theory that two Houses were better than one was that South Australia had always had it this way and that the two-House system must therefore be the better one. However, it was about then that the member for Mitcham realized that he was boxing himself in with that Labor stuff he was talking about, referring to equality, fraternity, and so on. Having said that our two Houses had virtually equal powers (and members can read this in *Hansard*), the honourable member said that there was no justification for a restricted franchise. He said that quite calmly and in beautiful English and flawless prose. However, he then started to get frantic, for he realized, of course, that this was dangerous territory, and he said that we needed to make the franchises different: the other things may be equal, but we have to make the franchises different! All the other things weigh pretty well on the scales, but we must have a bit of a difference here! I say that the two Houses are about equal in power; the people of this State are the same in regard to voting in both cases; and there is no justification for restricting the franchise.

Apparently, although all the people of the State have to live under the laws that result from the present system, we are to look for ways of making a difference. That is terribly logical when we think about it, I don't think! Of course, the way is perfectly straightforward as suggested at the time by the Attorney-General and the member for Elizabeth, namely, that half the members in the Upper House would retire at the one time, and different boundaries could apply (no-one said they did apply, but I think the member for Elizabeth said that they could). However, that just would not give the difference that the member for Mitcham wants. The difference he wants relates to the old cast-iron guarantee of not losing, and his Party already has that guarantee under the existing set-up.

Mr. Clark: It was the member for Playford, not I; although I would not have minded saying it, I don't want to take the credit for it.

Mr. PAYNE: I am only too pleased to transfer the credit to my colleague the member for Playford. The member for Mitcham wanted to be sure that he got the cast-iron guarantee, so out came the old bag of tricks. I will not repeat what he said. We realize that there are various ways of stopping people

from doing what they want to do. However, the electors are not as dumb as members opposite apparently think they are. Our Party states that it wants all adults to vote for the Upper House. We want all adults who are citizens and who live under its jurisdiction to vote for the Upper House. We want no other strings attached to it and no "ifs" and "maybes". What the L.C.L. wants has more strings attached to it than has a 10-string banjo. It says that everyone can have a vote on this matter, but they can have a vote if they find the time to enrol, if they are not at work during voting hours, if they are enrolled on a different roll, and if they are not voting for the two Houses on the same day. It is patently clear that the L.C.L. proposal is phoney.

Mr. Gunn: Do you—

Mr. PAYNE: The member for "hot air" is due to receive his initiation. The member for Mitcham concluded his remarks by saying piously, "And, heaven knows, our Parliamentary institutions need enhancement in the eyes of the public at present," and I agree with him at last. I contend that this sort of "shonky" L.C.L. deal would lower Parliament in the eyes of the people of this State for many a day. The next member to speak from the Opposition was the member for Alexandra, who is still hanging on to the No. 3 henchman position, as far as I can see, although I think there is a challenge in the offing (I refer, of course, to the member for Kavel who, I think, is a McLeay disciple, because he picks up old leaflets and quotes from them).

Mr. Goldsworthy: It wouldn't hurt you to read a bit more!

Mr. PAYNE: What I have in front of me came out of my heart, and that is more than an L.C.L. member can say.

Mr. Goldsworthy: I haven't even spoken on this Bill. What's got into you?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell.

Mr. PAYNE: I gather from that remark that we might be entertained (I think that would be the correct word) at a later stage with some remarks from the member for Kavel, and I look forward to that. The member for Alexandra confided in us that he did not like the Bill. He did not like the Government's attitude, either, to the Upper House in particular. May I confide in him that we do not like the Upper House's attitude to the Lower House, and we do not mind who knows it. The honourable member went on to say:

No harm is ever done by our having a second look at legislation.

I wonder whether Sir Thomas would agree with him. He wanted, and still wants, to build the Chowilla dam, but members opposite had a second look and would have given the whole thing away. So much for that sort of observation. Anyway, his theme was that the *status quo* (this is the member for Alexandra and, having listened to him, members will understand that I am being fair to him) was important and needed due weighting in order to ensure that progress and reform did not race away. Fair enough, maybe, but I reckon that 100 years of *status quo* is long enough for anyone. The trouble with *status quo* is that the same people always seem to have the *status* whilst everyone else has to stand in a *quo*.

The member for Alexandra then began apologizing for the L.C.L. members in the Upper House, as well he might. Apparently, they are a rather stand-offish lot, according to him, because, although they are in the same Party, they never meet together with Lower House members. I presume they do not even have lunch together because, according to him, they never have occasion to speak together. I have never bothered to check that statement, but I can only assume they are peculiar and stand-offish, as the honourable member implies.

Mr. Hopgood: It makes one wonder just how they get preselection.

Mr. PAYNE: Yes. The member for Alexandra also said, "It is not true to say that we act in unison as a Party." I suppose this is why their conferences are always closed to outsiders: any visitor might be upset by the bickering and arguing that goes on. It is difficult to find out what goes on in Liberal conferences, but one can go into an A.L.P. conference at any time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell is entitled to be heard without so many interjections.

Mr. PAYNE: The member for Alexandra was at least dinkum up to a point, and we must give him credit for that. That is one of the things that I look for: if a person is fair dinkum, that counts for much. The member for Alexandra is obviously against adult suffrage for the Upper House, and at least he had the guts to say so. He is reported in *Hansard* as saying that. The member for Eyre then bleated his way on to the scene. After saying that he thoroughly endorsed the remarks of the member

for Alexandra, he said that, at the risk of being called a Conservative, he opposed the Bill. There was no risk, really. I would not call him a Conservative—perhaps a sycophant or a camp follower, but not a Conservative. Later, in his “composition”, he said that we were blaming the Commonwealth Government all the time. He was referring to another matter, but I wonder how he feels now that Sir Henry Bolte blames the Commonwealth Government over another matter. Sir Henry beat the big drum and won out just as we did. Maybe the Commonwealth Government is wrong sometimes, even though it is a Liberal Government. The excerpt I have given was practically the whole of the speech of the member for Eyre.

We were then treated to a speech by the member for Torrens. Anyone who takes the trouble to read in *Hansard* what the member for Torrens said in 1968 will find that his recent remarks are consistent with his previously stated attitude, and I give him credit for that. He thought it was now time to let the disfranchised get on to the roll. I wonder whether losing on May 30 speeded up that thinking. However, on the compulsory clause, the honourable member was a little stronger. He said, “I believe there should be no compulsion in Legislative Council voting.” He said that quite blandly. As every member here knows, this was a statement from a member who was elected by a compulsory vote, as we all were. This is from a member whose Party line is compulsory military service and, if necessary, compulsory death in Vietnam. Fair go, Mr. Speaker! A bloke called Ross has just got two years for believing that there should be no compulsion to go to war, under a law made by a Party elected by compulsory voting.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, compulsion to go to war has nothing to do with the matter before the House.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr. PAYNE: In answer to that, Mr. Speaker, I have made a fair sort of reading of the debate as reported in *Hansard*, and I am sure you will agree, Mr. Speaker, that the debate has ranged far and wide. It is time this compulsory angle, about which members opposite are always talking, was at least kept in perspective. The member for Mawson showed clearly how L.C.L. Governments, whatever name they wore, had introduced and supported compulsory voting, as well they might. It

is the only sensible way to get a truly representative result. What of compulsory voting, anyway?

Mr. Gunn: Don't you agree—

Mr. PAYNE: Mr. Speaker, there's the member for Eyre braying again. One of the things I learned when I was about 12 years of age was that, if I did not know anything, I should shut up about it.

Mr. Venning: Then sit down!

Mr. PAYNE: That is why I am still on my feet. Before I was interrupted, I was developing my theme about compulsion. It is time it was put into perspective. Is it not compulsory to register births and deaths in this country? Is it not compulsory to register a motor vehicle before we take it on the road? Is it not compulsory to send our children to school and to notify infectious diseases? I could go on all day pointing out how much in ordinary everyday life compulsion plays a part for the good of the community. The point of this, as I am trying to show in my humble way, is that all these things are compulsory for the common good, and so is compulsory voting. As I have said, plenty of L.C.L. Governments agree on this point in relation to voting.

I want to conclude on this note: I read from earlier *Hansards* the remarks of members on both sides about this franchise issue. I can only say how remarkable it is that, although many members opposite commence their speeches as though they support adult franchise, they always end up with a series of “buts” and “ifs” and strings that completely negate what they pretended to support. This is a prime example of the latest “kick” of theirs which relates to having elections for the different Houses on different days. As I can find no reference to this in the previous debate on this matter, it appears to be the latest L.C.L. lurk. This is part of its efforts to trap the vote and to keep happy the old brigade in its castle upstairs. I believe I have shown the hypocrisy and chicanery of the L.C.L. stand on this issue over the years. Even the Hundred Years War finally ended: we must give all the people of the State their proper democratic rights. I support the Bill.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I thank the member for Mitchell for an interesting summary of the speeches made by previous speakers in this debate. I am not sure whether the series of interjections that the honourable member strung together can properly be called a speech: it seemed to me that

his remarks comprised all the interjections and things that he might have said if he had only thought of them at the time. He was alternatively smirking, disarming and (I think on one occasion) humble. However, he did display some arrogance in assuming that the Labor Party had the sole prerogative in regard to liberty, equality and fraternity: that is far from the case. I give qualified support to some aspects of the Bill. It will not please the member for Mitchell (although perhaps it will please him, because it will prove that what he says is correct) to hear that I support full adult franchise for the Upper House—

Mr. Clark: But!

Dr. TONKIN: —but (in capital letters) I do not support compulsion, and I will not support the compulsion inherent in the Bill. I will deal with the matter of full adult franchise as far as that goes, although I do not have to go far, because I believe it is only right that the 15 per cent or so voters who now do not have a vote for the Upper House should have that vote. In this connection I refer specifically to trained nurses in nursing homes, to teachers and academics in universities, colleges and schools—

Mr. McAnaney: Fair go!

Dr. TONKIN: This is a problem, but I believe that most thinking teachers and academics support free enterprise and Liberalism. In referring specifically to those who should have the vote for the Upper House, I refer also to members of religious orders and others. The people to whom I have referred are eminently qualified to vote for the Upper House and should have that right. Without reading them in *Hansard*, I will say that the statements about compulsion quoted by the member for Mitchell beg the question: they were not really pertinent to this question of compulsion. This is a delightful red herring, which gets somewhere near the mark but which is really not relevant. I cannot support compulsion, and, if it is, as stated, the intention to introduce, by this legislation, compulsory enrolment and voting for the Upper House, I must oppose the Bill. As we have seen expressed forcibly in the last few weeks, compulsion is only to be expected from a Socialist Government. We have seen compulsory unionism advocated as a thinly disguised ultimatum; it has even been said that there is nothing compulsory about an ultimatum.

Mr. Langley: What about the British Medical Association?

Dr. TONKIN: I assume the honourable member is referring to the Australian Medical

Association: membership of that body is not compulsory. We have seen compulsory unionism, and soon we will have compulsory democracy. Frankly, I cannot explain this contradiction in terms. Is it possible to have people exercising their free choice under threat and compulsion and by ultimatum? I do not believe it is. As I favour voluntary voting for both Houses, I am pleased to hear of the amendments foreshadowed by the Leader. As members may know, compulsory voting applies in only a few countries: Argentina, Belgium, Ecuador, Greece, Guatemala, Italy, Peru, Spain, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, and Australia (except for New South Wales).

Mr. Hopgood: That's a fair old list.

Dr. TONKIN: I wonder whether the honourable member knows how many countries there are in the world—how many flags fly outside the United Nations building.

Mr. Hopgood: It's a significant list.

Dr. TONKIN: It is a significant proportion, but it is a small proportion of the total number. Electoral systems should be established on the basis of the natural rights of the individual. Although members of the Labor Party do not always agree to this, the individual is regarded as an independent, self-sufficient and free entity with interests and relationships created by his private activity unaided and unimpeded by the State. The State is periodically created, dissolved and recreated by the people. It is only when the State takes precedence of the individual that compulsion is introduced.

Mr. Hopgood: As in the National Service Act.

Dr. TONKIN: Certainly, voting records in democratic countries where voting is compulsory are higher than where it is not compulsory; polls of up to 90 per cent and even more are common. However, democracy is not dependent on total vote participation. We have only to consider the totalitarian elections, where 99 per cent of the people turn up to vote for one-Party candidates, to see that this is merely an exercise in contempt of the democratic process. Suffrage is a right, and a voter should be free to exercise or not exercise his vote as he wishes. This depends on his conscience, after he has given due consideration to the issue. I now wish to quote the following part of an article by J. E. Llewellyn, which appeared in *Dissent* in 1964, and which seems to sum up this matter well:

But, to return to the crucial question, is it one of a man's moral obligations to exercise the right to vote? Is he not morally obliged rather to exercise that right thoughtfully? In

neither case would it follow that the moral obligation required a legal obligation to underpin it. Or undermine it: for to make non-voting a punishable offence is to show poor understanding of the voter's temperament. The recent studies in the extent of the donkey vote, particularly in the more complex election like the Senate, is surely evidence enough. These laws drain away an unnecessary amount of money to administer the recording of non-voters, the despatch to each of them of a request to explain why he apparently did not vote; an invitation to pay the fine that the electoral officer may impose if he does not accept the explanation, and a summons if this invitation is declined. Further, and more importantly it is evident that our representatives in Parliament, whether they belong to the Government Party or not, are impressed by the usefulness of these laws in getting in the vote with a relatively small expenditure of energy and Party funds; they are persuaded that it suits their more sinister interests not to remove this morbid appendix from the body politic. Hence still more public money would be tapped off by anyone who consequently felt that refusal to pay the fine for non-voting exacted by a court of summary jurisdiction was one of the few means left open by which he could try to prevent compulsory voting from remaining part of "the settled policy of the country." In short, these laws are bad morals, bad logic, bad psychology and bad economics.

I suggest (and others have suggested this much more eloquently than I can) that the real goal of democracy is to ensure access to the poll; we must ensure that it is easy for people to get to the poll and easy for them to enrol, rather than compel people to attend the poll. Perhaps the basic answer to compulsory voting is adequate education of the people, particularly young people, in the duties of citizenship and in their civic rights. I said earlier that one of the aims of this legislation was to introduce compulsion. As a result of the comments of Government members, we have been left in no doubt about another aim, although it is not spelt out in the Bill; that aim is to introduce compulsion—to move one step further towards abolishing the Upper House.

Mr. Keneally: The people will decide that.

Dr. TONKIN: Possibly, if they are given the chance. Nevertheless, I do not think that anything that threatens the existence of the Upper House can be supported. Although there has been some uncertainty in the past about the advocacy of full adult franchise leading to abolition of the Upper House and some confusion in the minds of some people (possibly when they want to see confusion there) I believe that the abolition of the Upper House would follow the introduction of full adult franchise for the Upper House. This is ample reason why the Upper House is very wary

and careful. I firmly believe in the bicameral system, and I think the member for Alexandra has ably expressed the views I hold in favour of this system.

A second House takes a second look at legislation, and there is nothing wrong in this. A second House provides a breathing space, and there is nothing wrong in this. A second House provides a very good check (the member for Mitchell did not mention this) on irresponsible legislation emanating from the Lower House. Upper House members are at present extremely uneasy about these proposed changes emanating from this House, and that is understandable. The Labor Party has openly stated many times that it intends to abolish the Upper House and, if the Upper House believes this is one step in that direction, it has every right to be uneasy. It provides a sure safeguard for the rights of the people of South Australia, and I think the people know this. It is quite understandable that the Upper House should be uneasy about the Labor Party's motives.

What has any Government to fear from a House of Review if its legislation is fair, reasonable, and for the good of the people? Why does the Labor Party wish to abolish the Upper House? What future legislation does the Government have in mind that it is unwilling to expose to the review of the Upper House? What is the Government afraid of? What items of proposed legislation does it have stored up to be introduced and perhaps imposed on the people if it finally succeeds in its expressed aim of abolishing the Upper House? If this is not the reason, I should like to hear a reasonable explanation of the Labor Party's avowed aim.

The main aim of the Government in introducing this Bill may be to enfranchise those members of the community who do not have a vote for the Upper House at present, but such members of the community are few now because, during the last Parliament, steps were taken to widen the franchise. If the Government is sincere, it will take steps to reframe the legislation so that it will be in a form that will allay the fears of the Upper House. If its major aim, however, is to introduce compulsory democracy with the overall aim of abolishing the Upper House, by linking this as a take-it-or-leave-it condition with the proposal for adult franchise, it does not deserve nor will it receive any support. I favour adult franchise for the Upper House, but I oppose compulsory voting both for this House and for the Upper House, and I oppose compulsory

enrolment, particularly if it is for the sole purpose (as admitted by Government members) of moving towards the abolition of the Upper House. A common roll and a common polling day will defeat the true spirit of voluntary voting (as long as compulsory voting continues to apply for the Lower House). I favour separate rolls and separate polling days for the Legislative Council. In spite of my strong desire for full adult franchise for the Upper House, I cannot support this Bill in its present form. I intend to support the amendments foreshadowed by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. CLARK (Elizabeth): I support the Bill. The trend of the debate from the other side seems to hinge on what I may call conditional democracy. I have never heard of this before. We heard about it from the member for Bragg. To be honest, I was surprised at the honourable member's speech. Because I have heard some impressive remarks from him on several occasions in the short time he has been here, I expected something more in accordance with the ability he has shown. I admit that it is difficult for Opposition members to speak about this matter.

Mr. Venning: Not at all.

Mr. CLARK: The honourable member who has just interjected finds it difficult to speak about anything. I am only too pleased to give him the opportunity to speak and I will sit here and listen to him, if not with bated breath at least with the attention that he deserves. We have heard much about conditional democracy—members have called it various names of their own. In the early part of his speech the member for Mitcham gave the best speech he has given in this place for a long time, but he suddenly fell from grace and revealed what he was working towards all along. Despite what members opposite have said, there is nothing in this Bill about compulsory voting. I defy them to find it and reveal it to the House and the public. Quite rightly, there is compulsory voting for the House of Assembly.

Mr. Rodda: This is a first step.

Mr. CLARK: There is compulsory voting for the House of Representatives and for the Senate, and I suggest that the votes given for those Houses would be worthless unless voting was compulsory.

Mr. Gunn: What about the United Kingdom?

Mr. CLARK: The United Kingdom will need only a few weeks in order to discover its mistake. In fact, from what I have read in letters and from what I have heard from

a delegate to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association conference, I believe that already the unfortunate result of the general election in the United Kingdom—

Mr. Mathwin: Are you speaking about Harold Wilson?

Mr. CLARK: The honourable member should know better, because I think he still has some ties with the United Kingdom. Already people in the United Kingdom are regretting what happened in the general election, and they will soon regret it even more. If the United Kingdom had had compulsory voting, the result would have been very different.

The Hon. L. J. King: A snowstorm can decide a general election over there.

Mr. CLARK: I do not believe the weather should decide the result of an election. People should be going out to vote because it is a right, duty and privilege that has been fought for over the years and dearly won.

Mr. Coumbe: They should vote whether they like it or whether they don't!

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order!

Mr. CLARK: It is significant that one member opposite has suggested that the vote given to 18-year-olds could have had something to do with the result. If the honourable member looks at the number who voted in the recent general election in the United Kingdom, he will find that, even with the large number given the franchise at that election because they had reached the age of 18 years, the total number of votes was one of the lowest cast for recent elections. Do not let it be thought that I am criticizing the idea of giving the vote to those who are 18 years of age: I consider that they should have the vote. However, the election result in the United Kingdom means something, and I repeat that the United Kingdom will have regrets.

I remember what happened only a few years ago when a delegation connected with the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association came to Australia. They came here not to attend a conference but because the mother of Parliaments was generous enough (and I applaud the idea) to send people to British Commonwealth countries to see what was going on and what could be learnt. They came about 18 months after Harold Wilson, whose name was slurred at me across the House a few minutes ago, had come to power, and one gentleman with whom I travelled on a couple of tours that we provided for the party told

me that the Conservatives thanked God that they were out of Government and had left the job to Harold Wilson.

Mr. Mathwin: Which side did he come from?

Mr. CLARK: This man came from the Conservative side. If the honourable member would like me to tell him the man's name, I shall do so privately, but I do not think it would be fair to bandy the name about here. However, I do not think mentioning that does any harm. In fact, it could do good, because at that time the Conservatives realized that they had managed to get the United Kingdom into such an appalling mess that they were only too pleased to let Mr. Harold Wilson get the country out of that mess. If I may say so, he proceeded to do that, even though he did not always receive the support that he might have got from those who should have been giving it. I am in a particularly generous and willing mood this afternoon and, if the member for Alexandra wants to ask me a question (and I can see that he wants to do so), for once I shall be pleased to reply to him.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Questions are out of order now.

Mr. CLARK: I regret that, because I am sure the reply that I could have given to the honourable member would be to his benefit and possibly would be of some value to the thinking members on both sides of the House. I think the fact that the United Kingdom has been mentioned as the place where voting is not compulsory is really an argument for what we are trying to do in this Bill. However, it is not a completely parallel argument, because in this Bill we are not advocating or attempting to introduce compulsory voting.

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

Mr. CLARK: This afternoon, one of the Opposition members offered a criticism of the speech made by the member for Mitchell, whose speech I frankly thought was a good one, for it had the supreme virtue in this place of keeping us interested and of making the points that the honourable member obviously intended to make. The member for Mitchell was accused of making his speech mainly from quotations of speeches made by members on the other side, and if this was a fault on the part of the member for Mitchell it could well be applied to my remarks, because I intend to adopt a similar approach and to try to show just how artificially contrived and basically silly is the Opposition's

idea of conditional democracy and of complete franchise for the Upper House as long as it is a rigidly controlled franchise.

It is now some weeks since the Attorney-General explained the Bill, and, while some members may have forgotten what he said, some of them, quite frankly, have missed the true import of his remarks. It seems to me that some members of the Opposition have rather got themselves confused in the maze regarding the idea of compulsory voting and of abolishing the Legislative Council, nothing of which is referred to in this Bill.

Mr. Rodda: You don't believe in abolishing the Legislative Council?

Mr. CLARK: If I should not be out of order, as I know I should be on this issue, I should be happy to reply to the member for Victoria. However, although I have noticed that some members opposite have managed to sneak under your guard, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if I started to elaborate on my belief that the Legislative Council ought to be abolished you would call me to order, and rightly so. Anyhow, I have no intention of speaking on that matter in this debate because, after all, we are definitely not discussing it in this Bill. I think it was during the last session that, with the agreement of both sides, we made it virtually impossible in South Australia to abolish the Legislative Council. It would therefore be idle for me to pursue that argument and I should be out of order in doing so. The Attorney-General said:

It is desirable to amend the Constitution Act so as to entitle all House of Assembly electors to vote at Legislative Council elections.

That is virtually all this Bill provides. The Attorney-General went on to say that the Government considered property qualifications to be artificial and outmoded as conditions attaching to any franchise, and I am happy to say that several Opposition members have agreed with him in that respect. I admit that they have agreed with strings attached, but I think that, after my experiences in this Chamber over about the last 17 years, getting them to agree to it at all is something. The Attorney-General went on to say:

As the years have passed, the emphasis has shifted from property to persons.

I believe the emphasis should always have been on persons, not on property. He added:

It is remarkable that we still have a franchise for one of the Houses of Parliament of this State that is restricted to persons who qualify in one way or another in relation to property (that is, whether they be owners or occupants

of property, or the spouses of the owners or occupiers of property) and to those who qualify as servicemen and ex-servicemen.

The Attorney-General, with some optimism (on which I congratulate him), later said:

I look forward . . . to a degree of unanimity in this House, for I find it difficult to believe that any member of this House who professes the democratic faith, which is at the very basis of the society in which we live, could possibly support the continuance of a restricted and privileged franchise that has the effect of giving one section of citizens of the State political privileges that the rest do not enjoy.

In brief, that may be regarded as a précis of the tone and spirit of the speech made by the Attorney-General when he explained this Bill. I agree with his remarks: in fact, I applaud his sentiments, but I am still afraid, judging by the remarks that have been made since his speech (and I have had the opportunity and, I may say, the privilege of hearing all or most of the speeches made on this matter, a privilege which, of course, the Attorney-General did not have) that he was looking forward to the future of this Bill with some optimism; and I have not yet lost hope about it, either.

I should like to examine some of the reactions of the Opposition speakers to this Bill. There is not much point in examining the remarks made by my own colleagues because, in the main, I agree with them. If I do not agree with everything they have said, I do agree with the end result of the remarks made by them in support of this measure. Let me first examine, briefly, some of the remarks made by the Leader of the Opposition when he followed the Attorney-General in this debate. As I remember it, he began with a diatribe on Labor's plans to abolish the Legislative Council. That subject is not in the Bill and, therefore, unlike the Leader of the Opposition, I do not intend to talk about it, because I like to keep my remarks in order and am always reluctant to have to be pulled up by you, Mr. Speaker.

The Leader of the Opposition then went on to talk about the Midland by-election. Again, this is not in the Bill so I shall not talk about that, either, for I do not think I am allowed to. The Leader then went on for a considerable time talking about voting with a cross instead of numbers, and then for a few minutes he progressed to the Vietnam war. I shall not talk about those things, either, because they are not in the Bill, and I would be pulled up if I mentioned them.

The Hon. L. J. King: And it's such a good Bill I don't know why they won't talk about it.

Mr. CLARK: In fact, the Attorney-General is, as usual, 100 per cent right: this is a very good Bill and it is obvious that the reluctance to talk about it arises from one of two things: either members opposite do not understand or have not read the Bill or they have not studied it very much and are trying to side-track the issue. Then the Leader of the Opposition started to get a little closer to the Bill when he spoke for a while on the differences of opinion in his Party with regard to the Legislative Council. In fact, when he said that, I sat up in my seat because it appeared that we were going to get at least something of this new image about which we have heard a little. Unfortunately, the Leader drew away, returning to dealing with the abolition of the Legislative Council, which we were not discussing and which it is not in order to discuss.

At last the Leader got to the three points he intended to make. First, he made a strong point that voting for the Legislative Council must not be compulsory (this has not been stipulated in the Bill, anyhow). Then he said that enrolment must not be compulsory; even if people were given the right to have their names on the Legislative Council roll, he said that this must not be compulsory, and that there must be separate rolls for the two Houses. The third point he made rather surprised me because, frankly, I had not expected it. He spoke about elections for the Council and the Assembly being held on separate days. Over the years I have noticed that the Leader has a peculiar sense of humour. Although this was not so obvious in that all too long period when he was Premier, since he has again been Leader of the Opposition I have noticed that he has a most peculiar sense of humour. When he suggested that Assembly and Council elections should be held on separate days, at first I thought he was trying to be funny. I have talked about this suggestion to many people outside. Although I may know the politics of one or two of those people, I have no idea of the politics of the others, and these people believe the Leader's suggestion to be absurd. Therefore, perhaps I should not be blamed for thinking that this was the Leader's idea of an odd sort of joke.

The Leader was followed by the member for Mitcham who, when he wants to, can make

a good speech, providing food for thought. I waited with bated breath to hear what he would say. I was probably lulled into a wrong attitude in the matter by thinking that the Leader was trying to be funny. I thought that possibly his idea of humour was to try to denigrate the Government's argument by the profundity of his wit, although I did not think he was very funny. Therefore, I listened closely to what the member for Mitcham said. The first part of his speech was possibly better than anything else he has said in this House for a long time. He began by saying that he regarded the Bill as of fundamental importance. So do I, and when the member for Mitcham and I start agreeing I think that there is every likelihood that one of us is right. I was possibly more interested than usual in what the honourable member was saying because I agreed with him.

Then the honourable member said (and I hope that when I quote what Opposition members have said in this debate I will not attach to their speeches more importance than they deserve: I use these quotations only to make some point about what they said):

The only object of this Bill, as I see it, is to allow all voters on the House of Assembly roll to enrol for the Legislative Council. The importance of achieving this reform is, as I have said, fundamental.

There again, to put it colloquially, I could not agree more with the honourable member. I started to think his speech was getting better and better, as indeed it was—up to that point. He continued:

There is no justification in principle, in my view, for any restriction on the franchise for either House.

Nothing could be better than that. It was obvious to me at this stage that the Deputy Leader believed that his Leader's speech was a joke in bad taste and that he was going to be independent and show he supported the Government's Bill. In fact, his remarks could have been made by our own Attorney-General from this side, although probably the Attorney-General would have made them in a better manner. At this stage it appeared to me that he was snubbing his Leader for his ill-timed jokes. Then, suddenly, the honourable member decided he had gone far enough and let me, in particular, know that I was dead wrong once more about him. He proceeded to give his conditions for allowing this fundamental removal of all restrictions on the franchise for the Legislative Council. His very illuminating conditions were as follows:

The franchise for the Houses must have a difference without restricting the franchise.

I ask members to analyse that. How can one give a complete franchise and have a difference without restricting the franchise? The honourable member's method was to have separate rolls for the two Houses and, in passing, he said that this could result in additional expense but that he thought the expense would be well worth it; I do not know why, and he did not tell us.

He went on to give some sort of excuse for this by saying that, if the rolls were different, the franchise would be different. Previously, he had advocated that it was fundamental that the franchise should be the same for both Houses. Then finally he, too, wanted the voting for the Legislative Council on a different day from House of Assembly voting. Here again, he admitted that it might be a little more costly but the cost would be worth it. He did not get over this part of his speech very well. The speech that had started so well had fallen by the wayside. He told us very briefly that already there was a basic difference between the way the Assembly is set up and the way the Council is set up.

He had very little to say about the fact that the Upper House districts are very different from the Lower House districts. He did not bother to mention that only half of the Upper House members retire every three years, nor did he tell us that an election might be held at an untimely stage. The last election was untimely, but many people in South Australia thought it was most timely. I think the House will know what I mean: if an election is held at an unusual time, as was the last election, the other place is completely exempt from going to the people. This Bill does not provide that those things should be altered, no matter how much Government members may like to see that happen.

I hope the House realizes that I have not offered one word of criticism of the Upper House up to the present, but it would be easy to offer such criticism. However, we must remember that one must be at least 30 years of age to be entitled to take his seat in that House. The member for Mitcham, when he was first elected to this House (and I well remember the occasion), would not have been entitled to be a member of the Legislative Council at that time.

Mr. Venning: He didn't want to be.

Mr. CLARK: The honourable member might have been more at home in the Council. I understand that at one time he had ambitions

to be a member of the House of Representatives. However, this ambition was cut short by a gentleman who, since that time, has proved an adornment and a real asset to the House of Representatives.

Mr. Venning: He hasn't done any harm.

Mr. CLARK: That is debatable. Possibly, he is the only one that he is likely to have harmed, but that is his business. If he wants to denigrate himself in the eyes of the public, I have no argument about that. I am simply saying that the member for Mitcham, who came here with much ability, as he has shown at times since, could not have been elected to the Legislative Council when first elected to this House. I fancy that the present Premier also, when he came here, was not eligible to be elected to the Upper House. Further, the member for Enfield, who has been an adornment to this House for several years, would not have been eligible to be a member of the other place when he first came here.

Mr. Jennings: What about the member for Eyre?

Mr. CLARK: I do not know his age. He often acts as though he is younger than 30 years and it seems a shame that the honourable member, with such an attractive personality and the makings of a statesman who will not be dumped by his Party after only two years, is deprived of the right to go to another place and give it the benefit of his wisdom.

Mr. Rodda: You're getting to the bottom of the barrel now.

Mr. CLARK: The honourable member is in error, because I have not said anything that is even more than vaguely impolite. Indeed, in some cases the bottom of the barrel is the sweetest part of it. The matters that I have referred to constitute a difference of opinion and of feeling between the two Houses, without having to decide to have voting on different days. Mr. Speaker, have you ever heard anything so intrinsically silly as that suggestion? I remember when the member for Torrens spoke on that matter. Because he is worth listening to, I take a charitable view that possibly he lost his notes on that occasion. I have heard him make many speeches and I admire the work that he does in debate, but it seemed that he had trouble trying to convince himself of the correctness of the position that he was duty bound to take on this matter.

I expected the member for Mitcham to advocate one specific thing. It seemed to me that, if a different franchise was sought for the two Houses, the honourable member might have suggested that we give to 18-year-olds the right

to vote for the House of Assembly but that we make them wait until they are 21 before they could vote for the Legislative Council. Apparently, however, this pearl of wisdom escaped him and his Party. I shall not be a bit surprised if we hear something about this before the debate is over.

The member for Mitcham wants democracy and he wants adult franchise for both Houses, but what he obviously wants is conditional democracy on his terms. I do not believe that there is such a thing as conditional democracy. Why does the member for Mitcham and the Leader of the Opposition want this? I am afraid I may have a suspicious mind, but I know that there are other members on this side who feel the same as I do about this. I think every member opposite knows that the reason is obviously that if all have the right to vote on the same day they will be encouraged to vote and will do so. If I can, I shall be leading those encouraging them to do so.

I think the Opposition fears that if all were on the one roll it might well have the same effect. How on earth can there be any other reason for going to the additional expense of having separate rolls as we used to have? I have heard from dozens of people how much handier it is since we have had the one roll for the Council and the Assembly.

Mr. Rodda: You are coming back now to the question of the abolition of the Legislative Council.

Mr. CLARK: I have not mentioned that. I have not advocated the abolition of the Legislative Council. I believe that under the legislation passed by this House last session it would be virtually impossible to abolish the Legislative Council, even if we wanted to do so. As I have said, the member for Mitcham has made it very plain that he wants a form of conditional democracy under which all the people will have a vote but will be discouraged from using the vote. After the member for Mitcham had got that far in his speech, I lost hope and gave up listening to him. It seemed to me and to many others that he had erected an elaborate edifice and then proved that it was a house of cheap, inferior cards, and very soiled cards at that.

I suppose I am a glutton for punishment, because after I had heard the speeches of the Leader and Deputy Leader I came back for more and listened carefully to the remarks of the member for Alexandra, who opposed the Bill outright. I must admit that I respected him more than I respected the advocates of conditional democracy. Even

though I completely disagreed with the opinions he put forward, those opinions were his own, and he was not trying to reflect the new mirror of the Party opposite. We then heard from the members for Eyre and Torrens, both of whom seemed to be half-hearted supporters of obtaining conditional democracy by conditional franchise. As I have said, I did not think the member for Torrens was at his best. However, I want to quote one paragraph from his speech because this is a very quotable passage for which I think he should be long remembered. He said:

I intend to support wholeheartedly the amendments foreshadowed by the Leader of the Opposition—

That was referring to the funny story about holding elections on a day different from the day on which House of Assembly elections are held. Do not members opposite know that every Party in Australia would like to see Senate and House of Representatives elections held on the same day, as they once were held and as they should always be held? I think that the holding of Senate and House of Representatives elections on different days, which happened more or less by accident, put the idea into the fertile brain of one or two members opposite. Referring to the remarks of the member for Torrens, I complete the relevant quotation as follows:

I intend to support wholeheartedly the amendments foreshadowed by the Leader of the Opposition, firmly believing in the bi-cameral system of Government in this State and further that there is no justification for any longer having a restricted franchise for the Upper House. However, I want it to be on a voluntary basis.

Mr. Gunn: What's wrong with that?

Mr. CLARK: If it is to be on a voluntary basis, what is the point of providing an unrestricted franchise? Why waste the time? Even the member for Torrens, who normally can think a little more deeply than he did on this occasion, is advocating a conditional franchise, but I submit that there can be no such thing as conditional democracy.

Mr. Burdon: It is getting a bit like Soekarno.

Mr. CLARK: Yes. It may have been the member for Bragg (I hope he will correct me if I am wrong) who said this afternoon that suffrage is a right, and of course it is. I and my colleagues on this side believe that everyone should have the right to vote and that everyone should have a free vote. I believe that everyone should have a vote for both Houses, if it is

necessary to have two Houses. As you know, Mr. Speaker, I am striving to keep in order—

Mr. Coumbe: You're struggling hard.

Mr. CLARK: Struggling for a free franchise has been a pretty hard struggle, and I am happy to have taken part in it. It is not a new struggle, and if members were prepared to put up with me (I am afraid they would not be, even though I would try to make my remarks highly interesting) I could go back through the ages to the *Magna Carta*, or even before that, and give honourable members a little talk.

Mr. Mathwin: You weren't here then, were you?

Mr. CLARK: It might have been a good thing if some of the members who are here today were living then. After all, the *Magna Carta* did not do much except make King John promise to behave himself, and, of course, he had no intention of adhering to the statements to which he signed his name. When we speak of the struggle for Parliamentary democracy and for the vote, we can tell a long story of the bitter struggle it has been, and it is obvious from the tone of remarks made in this debate that this struggle has not yet ended.

Mr. McKee: They die hard, don't they?

Mr. CLARK: Yes, although I do not mind that. However, I intensely dislike suggestions being made most strongly by the Leader and the Deputy Leader which most people in this State, to put it charitably, regard as silly suggestions. It is not only my interpretation: it is the interpretation that many people believe in, and we have found great difficulty, even within our own ranks, in taking seriously the proposed amendments. In conclusion, let me say that I believe everyone should have the right to vote; it is a duty—

The SPEAKER: I point out to the honourable member that his time has expired.

Mr. CLARK: It is a responsibility and, above all, it is a right which has been dearly won and which everyone should be allowed to exercise.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The red light does some good sometimes! The member for Elizabeth has had us as his guests tonight. He is a wily old fox. He would not own up to some of the things that we know have happened and the philosophy to which he subscribes. Perhaps to describe him as a wily old fox does him a grave injustice: he is more like an emu out of step. However, no matter how hard we tried on this side of the House to elicit from him the underlying intentions of his Party in this fragmented Bill that it has

introduced, we failed. I see the Attorney-General smiling; he is a very learned gentleman, as we all know, who knows how to deal with these things and how to give it to members in small doses. Some of the younger members opposite have been precocious, but they have been nearer the mark than other members in dealing with the reasons for the introduction of this Bill. For a long while now I have been dubbed a member of the ostrich club. At this point of time I see no reason to alter the opinions I have held for a long time.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: When are you going to take your head out of the sand?

Mr. RODDA: The Bill will control us by degrees. We are getting the third degree first, so we are getting it backwards, like that photograph we saw in the *Advertiser* over the weekend of some distinguished people walking through high grass to a secret meeting place. However, I take a leaf out of the book of the member for Elizabeth to avoid being called to order. It was emphasized—it was not in the policy speech but it was thrown around when its policy was enunciated by the Government—that it would introduce a Bill to alter the franchise for the Legislative Council, to alter districts, and to deal with the powers of the Legislative Council. For the life of me, I cannot see why those things could not have been included in this Bill. We have heard much about time-wasting—

Mr. McKee: You are doing that now. Give us your opinion and tell us just where you stand.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McKee: No-one knows where you stand.

Mr. RODDA: We have heard that we have been wasting much time in this House. The eminent Premier went to Queensland the other day and, although some nice things were said about him, some nasty things were also said about him. He was growling about time wasting in this Chamber and throughout the Parliaments of the British Commonwealth of Nations. He spoke about the reading of speeches and about the fact that some people were apparently unable to understand a Bill the first time it was read and had to have it read several times. Yet the Attorney-General will read this Bill to us nine times, for he will have three bites at this matter if he is to provide for all the things that he wants in an effort to bring some order into the Legislative Council, which my friends opposite seem to have such a passion about. The Legislative Council has never worked against the

interests of South Australia. Despite what the member for Mitchell said this afternoon, as he read with distinction, propped against a pillar, for just about the whole time that is allotted to him, the Legislative Council has always taken a balanced view and South Australia has never been a bad place to live in. Indeed, this State is highly regarded throughout the Commonwealth.

The Hon. L. J. King: What is your opinion of adult franchise?

Mr. RODDA: If the Attorney-General will wait long enough, he will find out.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must speak to the Bill.

Mr. RODDA: I appreciate your observation, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry if I am getting off the track, but I thought I was only on ground that was covered well by members who had spoken before me. If anyone can show me where the Legislative Council has worked against the interests of the people, perhaps I will be able to go all the way with the Attorney-General. When the people of the State have seemed to have nowhere to turn, they have turned to the Council. I will not hold it against the Attorney-General, but other members opposite will remember what happened in 1965 when the iniquitous road transport legislation was before the Chamber; they will remember that only too well. I do not want to point to members opposite; I know that they are men of intestinal fortitude, and it was not their fault that they were not present on one occasion to stand up for the legislation, which was getting under the skin of some very prominent people in the State. Members opposite were just not present at a certain meeting. I remember that one member of that Government went to the meeting (I do not know whether he acted against the advice he received); I believe he was very sorry that he attended. As a result of the balanced and responsible attitude of the Legislative Council, South Australia has had less trouble than it might have had. To answer the learned question from the other side about my view on adult franchise, I can say that I believe in the bicameral system of Government.

Mr. McKee: What's your view on adult franchise?

Mr. RODDA: If the honourable member can contain himself, I will tell him. I believe that, if we are to have full adult franchise, we should have only one House of Parliament. And that is what my friends opposite believe, in the ultimate, despite what the emu out of

step was trying to say tonight. His less experienced colleagues gave the pot away: they want the abolition of the Upper House. We need to have two Houses of Parliament that do the work expected of them in a democracy. The member for Pirie can voluntarily enrol as a Legislative Council voter and have a vote, and his son and daughter can qualify in due course. What is wrong with this? If we are to have a common roll we may as well have only one House.

Mr. Burdon: What about the common roll for the two Houses of the Commonwealth Parliament?

Mr. RODDA: The honourable member has posed a silly question. The Commonwealth Parliament is in a vastly different situation, because the States have varying populations. My response to the Attorney's request for my view on adult franchise is that the *status quo* should be maintained. We have seen the Government speaking with two voices: the member for Elizabeth and the Minister have said that there is nothing in this Bill about compulsory voting whilst the young blades behind them have said that they see the ultimate in this Bill as a means of destroying the other place. The member for Playford, in speaking about the history of South Australia, said that some of our leading statesmen, portraits of whom adorn the walls of this Chamber, ruled this State with the Bible in one hand and a gun in the other. That is a sacrilegious observation to make about people who have given us a heritage of which we should be proud. The two-House system offers a wonderful safeguard. We have the Judiciary, the Auditor-General, the Public Service Commissioner, and our Commissioner of Police, who are all answerable to Parliament. I do not want to develop that point, because I would be transgressing on a matter that is *sub judice*. The people of South Australia have every reason to be grateful—

Mr. McKee: Do you think a member of Parliament should be elected by all the people or by only a few people?

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order! The member for Victoria.

Mr. RODDA: I have made it clear where I stand: if we are to have two Houses of Parliament there should be a fundamental difference between the methods of electing them.

Mr. McKee: That is semi-democracy.

Mr. RODDA: No; it is not. Everyone who desires to do so can, in due course,

qualify to be a Legislative Council elector. We have heard from the member for Mitchell a long drawn-out speech against compulsion, and he then did a complete somersault and gave 100 reasons why he believed in it. What the member for Mitchell was trying to convey was a puzzle to members on this side.

Other members want to speak on this fragmentation of a Bill that we are now considering. I cannot describe it as anything other than a first instalment in a move, for want of a better term, to have a go at the very secure Parliamentary system that we have in South Australia. If members opposite implement the policies that they should be implementing, as members of a good Government, they will have nothing to fear and they will win a majority in the other House, too. If the Government can bring down a policy that is acceptable to all the people, the members of the other place will support it. It is all very well for the member for Peake to laugh. He has been extremely quiet lately, and I do not know what the trouble is.

We must give full credit to my Leader. When he was in Government, he brought down a fair plan for the Lower House. That plan recognized the need for adequate representation for the city and, although I am not as pleased as I could be about the position regarding the country, we are willing to make some concessions. The present Government has gone into office with 62 per cent of the seats after gaining 51 per cent of the votes. If members opposite do not get off their bottoms and do something, they will not stay in Government for long. I consider there should be some fundamental difference between the franchise for the two Houses.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I consider the Bill to be one of the gravest importance. It is designed to acknowledge the equality of one man to another. It intends that all people of voting age will have equal opportunity to have their say in electing to Parliament those people who will make the laws by which the community should abide. It is a Bill to implement adult franchise for the Legislative Council. This alone is the intention of the Bill, and who in this Chamber could disagree with that intention? All members here have been elected in terms of the system that we wish to implement in the Legislative Council; that is adult franchise and compulsory voting.

Mr. McKee: Are they prepared to be Christians in this matter?

Mr. KENEALLY: Well, the member for Mitcham based his whole argument on being a Christian and I compliment him on this. I suggest that other members opposite should follow his example and support adult franchise. It is incredible that, although many centuries have passed since the system of democratically-elected Government was introduced, in this State we are still, in 1970, having difficulty in getting this principle accepted. I am pleased that the member for Mitcham, the member for Torrens and the member for Bragg accept adult franchise. The member for Alexandra knew where he stood and said so. However, I consider that the Leader of the Opposition knows where he stands but has been afraid to say so. The member for Eyre and the member for Victoria just did not know.

We are debating whether to give the electors Government of the people, by the people, for the people. That is all honourable members are asked to decide on, and that is the simple effect of the Bill. All that people are asked to decide on is whether or not they believe in democracy. I see no mention in the Bill at all of abolition of the Upper House, and this is the thing on which members opposite who disagree with this Bill justify their stand.

The member for Alexandra is afraid that if all the people are given an opportunity to vote they will elect into the Upper House a majority of Parliamentarians who oppose his political thinking, and he fears that ultimately, because of this, the Legislative Council will be abolished. I make no apology for the Party platform, which is as follows:

The Legislative Council should be abolished after a favourable vote of citizens at an election at which abolition is an issue.

That should be remembered. Also, I point out—and the member for Alexandra would know this—that the Upper House can be abolished only as a result of a referendum. Is he prepared to say that, if such an election or such a referendum resulted in the view of the people being that the Upper House should be abolished, we should not accept this majority view? Does he not accept that we are representatives of the people and, as such, should be guided by the majority vote? In short, is he afraid of democracy? I submit that members opposite are afraid of democracy and that they do not wish a democratic process to be implemented.

It is thoroughly unjust and immoral to suggest that, because full adult franchise might eventually lead to the abolition of the Legislative Council, this is a good reason for deny-

ing that particular franchise. Members should be prepared to accept adult franchise and then go out and convince the people of this State, if they feel compelled to do so, that the Legislative Council should remain. After all, that is the very basis of democracy. It is no good a person's denying the people the opportunity to vote for the Legislative Council because he fears that by doing this he might be making a start towards the abolition of that House. Such a person should rather accept adult franchise and, if he felt there was any justice in the stand he took, he should go out to the electorate and convince the people that the Legislative Council should remain.

If a person was unable to convince the people of this, and if the people, having listened, rejected that point of view, then what argument is left? I say there is none. It is the people in this State who are going to elect the Government, and it is the people who will say whether we should have two Houses or one House. I cannot for the life of me see why anyone should object to this. This is democracy, and this is the fundamental right of the people. It has been suggested in this debate that it may be beneficial to have a different franchise for each House. In rejecting this view completely, I would ask the exponents of this argument: if they favoured 15 per cent or thereabouts of the electorate being refused a vote, would they accept a hypothetical compromise, namely, to retain this different franchise with, say, the top 15 per cent of property owners, in terms of financial value, being refused a vote? What would be their position? There would remain this differing franchise. If those people were 15 per cent of the most financial property owners, would members opposite accept this? I submit that they would not. Everybody should be entitled to the vote. Members opposite would not accept this position because in doing so they would reveal their opposition to the Bill as being one of pure political expediency. I submit that properties should not be more important than people in the election of any of our Governments.

Mr. Evans: Is it only property owners who are entitled to a vote for the Legislative Council?

Mr. KENEALLY: No. What I am pointing out is that there could be many differing hypothetical franchises. The current system is beneficial to members opposite and

coincides with their political views. On the other hand, if there were to be a franchise that would benefit the Party to which we on this side belong, members opposite would object. I suggest that it is political expediency alone that forces members opposite to support the current franchise for the Upper House, and, in fairness to those members opposite who do not support the current franchise, I am addressing my remarks to those who wish to retain the *status quo*. All that members are asked to decide at present is whether they support democracy. That is a fairly simple question, and there is only one practical answer: of course members support democracy. Because of this view, this Bill should have the unanimous support of the House. Many comments have been made on compulsion.

Mr. McKee: What about conscription?

Mr. KENEALLY: I will not deal with conscription now. Although members opposite favour adult franchise they are opposed to compulsory voting. I suggest that one good argument for extending the franchise for the Legislative Council is that fewer than 10 per cent of the people of this State are able to say who their Legislative Councillors are. In my own district, I know that until after the recent House of Assembly elections I had only ever seen one of the four Legislative Councillors for the Northern District, and I am interested in politics. Considerably fewer than 10 per cent of the people in my district could say who were their current Legislative Councillors. I think that the electors of South Australia are well aware of who their House of Assembly members are, because they are forced to take an interest in House of Assembly elections. The people of South Australia think that the Government of the State is in the House of Assembly and, being unaware of the power of the Legislative Council, they do not take an interest in it.

Why is there an awareness regarding the House of Assembly and its members as opposed to an ignorance of the Legislative Council and its members? The reason is that people are compelled to take an interest in the House of Assembly: being compelled to vote, they take an interest in what they are voting for. Disinterested people make for disinterested government. Members of the Legislative Council know that whatever they do to legislation they will not be blamed for it, because most people are unaware of their existence and hold the House of Assembly responsible. This, then, protects members of

the Upper House and provides the cast-iron protective case to which one of my colleagues referred earlier. The House of Assembly is held in high repute because people know we are here, mainly because they are compelled to take an interest in what we are doing.

Many people are unaware that there is another House that is so powerful that it can reject legislation passed in this House. If there were compulsory voting for the Legislative Council, that Chamber would be made responsible to the people. If we have apathetic voters, we have apathetic government. The members of the Legislative Council can be apathetic because they know that only a small proportion of the people in South Australia at election time will vote at Legislative Council elections, and that they will be returned. There is no doubt that that is why they adopt the attitude they adopt. If the people were aware of their responsibilities and were compelled to be responsible and so take an interest in the Legislative Council, we would have better government, a Government that was more responsible to the people than we have now. I feel there is nothing wrong in opening the Legislative Council to the critical view of the people, as this can only be to the benefit of the State.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): Most people know my views on this matter. Listening to the member for Playford and the member for Mawson makes us think that perhaps we are mistaken in our views, because I have never heard more irrational and illogical speeches in my life.

Mr. McKee: As a member of a civil liberties organization, speak like a good and true member of that organization.

Mr. McANANEY: One thing that amazes me is when the member for Stuart brings out a little book (I think it is the A.L.P. bible on what its members should and should not do) and says that, because it has a statement that it is the policy of the A.L.P. at present to hold a referendum before the abolition of the Legislative Council, this would bind future Parliaments. If the Government was prepared to introduce a Bill dealing fully with all these matters, which it should have done instead of tinkering with the matter by dealing with one minor matter in this whole subject of reform, we should have the full case before us of the Government's intentions, and then we could assess the situation. The Premier two years ago accepted the fact that there should be a referendum before the Upper

House could be abolished, but we do not hear about that now, except that it is said that it is in the A.L.P.'s platform. However, that can be changed at any time by a small group of people. The Labor Party wants compulsion in the unions because, under the present system, fewer than half the work force in Australia belongs to trade unions, and that Party wants to get all workers into the unions.

The way to get people to join an organization is to show them that it is doing something for the workers that is effective and is of some value to them. The Labor Party wants compulsory voting in the unions to give some validity to that Party's platform. It is this two-faced attitude that makes me almost change my views on what should happen in this respect. We have an A.L.P. that is so undemocratic that it has to step in and put in almost a dictator group to control the A.L.P. The member for Stuart says, "We have got it in this little book, and this should be binding upon us", but there is no guarantee that it will not be changed almost overnight by the most undemocratic methods. To say that people who are not interested in voting should be compelled to vote is, to me, against the very principles of democracy. At the Midland by-election, people went to the booths and said, "We are enrolled, but is voting compulsory?" When they were told that voting was voluntary, they hopped back into their cars and went away without voting, yet members opposite say that these are the people who should be compelled to vote and that they should have an effective say in what happens in South Australia, or in electing a House of Review. As they do not take an interest in these matters, how can it be said that they are entitled to have a vote? It is this sort of consideration that makes me hesitate in supporting what I believe is the right course. There is no reason to deny a vote to any person over a particular age who contributes to the taxes of the country. It is different in local government, in relation to which I do not believe in adult franchise, because one section of the community provides the funds and to give the vote to people who did not contribute to those finances would not be logical.

If anyone can show me why a person over 21 years or a certain age who contributes to the taxes of the country should not have the right to have a say in the Government, I will change my vote. This afternoon, I waded through all the speeches made two years ago against adult franchise, and in those speeches not one logical reason was advanced against it.

One member said that a person was perfectly free to buy a piece of land and that that would qualify him to vote, but everyone does not want a piece of land. I do not have any land at present. For three or four days of the week I live with my mother, and when I go home I live in my son's house; I do not have a house and I do not have any land.

Mr. McKee: I feel sorry for you.

Mr. McANANEY: If I had the farm at present, I would be destitute but, not having any land, I can just keep my head above water. Therefore, it is a silly condition for voting that one should own land. If for some reason or another a person does not want to occupy a house or buy land, he has the perfect right not to do so. Another member said that a person could get married and thus become eligible to vote. Many people now marry before they are 21 years old, and I think they are much more irresponsible than those who marry at 25 years of age; some young people get married before they are 21 years old through inclination while for others it is a matter of necessity.

Mr. Rodda: Would you like to define "necessity"?

Mr. McANANEY: By what he said, the honourable member brought me back to voting the right way. The arguments that there must be a different roll for a different group of people and that one section of the people must be denied the vote are complete twaddle, without any logic. However, I am always open to reason and, if someone can tell me some logical reason why a person should not have a vote, I will listen to him. By excluding certain people from voting, the ridiculous situation is reached of three young people who live in a flat at North Adelaide having to draw a straw to decide who can vote, as one only can be the occupier, who is entitled to a vote, whereas the other two are not entitled to vote. It was said in another place that, as all such people are university students, they should not be entitled to vote. However, the proportion of people aged between 18 years and 21 years who attend the university is very small. Most people of this age are working, earning money, and paying taxes, and they have an absolute right to have a vote and have some say in the Government. I may be wrong about this, but I went through all the voting systems in the world and could find only one that was similar to our system—it was the system used in Northern Ireland. I hope there are some Irish people still willing to fight for their rights.

Paisley is a contaminated Irishman who is influenced by many Englishmen.

Being a conservative, I believe that we should build on the foundations laid in the past. We should seek to improve the system that has proved so good in the past: we should not seek to tear it down, as advocated by the academic young Socialists who have invaded the Labor Party. The older type of Labor Party member believed in an honest, decent approach to things, unlike the young Socialist academic theorists. When the young group that is against everything is asked, "What do you want?", they say, "Destroy everything you have got, make a fresh start, and try something different." I cannot understand the viewpoint of this group. I admit that there are faults in our system and that it can be improved so that everyone can share in the good things of life, and I believe that everyone should have freedom and not so much compulsion.

I think there should be in the Constitution an inbuilt clause providing that a referendum must be held before the Upper House can be abolished. This is a good safeguard, because I do not think the people would vote the Legislative Council out of existence. Because each Legislative Council member remains in office for six years, that House provides stability. I might even suggest that each Legislative Council member should serve for three periods, each of three years. I am not particularly keen on the proposal to have Legislative Council elections on a different day from House of Assembly elections: we have enough elections now. If I had not heard the member for Mawson and the member for Playford, my views would have been different. There is a weakness in the Commonwealth system at present: because there is an election for a House in the Commonwealth Parliament every 18 months, the Government of the day in Canberra is looking over its shoulder every time it does something. It is far better for a Government to be in office for a period that will enable it to carry out a definite policy without having to think of the result of the next election.

The member for Mitchell spoke of compulsion to serve in Vietnam. I do not particularly like to get involved in a discussion on this subject, but a decent young man from Strathalbyn is in gaol at present. He is opposed to this war and he says, "I am not willing to go but I am willing to serve out my two years." I have a fair amount of admiration for this person, but honourable members ought to hear his mother talking about the Premier and the

Commonwealth member for Adelaide! Those persons told him that this is what he should do, and his mother is completely disgusted with people who have said, "You should break the law." The people, by a democratic full vote, have said that they are in favour of this war. They could have voted the Government out at any time, and they were supported by the Gallup polls of the day.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Order! Will the honourable member link up his remarks with the Bill?

Mr. McANANEY: I am linking them up, through the member for Playford and the member for Mitchell, who spoke on this subject. I believe that we in this House should have a strict Speaker who keeps everybody to the point, not letting any member stray. However, when one member strays around the bush, surely I can stray around the other side of the bush. I think it is about time we straightened this out in this House, because there is too much of it. I am saying what I believe, as I always do. We should be able to talk to people and discuss matters and still stay free, even though opinions may differ. In the world today, we need to be able to discuss matters in a sensible and logical manner. As the House may have gathered from my previous statements, I believe in adult franchise. I have said this publicly in my former district and in my new district, and at every election I have gained an increased percentage of the vote.

I consider it the duty of a member to tell persons in his district both sides of a question and let them make up their mind. I do that, but in some districts people have put up one side of the case by a not very logical argument, and possibly this is where we get minor differences in our Party. In our Party members may have divergent views but still stay together amicably as a Party. This position is quite different from the public brawling and argument rife in the Party opposite.

The Premier is always talking about Bull Creek. We do not have to go to Bull Creek and toss out the heads of the Liberal and Country League branch there because I am saying something different from what they believe in. However, that is what the dictators at the head of the Party opposite will do.

Mr. Clark: I don't think that is nice.

Mr. McANANEY: But it is factual. I say emphatically that I believe people should have enough energy and drive and interest in politics to get themselves on the roll. The member for Stuart has said that the people do not have the time, but surely people have more

time today than they have ever had. It is simple for a person to get his name on the roll if he has sufficient interest to do so, and if a person does not have this interest he should not be entitled to a vote. I think there is some merit in having a different group of people voting. Those who are interested in voting, who take an interest in politics and who are willing to spend a few minutes to get their name on the roll, should be entitled to vote. However, even though they are on the roll they should not be compelled to vote. I think that this is a very good principle and that it would be for the benefit of South Australia.

I believe that the Legislative Council has done a very good job over the years. I think the bicameral system of Parliament is good and that with adult franchise under the terms I have stated there could possibly be some improvement on the present situation. I have great confidence in the Liberal cause and the Liberal philosophy. I consider that my Party has much more hope of getting to the young people than has the A.L.P. In fact, this was shown at the last Commonwealth election when the 21-29 years age group was second only to the over 70 years group in the way they voted Liberal. Therefore, I am not frightened of the young people's vote. In my opinion, those who are opposed to adult franchise show that they are not prepared to accept this and that they do not think they can get to the young people. I believe that my Party can do this, because we are the advocates of freedom. The Minister of Local Government is the greatest compulsion expert that I have ever met, and I cannot imagine the young people I know ever supporting him. I believe that adult franchise is essential. However, we must not compel people to enrol or to vote.

Mr. BROWN (Whyalla): I was rather surprised to hear the remarks of the member for Heysen. I thought for a moment that he was on the Government's side on this matter and that we might soon be able to make him a member of the A.L.P. and educate him a little. Every speaker in this debate so far has touched on the question of democracy, and quite rightly so. Although I am not brilliant educationally, I understand that "democracy" means government of the people by the people. I understand from history that democracy began in Greece, and I wonder whether the Party opposite is inclined to think that we should start the

way Greece started and finish where that country is today, with a political military junta.

I now turn to the form of democracy carried on in America. I doubt whether true democracy exists in that country. We find that in America, for example, a person has to be a millionaire even to have the right, at least, to run for President. I wonder whether democracy in America is anything other than what Arthur Calwell once called it, namely, two empty cans making a lot of noise. Another country that carries out a certain form of democracy is Rhodesia, in which country Mr. Ian Smith has said that only the white people should have the right to vote and to decide who governs.

Mr. Jennings: Applauded by John McLeay.

Mr. BROWN: Yes, applauded by the honourable (or should I say dishonourable in this respect?) John McLeay. It is well known that for decades under Sir Thomas Playford there was anything but democracy in this State. With a gerrymander in existence, Sir Thomas Playford, an astute politician, led the Government of South Australia with a minority vote, finally reaching the situation where he had to depend on an Independent member in order to stay in Government. I understand that there was no doubt in the mind of some of my colleagues that, under proposed alterations to electoral districts, the Leader of the Opposition could not keep his former Government in power, depending on the vote of one person.

I do not know whether Liberal and Country League members in the Upper House are supposed to have some divine right or supernatural powers, and I am doubtful whether they have these things. However, I witnessed an incident in this building some weeks ago when a gentleman, whose name I will not mention, came in to have a cup of coffee and, engrossed in conversation with a group of us, he said, "I don't necessarily vote for the Liberal Party on a particular Bill. Sometimes I decide whether I might vote in favour or against, or I might amend something." I am wondering just how that member decides to do this. What gives him this privilege? I understand that the Liberal Party in this House does not meet with the Liberal Party in the Upper House.

Mr. Venning: That's right. Do you meet with A.L.P. fellows in the Upper House?

Mr. BROWN: My word we do!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Whyalla!

Mr. BROWN: I want it to be understood that the Labor Party does not believe in racial discrimination. We are all together. But I understand also from this gentleman from the other place that he does not even meet the members of the L.C.L. in the other place because he decides which way to vote by going to some massive caucus. That is how they work their system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BROWN: The fact remains that I have the impression that they just decide individually which way they will vote. This gentleman said that, if it did not suit him, he would walk out and not vote at all. That is the way it goes. It is a beautiful set-up, is it not? And we talk about democracy!

Mr. Jennings: They can afford to act in that way: there are 16 of them to our four.

Mr. BROWN: My understanding of democracy is far different from that.

Mr. Mathwin: What did you do when voting for wearing shorts in the House?

Mr. BROWN: The Upper House breeds on the apathy of the ordinary citizen in the street. He is not stupid but he is apathetic. History shows that, if we walked out on to North Terrace in the day time—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. BROWN: People are apathetic and there is no doubt that the members of the Upper House breed on this apathetic outlook. The point I was making before I was interrupted was that, if there was some basic problem that had to be dealt with and it depended on the normal citizen voting voluntarily, there is no doubt that the majority would not vote; but history shows that, once people are compelled to do something, they immediately look at the problem. I have personal knowledge of this, in a small way. I refer to the fact that a few years ago in Whyalla we changed our local government from a city commission to a fully elected council. We had to go to the ordinary ratepayer and obtain a majority vote of all the ratepayers in Whyalla. This was a tremendous task. If we had waited for the majority of the ratepayers in Whyalla voluntarily to come along and support a fully elected council, we would have waited until Domesday. So what did we have to do? We waited, in one case, until the day of either a State or a Commonwealth election and we produced a petition at the poll. It may or may not

be interesting to know that I manned a polling booth on this occasion for two hours.

When I got to the polling station, there was a young girl standing there with a blue L.C.L. how-to-vote card. I had the petition with me and she commented, "Do you think that people will sign that or will they do nothing?" I replied, "I will not answer the question now. Stay here for a while and we will find out." I asked each person who came up to vote whether he or she would sign the petition. Without exception, the question they asked me was, "What is it for?" In other words, they would not sign the petition until they knew what it was for and, once they knew that, they decided whether or not they would sign it. Most of them did sign it. However, the point I am making is that these people thought about the matter. When they were asked to sign the petition, they thought about it. In fact, one man voted and then came back later saying, "I will sign it now: I have thought about it."

If people are compelled to sign or vote for or against something, they think about the matter even more carefully before deciding on it. The Upper House breeds on the apathetic outlook of the normal person. Opposition members have said that the question of adult franchise for the Upper House is something that the Upper House should decide. However, the Government went to the ordinary citizens of the State with its policy of adult franchise for the Upper House and it was supported.

Mr. Evans: Try your luck now.

Mr. BROWN: We were supported then, and if we went to the people on this question tomorrow we would still be supported. After listening to members opposite, I am convinced that they are confused about what their Party supports. At the start of his speech, the member for Heyden fully supported what we are putting forward. The member for Torrens supports a certain course, although he does not go the whole way, and the member for Mitcham takes a similar position. The Leader of the Opposition has put up a certain proposal. I understand that the member for Eyre, on the other hand, greatly opposes the Bill. Therefore, as members opposite do not have a clear policy, I suggest that they should put their own house in order and find out what they support.

Before I came to this place, I had heard a lot about the Upper House, but I can assure honourable members that I was absolutely amazed when I saw the way that that House

is run and the form of so-called democracy that exists in regard to it; I never dreamed that this sort of so-called democracy existed. I do not think the ordinary citizen realizes what is going on. Some of my colleagues have put up certain suggestions about what we should do with the Upper House, but I think that if some of those suggestions were carried out we would be in trouble with the law. I wholeheartedly support the Bill.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I oppose the Bill. I am very pleased to know that I belong to a Party in which the individual can please himself on these matters, and this is exactly the stand I take on this Bill. When I came into this House my Party was in Government and I recently became a member of the Opposition; so, I have had the opportunity both in Government and in Opposition to watch the activities of the Upper House. I cannot speak too highly of the effectiveness of the other House in regard to legislation. Whether a Labor Government or a Liberal Government is in office, the Upper House fulfils the job it is there to do—to review the legislation that is passed up to it. I intend to judge the Legislative Council on its record, and it will do me.

It is not necessary to put Government members under an X-ray in connection with this legislation, because we know only too well what is in the back of their minds. They say there is no mention in this Bill of compulsion, no mention of doing away with the Legislative Council, and no mention of voluntary voting, but we know that this is only the thin end of the wedge. If they had their way, all these things would take place and we would finish up in South Australia with one House. They would then go for the abolition of the State Parliament, do away with decentralization, and everything would be conducted from Canberra. Our State schools would be run from Canberra—and we know what sort of treatment we would receive from a place so distantly removed. It would concern me very much if this present Government were in power for long enough to do this. I know the people view with concern the Government's attitude in this regard. I do not intend to go through all the speeches that have been made on this Bill, but the member for Stuart spoke in derogatory terms about Legislative Council members. I do not know whether he was talking about the Labor Party members there, but the Liberal members in the Council are a very hard-working bunch of fellows.

Mr. Jennings: Rubbish! They work 40 hours a year.

Mr. VENNING: Speaking on behalf of the rural members, I can say that they are indeed a very hard-working bunch of chaps. The member for Eyre says that they are held in very high regard throughout the State. The member for Stuart said tonight that the constituents do not even know who their Legislative Council members are. I am inclined to think that some do not even know who their Assembly members are. Country people certainly know both their Assembly members and their Legislative Council members. I greatly appreciate the assistance given in rural areas by Legislative Council members, particularly at present, when our country electoral districts have been enlarged to their present degree.

Several honourable members who have spoken in this debate have got away from the Bill considerably and have not been brought back to it, so I suppose I am entitled to make some comments for the same reason. This afternoon the member for Mitchell spoke about National Service, but I was interested in the comments made recently by a National Service trainee from Puckapunyal who was home on leave that 92 per cent of the National Service trainees had volunteered to go to Vietnam. This is a completely different story from what we have been led to believe by members opposite this afternoon. My son did his National Service training and not once did I hear him raise his voice against training for the defence of this country.

I have said earlier that I do not intend to take up much time on this Bill, but I say definitely that I oppose it. Some of my colleagues have said that they favour certain aspects, such as voting on a different day and adult franchise. However, I would be very fearful of this attitude, because I do not think it would be possible to keep the situation in line and eventually we would get back to having a common roll, with voting on the same day, for both Houses, and that would end in the abolition of the Legislative Council. I shall strive to preserve the Legislative Council as long as I am able to do so.

Mr. JENNINGS secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.23 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 14, at 2 p.m.