

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, October 15, 1970

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

## QUESTIONS

## SHOP EMPLOYEES

Mr. HALL: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say how many people north and south of the city will lose their Friday night jobs if the Government's legislation on shopping hours is passed?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think the Leader of the Opposition will realize that he has asked a very broad question.

Mr. Millhouse: Did you say an important question?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think the member for Mitcham had better read *Hansard* tomorrow if he is having trouble with his ears. Many casual workers who are now working only on Friday nights and Saturday mornings may be required to work only on Saturday mornings in future, but it is up to the employers to determine whether—

Mr. Hall: I am referring to Friday nights.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: No permanent employee will lose his job as a result of the Friday night shopping position.

Mr. Hall: That is not my question: how many people now working on Friday nights will lose their jobs?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think I have answered that. It will be up to the employers to determine whether or not they require the employees concerned to work on Fridays and on Saturday mornings in the future. I do not think this will affect the employment of those people who are generally engaged as casuals on Fridays and on Saturday mornings, but I cannot give any accurate reply. Indeed, I do not think the Leader seriously expects me to give him an accurate reply.

## THEBARTON PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. LAWN: Can the Minister of Works say when tenders will be called for rebuilding the Thebarton Primary School?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I understand that the Public Buildings Department will be able to call tenders early in November, but to make sure that that information is completely accurate I will check on the matter and let the honourable member know as soon as possible.

c5

## MURRAY SALINITY

Mr. CUMBE: The Minister of Works will recall that some time ago, when I asked a question about the Gutteridge report on Murray River salinity, he promised to table that report. Since then, the Minister has made a public statement on the matter. Can he now say when it will be possible for him to table that report for the benefit of the House?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If my memory is correct, I think that I said that six copies of the report would be placed in the Parliamentary Library, although I am not sure that that is what I said. Although the distribution list has been sent from South Australia to the Commonwealth Government, which is responsible for printing the report, I am certain that the list includes a reference to six copies for the Parliamentary Library. When I inquired the other day, the copies had not been received, and nothing had been heard about the matter. As I have a copy of the report, if it is of urgent interest to the honourable member I shall be happy to let him have a look at it.

## D.D.T.

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to have the Agriculture Department investigate allegations that certain councils are offering free to rate-payers supplies of D.D.T. for the control of mosquitoes breeding in septic tanks? At present, D.D.T. is a most controversial chemical. Experts tell us that clinically it is very stable and therefore does not dissipate quickly through the agencies of nature, and many countries are seriously considering banning it. In these circumstances, it seems to me rather peculiar that what could be a dangerous chemical is being made available. My information is that, in a news bulletin inserted in the *Country Hour* programme on station 5CK, it was made clear that the Gladstone council had last week offered this service to ratepayers.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up the matter with my colleague and to bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

## GARDEN SUBURB

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Works request the Electricity Trust to desist from erecting high tension poles in East Parkway, Colonel Light Gardens? This year the Garden Suburb celebrated its 50th anniversary. This suburb, which was the first essay in town

planning in South Australia, was laid out in such a way as to permit of service lanes between the houses with the object of taking all sorts of poles, sewers, gas mains, and so on. For all the period of the existence of the Garden Suburb most of the streets have remained free of poles, and I am sure the Minister will agree with me that that is desirable. This morning I had a call from a constituent of mine, who is well known to and well respected by many members of this House, protesting most vigorously at the apparent intention of the trust to erect poles in East Parkway, where he lives. He told me that holes had been dug and concrete poured, and I undertook to take the matter up with the Minister of Works, to whom I have given notice that I would ask this question.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I appreciate the fact that the honourable member contacted me this morning, and I was able to obtain a report from the Electricity Trust, as follows:

The proposed powerline along East Parkway had been discussed with the Garden Suburb Commissioner and it had been agreed that special insulated conductors should be used to minimize tree cutting. However, work on this project has been suspended in order to examine the possibility of being able to use service lanes for this particular powerline.

#### DARLEY FORD CROSSING

Mr. SLATER: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question regarding the Torrens River crossing known as Darley ford?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The planning of a permanent bridge crossing at the site of the Darley Road ford is well advanced but it has not yet been possible to reach agreement with the two councils involved, namely, the Corporation of the City of Enfield and the Corporation of the City of Campbelltown. An on-site meeting of representatives of the Highways Department and the two councils was held on October 1, and general agreement on the location and alignment of a bridge to replace the ford was reached. Detailed plans and a scale model are now being prepared to enable members of the two councils to fully assess the effects of the scheme when it is submitted for their final acceptance. It is expected that the work will commence in 1971-72.

#### RAILWAY ESTIMATES

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked, during the Loan Estimates debate, about whether expenditure on railway track rehabilitation in this financial year had been reduced?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not true to say, as the honourable member has alleged, that any work has been cut back. In fact, apart from the Loan expenditure to which I referred on August 25, working expenditure on the project of rehabilitating the track during 1970-71 will be about \$500,000 more than was spent in 1969-70.

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question on certain railway expenditure that I asked during the debate on the Loan Estimates?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The item for ballast in the Loan Estimates represents only a relatively small proportion of the total cost involved in this type of work, the bulk of the ballast used over the system being debitable to working expenses. We have provided for the use of 176,000 cub. yds. of ballast during 1970-71. Of this, approximately 60,000 cub. yds. will be used on the Adelaide-Serviceton line. The estimated cost for the purchase of this ballast from metropolitan sources and also from Keith is \$140,000. This figure does not include labour and other costs associated with its use. The special committee set up by the previous Government to examine the cause of derailments on the South Australian Railways presented its report to the previous Government, and it was as a result of that report that certain upgrading and rehabilitation of the rail lines in South Australia was approved. The committee is not now functioning, because it ceased to operate when its report was presented to the previous Government. No additional funds for cottage improvements at Tailm Bend can be made available during this financial year. The rest of the question asked by the honourable member was answered on August 25, 1970, in response to a question on notice.

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate about hopper waggon?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The hopper waggon referred to cover the construction of a second rake of 17 aluminium hopper waggons used for grain haulage.

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my question, asked during the Loan Estimates debate, about provision made for expenditure on railway locomotives?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The reference to diesel-electric locomotives has nothing to do with the conversion of the Overland to head-end power. An amount of \$827,000 is provided for three new broad-gauge locomotives,

while \$324,000 covers the completion of an order for six 830-class standard gauge locomotives, together with a new order for three 600-class standard gauge locomotives. Conversion of the Overland to head-end power will be effected in October, 1970.

Mr. HALL: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate regarding joint stock cars and the Overland?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The joint stock cars proposed are to replace four of the original air-conditioned cars which it is proposed to sell to the Victorian Railways for intra-system use. They do not represent any increase in the joint stock fleet. The Overland shows a worthwhile profit on out-of-pocket costs and a small loss after debt charges have been met. The South Australian Railways share of the capital cost of the Overland air-conditioned cars as at June 30, 1970, was \$1,519,480.

#### SCHOOL CLOSURES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier, in the temporary absence of the Minister of Education, say whether in future I and other members can expect to receive from the Minister the courtesy of being given, either in the House or by letter, replies to members' questions before the information sought is published in the press? On August 25 I sought from the Minister information by asking him a question about one-teacher schools, and in reply he said:

The details of our policy on this matter are being considered at present and I expect to make an announcement soon. When I am ready to do that I shall let the honourable member have the information.

In the press yesterday afternoon, members received their first indication that 24 schools in the country areas, including four in the District of Light, would be closed down. Publication in this way is certainly not making the information available to the member as the Minister indicated in his reply that it would be made available. Further, my inquiries this morning show that the statement was released not only to city newspapers but also to country newspapers circulating in my district.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I think the honourable member is being quite petulant. The matter to which he referred was not one that he raised originally in this House. It is a matter upon which Government policy was announced prior to the last election. The Minister said that he was developing a policy on this matter and it was not appropriate for

him then to release to the public details of that policy. The honourable member cannot bind the Minister to make his release in a certain way by asking a question in this House.

Dr. Eastick: Notwithstanding the promise he has given?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He said he would obtain the information for the honourable member, and I have not the slightest doubt that he will do so.

Mr. Millhouse: Who do you think you're kidding?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Mitcham should cease his petulant nonsense for once. There is nothing so petty as the way in which he carries on in this House, and the demands that he makes on this Government are certainly not the kind of demands he was prepared to satisfy when he was a Minister. Indeed, he has never been prepared to do so.

Mr. Millhouse: If you use a bit of common sense when you answer questions—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggest that the honourable member calm down or take some Amytal.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't know what that is.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In that case, the honourable member obviously needs a little advice. Although the Ministers realize that they should be courteous to members in the House, the honourable member cannot bind the Minister on a matter of general Government policy to making his first release in this House when on another occasion the Government has said that it will make an announcement.

Dr. EASTICK: In the absence of the Minister of Education, can the Premier say whether, in respect of future announcements relating to school closures, we can expect that either the teachers involved or the Chairman of the school committee involved, or all these people, will be notified in advance of, or simultaneously with, any press release? I know that in several cases no such announcement has been made to those persons, even though I personally am involved at present in making representations on behalf of the committee of one of those schools to have the alteration of a bus route considered, which representations, if successful, would allow an increase in the number of students that could attend a school. Since asking my first question on this matter today I have been told that at least one member received in his letter box yesterday afternoon a notification that a school

in his area would be closed, but such a courtesy was not accorded to other members.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will take this matter up with the Minister.

#### PARA VISTA SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Education, ascertain when the playing fields or oval at the Para Vista Primary School, which was opened in February, 1968, are to be grassed and reticulated and when tenders are to be called? I have been asked by members of the school committee to seek this information.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

#### GLADSTONE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: When the Minister of Education was in the area some time ago, he assured the Gladstone High School Committee that its new school would be ready for occupation at the beginning of 1972. Can the Minister of Works say whether sketch plans for this school have yet been submitted to the Public Works Standing Committee and, if they have not, when it is expected that they will be?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I expect it will be three weeks to a month before the department can give me the necessary details for submission to Cabinet, after which the project will be referred to Executive Council, which, in turn, will refer it to the Public Works Committee. I assure the honourable member that I will inform him when the matter has been referred to the Public Works Committee.

#### PORT PIRIE HOSPITAL

Mr. McKEE: Can the Minister of Works say when work is likely to commence on the first stage of the proposed extensions to the Port Pirie Hospital?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot give the exact date but I will certainly inquire and bring down a report for the honourable member next Tuesday.

#### VERMIN CONTROL

Mr. RODDA: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport confer with the officers of his department concerning the control of vermin, in the form of rabbits, at the Glenroy railway yards? This outbreak has occurred since the gang has been transferred from Glenroy to Hynam. There is a colony of rabbits in the Glenroy railway yards and in the railway reserve north of the yards.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will investigate the matter.

#### MISLEADING ADVERTISING

Mr. EVANS: In the absence of the Attorney-General, will the Premier investigate a full-page advertisement which appeared in the *Sunday Mail* of September 26 advertising a sell-out of watches? The firm advertising, which claimed to be a proprietary company from another State, undertook to have orders processed, or deliveries made, within 48 hours. On September 28 and 29, two constituents of mine who live in the same house sent cheques which were presented at the bank on October 5 and 6, but they have not received a reply from the advertisers. I am led to believe that another full-page advertisement is to appear in the *News*.

Mr. Clark: It has been in a number of publications.

Mr. EVANS: I believe it appeared in the newspaper published at Broken Hill. I think the matter needs investigating before someone "shoots through" with a lot of money.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes.

#### LAMB CARCASSES

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the Australian Meat Board intends to continue the system of price guarantee for lamb carcasses for the 1970-71 export season? During the 1969-70 season the board operated a price guarantee system for lamb carcasses of 36 lb. or under exported to the United Kingdom.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a report.

#### BREAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply from the Minister of Health regarding the desirability of the wrapping of bread?

Mr. BROOMHILL: The Minister of Health has replied to questions asked by the members for Glenelg and Mitcham on September 15, as follows:

The regulation prohibiting returns of bread is a regulation under the Food and Drugs Act which has been in force for more than 20 years and which was re-enacted in the consolidation of those regulations in 1964 under the Playford Government. The recent enforcement of the regulation arose from prosecutions (not by the Government) of breadcarters for breach of the regulation. The Government has considered the regulation and considers its continued operation unnecessary in present conditions. Before the regulation can be revoked, a recommendation to that effect is needed from the Food and Drugs Act Advisory Committee. The Government has requested the committee to examine the matter urgently and make a

recommendation on it. The member for Glenelg also asked if consideration would be given to require that all bread be wrapped. Provision exists under the Local Government Act for local authorities to make a by-law to require bread to be wrapped and, in fact, some country councils have done so. The wrapping of all bread would add to the ultimate cost to the consumer and this would lead to general customer resistance.

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to the question I asked yesterday about bread deliveries to businesses?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I have contacted the Bread Manufacturers Association regarding the honourable member's question and, as I said yesterday, the arrangement for the supply of bread from metropolitan bakers to country districts has been made by the association. I have been informed by the association that the present indications are that the new arrangement will be implemented next week in those country districts in which it has not been already applied.

#### HOUSING TRUST APPLICATION

Mr. BECKER: Will the Premier, as Minister of Development, arrange to make available, as a matter of extreme urgency, a Housing Trust rental house for an English migrant family of 10 people who are at present renting for \$20 a week at Glenelg North a two-bedroom house with no hot water service? My constituent applied to the Housing Trust in April, 1970, for a rental house but, as his application was incorrectly filed, it was not immediately investigated by the appropriate officer in accordance with the usual practice. As the lease on my constituent's present home expires on November 5, 1970, will the Minister try to have the matter expedited?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will certainly have the matter examined, but I point out that applications for rental houses within the inner metropolitan area rarely produce a vacant house within the period that has elapsed since this application was lodged. The waiting time for a house in the inner metropolitan area is much more than it is for a house elsewhere. The trust has very little vacant land in the inner suburbs. Its main holdings of land for building are at Ingle Farm, in the area north of Salisbury, and in the south from Christies Beach to Noarlunga. In order to provide a rental house in the inner metropolitan area, there would have to be a vacancy occurring in an existing Housing Trust house, and few such houses become available. If the honourable member will give me the details of this matter, I will see what assistance can be given.

#### MINISTERS' REPLIES

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: In the absence of the Minister of Education, will the Premier see that more prompt replies are given to members' letters and questions when, in fact, those replies are available? I ask this question in relation to a letter that I sent to the Minister of Education regarding a subsidy for the Keyneton Primary School, and my question is subsequent to a question asked by the member for Light. I wrote a letter about two months ago, pointing out that the Keyneton Primary School had received no notification of its subsidy allocation for 1970-71, and I asked for a reply so that I could notify the school of the position. Subsequently, when I was in Keyneton, I heard by chance that a letter had been sent to the school notifying it of its allocation, although I had received no reply to my letter. About a fortnight later, I telephoned the Minister's Secretary and, as a result, I received a reply to my original letter. Although this may have been an oversight, I consider that in the circumstances it would be common courtesy for a Minister to reply to a member's letter or question as promptly as possible. Further, although I believe that all the subsidies were probably allocated at the same time, I think that in the circumstances steps should be taken to expedite these replies.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will draw the honourable member's complaint to the Minister's attention, although I am sure that it would have been the result of an oversight. Knowing that the procedure in the Minister's department is to provide replies in the circumstances outlined by the honourable member, I regret that the reply was not given and I will draw the matter to the Minister's attention.

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Premier ask his Ministers to get somewhere near up to date in providing replies to questions asked in this House? The question of longest standing that I have asked was asked on July 22 and about a month ago I asked for a reply to that question. I think it only fair that members should be given these replies. I know that Ministers have many problems on their minds and that they are worried, but they should reply to our questions within a reasonable time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will bring the honourable member's remarks to the attention of my colleagues. In many cases, although members opposite have been notified that

replies are available, those members have taken an inordinately long time to ask for the replies.

#### MICROPHONES

The SPEAKER: I wish to announce that the microphones do not seem to be working and I shall be obliged if honourable members will speak up a little, as it is difficult to hear. I understand that a technician will attend to investigate the matter shortly.

#### UNION MEMBERSHIP

Mr. SLATER: Will the member for Glenelg say whether he has ever been a member of a recognized trade union? If he has, what was the trade union and is he still a member? If he is not still a member, why was his membership terminated?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member does not necessarily have to reply but, if he desires to reply, he may do so.

Mr. MATHWIN: I do not wish to reply.

#### LAMEROO AREA SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Works ascertain whether it is intended to provide air-conditioning initially when the new Lamerloo Area School is built? If it is not, will he ascertain whether the fresh-air circulation ducts that are to be installed at the school will be suitable for air-conditioning if it is decided later as a matter of policy to install air-conditioning in such schools? If the ducting at present provided for in the specifications is not of the required size to be suitable for air-conditioning in future, will the Minister see whether or not it is still possible, in view of the progress made so far in regard to planning, to have this matter reviewed to see whether the specifications might be altered to ensure that they would be suitable should future policy be to provide air-conditioning in new solid construction schools?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take up the matter with the Public Buildings Department and to bring down a report for the honourable member as soon as possible.

#### NURSE TRAINING

Dr. TONKIN: In the absence of the Attorney-General, will the Premier obtain from the Chief Secretary replies to the questions I asked on August 6 relating to the training of nurses? As I have said before, having an interest in health matters I find it rather difficult to have to ask questions through another Minister, but that is inevitable. I should

appreciate it if some of the answers could come back as soon as possible. Although I realize that there may be difficulties in replying to these questions, I cannot really see those difficulties.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague.

#### DENTAL CLINICS

Mr. ALLEN: In the absence of the Attorney-General, will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary whether dental clinic services can be made available to students at the Peterborough High School? At present, as there is no resident dental surgeon in the Peterborough township, it is necessary for residents of this town either to go to Adelaide for dental services or to travel about 70 miles to the nearest dentist. Earlier this year, the Peterborough businessmen's association approached the Chief Secretary requesting that dental clinic services be extended in the district, with the result that services were made available to the Peterborough St. Joseph's Convent, the Terowie Primary School and the Yongala Primary School. I have now received from the Peterborough High School a request for these dental clinic services to be made available also to students of the Peterborough High School.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get the information for the honourable member.

#### BUILDING CONTRACT

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Premier have the Prices Branch investigate allegations by one of my constituents that he has been grossly misled by the agent of a builder in relation to a building contract? In deference to the people concerned, I will not name the purchaser, agent or builder, but I can make this information available to the Prices Branch. My constituent recently purchased a house (a "spec" house) in Brodie Road, Morphet Vale, where he is now living, having arranged for what is called temporary finance. On approaching the State Bank for a mortgage, he was told that a request for a mortgage on the very same house had been refused two years before on the grounds that the house was badly cracked. My constituent alleges that, two weeks before he purchased the house (and this is something he subsequently found out), cracks that had been in the walls for two years were patched up and painted over. He was not told anything of the previous history of the house, but was told that

it was two years old; he alleges that he has since found out that it is four years old.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will have the matter investigated. The Prices Commissioner's powers in relation to real property are limited. If the honourable member supplies the information to me, I will make it available not only to the Prices Commissioner but also to the Builders Licensing Board.

#### MORPHETTVILLE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. MATHWIN: On August 25, in reply to my question about repaving the Morphettville Primary School yard, the Minister of Education said that he had no information but that he would find out the answer and let me know. In his absence, can the Premier say whether that information is available?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will bring the matter to my colleague's attention.

#### PORNOGRAPHY

Mr. EVANS: In the absence of the Attorney-General and the Minister of Education, has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about pornographic literature? The Minister of Education told me yesterday that he had the reply, but I did not get a chance to ask for it then.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am amazed that the honourable member did not have a chance to ask his question yesterday, in view of the fact that Question Time did not cease until, I think, 2.20 p.m.!

Mr. Millhouse: Weren't you sorry about that?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In fact, no-one was more delighted than I was with the result of the debate yesterday: the attitude of the Government has been confirmed by Parliament. To return to the honourable member's question, as requested by the honourable member the Attorney-General wrote to the Postmaster-General regarding the matter, and the Postmaster-General has now replied as follows:

The distribution of unsolicited advertising material by mail is, of course, a common business practice. Unless such items contravene the postal legislation in some way they are entitled to postal transmission under the appropriate conditions of the service paid for by the sender. Whilst I appreciate that the material concerned can be offensive to some recipients, opinions on issues of this kind do, of course, vary widely throughout the community. It is felt that for articles of this type it would be inappropriate for my department to attempt to determine these issues by intervening in the matter. I might mention that any item an

addressee does not wish to accept may be marked "Refused" and posted unopened in any letter receiver.

#### WORKING HOURS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier say whether the Government intends to introduce amendments to the Industrial Code to provide for a 35-hour working week? On page 3 of this morning's paper there is a report that states:

Next year would be the year for a 35-hour working week, the President of the Australian Council of Trade Unions (Mr. R. J. L. Hawke) said yesterday.

I understand that last Monday the Premier marched through the streets of Adelaide with the gentleman in question. I see that last evening in his second reading explanation of the Industrial Code Amendment Bill the Minister of Labour and Industry foreshadowed an overhaul of the Industrial Code. I therefore ask whether this provision for a 35-hour working week, which I understand is in conformity with the policy of the Labor Party, will be included in the Bill.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No decision to that effect has been taken by the Government.

#### CONCRETE SLEEPERS

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked recently in the Loan Estimates debate about the use of concrete sleepers by the Railways Department?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The possible use of prestressed concrete sleepers on South Australian railway lines is constantly under review but at this juncture it is considered that the economics favour timber sleepers.

#### RAILWAY MATISA CAR

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate on August 25 about use of the Matisa car and the supply of ballast for railway track work? Although the Minister suggested that I might not be interested in the value of the Matisa car and the work it would be doing, I assure him that I have considerable interest in the upgrading of the section of line in question and would be pleased to have all the information that he can give me.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to give the honourable member all the information I have. The Victorian Railways Matisa track recording car has operated over the Murray Bridge to Serviceton section twice in

this calendar year. The ballast to be obtained from Mount Monster will be used to ballast the line south of Tailem Bend.

#### MYPOLONGA SCHOOLHOUSE

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Premier, in the absence of the Minister of Education, find out when the new schoolhouse at Mypolonga is to be built and whether it will be built in the existing schoolgrounds or on a township block nearby?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get the information for the honourable member.

#### RAILWAY RESUMPTIONS

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate about finalizing settlements in respect of land resumed by the Railways Department?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Not all land-owners affected by rail standardization have as yet been compensated for the land taken. Those outstanding comprise 15 between Gladstone and Jamestown, two between Ucolta and Yongala, and one between Ucolta and Methuen. All but two of these are at present with the Crown Solicitor for preparation of transfers and final settlement, due allowance being made for interest on the purchase price from the date of entry to the settlement date, and adjustments of rates and taxes.

#### BUS NOISE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport please reply to the question I asked on September 17 regarding the annoyance caused to a resident living near the Westbourne Park bus route terminus?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: On mornings during the cold winter months it is necessary for bus engines to be kept running at idling speed while buses are standing at termini. It has been found that during this period bus engines frequently cannot be started when cold and, unless the abovementioned precaution is taken, serious disruptions to services could occur. Relocation of the terminus would not solve the problem but would merely transfer it elsewhere. The Municipal Tramways Trust regrets any inconvenience caused to residents because of this practice and is doing everything possible to minimize engine noise and exhaust emissions.

#### TORRENS RIVER PUMPING

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Works explain the policy of the Engineering and Water Supply Department regarding pumping

from the Torrens River? I know of the procedure followed and the arrangements made after the Kangaroo Creek reservoir was built, whereby water has been supplied to the Adelaide City Council in terms of a long-standing arrangement, the council having been the first consumer provided with water in this State. I also know that several divertees (market gardeners and other persons) pump from the river. Will the Minister explain whether this procedure still operates; whether, having regard to the legislation we have been considering recently regarding the Torrens River, this practice will continue; and, thirdly, if that legislation is passed, what would be the position if any new divertee or other person wished to pump from the river?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I understand that the progress made with the legislation to which the honourable member has referred has not been great. The measure is having a rather rough passage, for some reason or other. I have not examined the matter to which he has referred but I will do that, giving special attention to the points he raises, and tell him what is the outcome of that consideration.

#### CITRUS COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. WARDLE: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he intends to table the report of the Citrus Organization Committee, which I believe he has at the moment and, if he does intend to table it, when we can expect that it will be tabled?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will inquire of my colleague.

#### EYRE PENINSULA RAILWAY WORKS

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport give me a complete answer to the question I asked during the Loan Estimate debate regarding the ballasting and re-laying being carried out on Eyre Peninsula? On August 25, I asked the Minister whether it was intended that this work, at present in progress on Eyre Peninsula, was to be continued, and I went on to ask a question about hopper waggons. The Minister today replied to the latter part of my question but did not reply to the former part. Would he now obtain that reply for me?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It would appear from what the honourable member has said that he started off on one train and then jumped on to another. However, I will refer the matter back to the Railways Department and obtain that information for him.



**CRESCENT YOUTH CLUB**

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked him many weeks ago regarding the use of the institute in the Garden Suburb, particularly by the Crescent Youth Club and the pensioners' association?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: True, it is many weeks since the honourable member asked this question. It is also many weeks since I told him I had a reply.

Mr. Millhouse: I received the notification yesterday.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: You had that information before the recess.

Mr. Millhouse: No, I got it yesterday.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Further to my comments of September 17, 1970, in connection with the Crescent Youth Club at Colonel Light Gardens, I wish to add that with the assistance of my colleague, the Minister of Works, arrangements are now in hand for officers of the Public Buildings Department to prepare necessary plans and specifications for repairs to the community hall. In the meantime, following discussions with the Garden Suburb Commissioner, the only disturbance to the continuity of use of the hall by the Crescent Youth Club and other people (and that includes pensioners) will be as a result of work to improve the facilities. I am extremely happy that, contrary to prior opinion that it was not worth spending money on this hall (indeed, the honourable member in asking his question referred to this aspect), it has been decided, the hall having been examined by experts from the Public Buildings Department, that the building is completely sound structurally.

Mr. Millhouse: Who is to bear the cost of the repairs?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Government. As a result of the active co-operation that the Minister of Works has extended to me in this regard, the Public Buildings Department is preparing plans and specifications and will supervise the contract.

**POLICE ESCORTS**

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked during the Loan Estimates debate regarding police escorts?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: A police officer is supplied every day to escort a departmental officer with a large sum of money to the bank. The Motor Vehicles Department pays

the Police Department for this service. This is normal procedure where large amounts of money are involved.

**RECREATION FACILITIES**

Mr. EVANS: Will the Deputy Premier, in the absence of the Premier, negotiate with the Minister of Education and the Director of the Adelaide Botanic Garden regarding the possibility of schoolgrounds being used by the public and the possibility of children using, at desirable times, Botanic Garden properties as short cuts to their schools? In a recent edition of the *Advertiser* the Director of the Botanic Garden (Mr. Lothian) is reported as saying that schoolgrounds should be opened to the public for weekend sport and other activities. Some people in my area, who also hold the same view, have asked me to express in this House their concern that much money is being spent on school properties that are not being used to the best advantage, being left idle at weekends. In one instance at Blackwood, a Mr. Ashby has been kind enough to donate a property at the end of Sherbourne Road to the Botanic Garden. If children could walk through this property on their way to school they could be saved a walk of about three-quarters of a mile. The residents of the area believe that, if Mr. Lothian could make a path available through this area for school-children, the children would be encouraged not to become destructive but to plant trees and shrubs and take an interest in them. I think, too, that it would be courteous to ask Mr. Ashby, who donated the property to the Botanic Garden and who has the life tenancy of the property, whether he approves of this course of action.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am aware of the area to which the honourable member has referred, which was donated by Mr. Ashby to the Botanic Garden, a very generous action on his part. When I was Minister of Lands I inspected this area soon after it was handed over. I shall be happy to take up the matter of the use of school ovals by the public at weekends. Evidently, this matter is the prerogative of the headmaster concerned, but I will certainly take it up with the Minister of Education and ask him to consider not only that matter but the other matter to which the honourable member has referred.

**WATER EXTENSIONS**

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Government intends to review the current policy of the Engineering and

Water Supply Department whereby persons requiring water main extensions are required to share the costs on the basis of a division of costs by those who will accept the costs, even though all the properties passed will ultimately benefit from the extension? I have referred before to a subdivision of 15 units, the holders of six of which receive their water from indirect services and refuse to accept any of the costs of a water main extension past their property so that the other units in the subdivision could benefit. Could a policy be laid down whereby, once a certain percentage of all the landholders are prepared to accept the costs, it could be a cost against all of them?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have had representations concerning this matter. The honourable member will appreciate the difficulties involved in formulating a policy to cover every possible situation that can occur; from time to time there are bound to be anomalies. The matter is being investigated not only because of the point raised by the honourable member but because of a similar situation that has occurred in Mount Gambier and several others that have been referred to us. I have asked the Engineer-in-Chief to see whether he cannot formulate a policy that could cover the aspects referred to.

#### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the absence of the Attorney-General, I ask the Minister of Labour and Industry a question about the application outside South Australia of the Workmen's Compensation Act. I have been referred to a judgment given by a magistrate in a country court to the effect that a South Australian court is not competent to make an award under the Workmen's Compensation Act when the accident that gave rise to the action occurred outside the territorial limits of South Australia. This is a matter of some disquiet. The same legal problem has occurred in several other States, notably New South Wales and Victoria, but I do not know of a decision of a superior court in South Australia on the subject. As it is undesirable that there should be any doubt about the matter, I ask whether the Government intends to introduce the necessary amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Act to make it clear that compensation may be awarded pursuant to the Act when the accident occurs outside the State.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am pleased to inform the honourable member that the member for Playford has already

referred this matter to me<sup>o</sup> and attention has been given to it. It is intended to include such a provision in the Workmen's Compensation Act when the legislation is brought down at an early date.

Mr. Millhouse: This session?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes.

#### TRAFFIC ISLAND

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport recommend to the Road Traffic Board that the traffic island at the Adelphi Terrace and Sturt Street intersection on Anzac Highway be altered to allow motor vehicles to turn from the northern side to the southern side of Anzac Highway? Since the traffic island was erected considerable development has taken place on the northern side of Anzac Highway and motorists are having difficulty in reaching the shops, especially the all-night chemist, on the southern side of Anzac Highway.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should not be willing to recommend that the traffic island be altered as suggested. I should be willing, however, to ask the Road Traffic Board to review the traffic island to see whether in its opinion the island should be altered. It is not my prerogative to recommend a course of action to the board, which comprises the Commissioner of Police, the Commissioner of Highways, and a representative of local government, all of whom have far more knowledge of road traffic affairs than I have. The services of a traffic engineer are also available to the board. I should be delighted, however, to ask the board to review the position to see whether the alteration suggested is desirable in the interests of road safety.

#### NORTH-EASTERN HOSPITAL

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In the absence of the Attorney-General, can the Premier reply to the question I asked a few days ago whether the Government intends to proceed with the erection of the north-eastern community hospital?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The basis on which capital works for metropolitan community hospitals might be supported by Government subsidy is at present under review by the Director-General of Medical Services and a report will be submitted to the Chief Secretary at an early date. The committee of the proposed north-eastern community hospital would be faced with meeting interest charges on a large capital debt under the present basis of granting subsidy on a \$2 for \$1 basis, as the funds available from donations are far short of

the amount which the committee would have to find. The committee could proceed with erection of the new hospital under current arrangements for Government subsidy, but it has been advised to await a decision as to means by which additional financial assistance might be made available. The Commonwealth Government's assistance towards the nursing home part of this hospital complex is dependent upon funds being raised by the committee other than from State Government sources, as funds of this latter nature do not qualify for Commonwealth subsidy.

#### KANGAROO ISLAND FERRY

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: My question, addressed to the Minister of Roads and Transport, refers to the road link with the proposed ferry from Cape Jervis to Kangaroo Island. It is some time since the Minister has replied to a question on this subject in the House, and I have from time to time received inquiries from various people and organizations on Kangaroo Island whose main concern is that the timing of the project will not leave a gap consequent on the cessation of the guarantee to Adelaide Steamship Company Limited in respect of the running of the *Troubridge*. I merely wish to know whether the Minister still has in mind this problem of timing. Although I know that, bearing in mind all the various processes that have to be gone through, the Minister cannot give me the detail of what is taking place, I ask whether he still has the whole matter in mind.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think the short answer to both questions is "Yes". The Minister of Marine and I have over the past few weeks been actively engaged in discussions on this matter, both within our own departments and with Canberra, and throughout we are stressing that the ferry must be operating by July 1, 1972. Although I think that this is readily accepted by all concerned, I point out at this stage that we must certainly keep the project moving if we are to meet the deadline. We are still working on this date, and there is no reason at this stage why we will not be able to achieve our objective.

#### MOSQUITOES

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Marine say what progress has been made in eradicating mosquitoes near Torrens Island? I recall that this important question was asked by you, Mr. Speaker, and by the member for Price when I was Minister of Marine.

Mr. Ryan: They're still there.

Mr. COUMBE: At that time, I had certain work undertaken to eradicate this nuisance. Can the Minister now either inform me of the position or prepare for me a report on the efficacy of the steps then taken, and will he ascertain whether this nuisance has now been eradicated?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I can only say that the honourable member should have no doubts about the efficacy of the work undertaken, because he put it in train and would no doubt believe that it would have been successful. However, as I am not certain whether it was or was not successful, I will obtain the report that he has requested.

#### REFUSE DISPOSAL

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Local Government take up with metropolitan councils the problem of refuse disposal with the object of having a refuse treatment plant built in the metropolitan area?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It'll do you out of business.

Mr. EVANS: I would expect that sort of comment. Several people in my district have written to me about this matter and have brought to my notice the fact that we are heading for a serious problem. As my constituents have said, we are already burning much waste that could be treated by an impact-type crusher, which would reduce the material to a common size so that it could be dumped effectively. Alternatively, if necessary, we could use the type of plant used in other countries, where magnets are used to take out all the ferrous material, which is used as scrap, the organic material being taken out and used as fertilizer and the remainder being disposed of by dumping. This matter concerns the whole community, as the burning of rubbish will only lead to pollution and will create many problems for society in the future. We need to reduce as much as possible the quantity of material that we burn, or pollution in the atmosphere will be increased. I believe that the Minister or local government authorities could well make use of the information obtained recently by the Town Clerk of Brighton who went overseas on a Churchill Fellowship to study this matter. Although there may be some laughter opposite about it, I believe that it is a serious problem, and I ask the Minister to take up the matter with the seriousness with which I have asked the question.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am willing to have a look at this matter, although I do

not know about taking it up with any authorities, for I am not sure to which authorities the honourable member is referring or whether he wants me to take up the matter with all local government authorities within the metropolitan area. However, I think the honourable member is a little off key when he talks about the large-scale burning of garbage, because few councils, if any, are currently engaged in this sort of destruction method. Some councils (I think the council in whose area the honourable member lives, and certainly the council in whose area I live) are engaged in the landfill disposal method, and this is a highly satisfactory method from the environmental point of view. More important, this method is restoring some of the scars created in the Adelaide Hills by indiscriminate quarrying and is also creating pleasant areas of park land. However, this does not apply to some councils. Only a fortnight or so ago I saw a demonstration of disposal by smokeless burning and, although it was not quite smokeless, I said at the time that this method had potential and perhaps needed perfecting. This is a real problem, which cannot be minimized in regard to some councils. Although I am not certain at this stage what is the best method of trying to solve the problem, it certainly can be looked at and possibly some solution reached.

#### HOSPITAL BENEFITS

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to ascertain why the Mutual Hospital Association Limited and similar organizations do not give contributors any rebate on outpatients' fees incurred at public hospitals? I point out that a person who attends the outpatients' department in certain public hospitals is required to pay a fee of \$1, for which no rebate is given by organizations such as I have mentioned. However, for people who go to their own doctor, bearing in mind the rebate now payable, it costs only 80c to get the same sort of service.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will take up the matter with the Minister.

#### PARLIAMENT HOUSE PARKING

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Works explain why it was suggested that the transfer letter "H" be placed on members' motor vehicles to enable them to park in front of or at the rear of Parliament House? Many constituents have asked me about the stickers, suggesting that I engineered them to promote "Heini for Hanson".

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If "Heini for Hanson" did not have the sticker on his car, he would not be able to park it outside the House, but I am glad that the honourable member has given me an opportunity to say something about this matter. There has been a tremendous problem in regard to parking in front of Parliament House. I have received a request from the Road Traffic Board to discontinue the practice or to have parallel parking instead of ranking, which applies at present. Frankly, there is not sufficient room in front of Parliament House for members' cars and for the cars of others who are authorized persons, because the whole thing is being abused. In issuing these stickers to people, I made a genuine effort to see that people were restricted to the use of one car so that they would use only one place in front of the House and so that room would be available and the convenience of members would not be interfered with. Parking in the area at the rear of the House is also being abused, although that area is for the use of members only. Only yesterday, the police officer who looks after the parking arrangements in front of the House informed me that not many members were co-operating with him in regard to the use of stickers. If this system does not work, and the situation arises, as arose in the past, that members cannot park their cars when they should be able to do so, I shall have to take steps to see that no member or any other authorized person can park a car in front of Parliament House unless it has a sticker on it, and that will be enforced. However, I will not do that until members have had the opportunity to co-operate with the policeman in front of the House.

Mr. Hopgood: The "H" is for "Hopgood", isn't it?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

#### SICK AGED

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question concerns a paper that is based on an address given by the Rev. Erwin Vogt in Sunday Focus at the Maughan Church on, I think, the Sunday before last. You, Mr. Speaker, and, I presume, all members of Parliament were invited to attend on that occasion, when Mr. Vogt gave an address entitled "Who will care for the sick aged?" The Rev. Vogt has since sent me a copy of the paper in which he draws attention to the plight of the sick aged in our community, making the point, which I respectfully adopt, that this is not the responsibility of either Party but is a problem that has been

going on for a very long time. In his address, he makes certain suggestions for alleviating the problem, and it is in the power of the Government to act or not to act on these suggestions. One of the suggestions I notice is that the Morris Hospital has empty wards which should be made available for the sick aged. In the absence of the Attorney-General, will the Premier (I presume that, in the absence of the Attorney-General, the Premier has taken it on himself to represent the Attorney-General) ask the Chief Secretary whether the Government has considered the suggestions made by Mr. Vogt in his address and whether it is able to act on any of them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will take up the matter with my colleague.

#### NOTICE PAPER

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I direct a question to you, Mr. Speaker, and I desire to explain it.

Mr. Hoggood: What's the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question is: are you, Sir, yet able to give a reply to the letter I wrote to you on August 28? On that date I wrote to you, renewing the suggestion I had made to one of your predecessors (this suggestion was made by a constituent of mine who is well known to many members) that there should be displayed each sitting day outside of Parliament House a copy of the Notice Paper, in an effort to stimulate interest in the affairs of this House. I notice that the Government has done quite a little lately to provide that stimulus. On September 2 you acknowledged receipt of my letter, saying that you would call for a report on the suggestion and inform me. As it is now about six weeks since you acknowledged my letter, I ask whether you are able to give me a reply.

The SPEAKER: I do not have the reply yet, but I will expedite the matter. I thank the honourable member for directing it to my attention.

#### NEW WARDS

Dr. TONKIN: In the absence of the Attorney-General, will the Premier ask the Chief Secretary to say whether the opening of two additional wards at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, as recently announced by the Chief Secretary, is indicative of an improvement in the nursing situation at that hospital, as was implied, or whether it is in fact due to the closure of the Magill Wards and the subsequent transfer of patients from that institution to the Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will get a reply for the honourable member.

#### JURY FEES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask a question of the Premier, who is apparently representing the Attorney-General this afternoon. It concerns fees paid to jurors, and with your permission, Sir, and the concurrence of the House I desire to explain the question. I have had a letter from a lady at Croydon whose husband was on the jury panel—

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What's the question?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have asked the question.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You said, "It concerns jurors."

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question concerns the payment of jury fees and whether the Government is prepared to increase that payment. I have a letter from a lady at Croydon—

Mr. Ryan: I wonder whose district that's in?

Mr. McKee: He wouldn't get a vote there.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I have had a letter from a lady at Croydon whose husband was on the jury panel last month, I think (or quite recently anyhow), in which she states:

I think it is high time that the payment of jury fees was looked into. My husband has served twice on the jury within a short number of years.

She makes the point that the travelling allowance does not cover the cost: it cost her husband 40c a day on the Port Road bus and he had to walk to Victoria Square, yet he received only 30c a day as travelling allowance. To sum it up, the position is that the payment made to jurors for the service they render to the State is very low. As I think that it has not been reviewed for some time, can the Premier say whether the Government intends to review and increase the payment?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will draw the matter to the attention of the Attorney-General, although the fees were last reviewed when I was Attorney-General.

Mr. Millhouse: That's a long time ago.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You didn't do anything about it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is about four years ago. I will bring the matter to the attention of the Attorney-General.

## PASTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It amends the Pastoral Act in two important respects, as well as removing some sections that are now outdated. First, it provides increased protection to pastoral property against damage from mining operations carried out on lands comprised in pastoral leases. Under the present provisions of the Pastoral Act, claims may be pegged out or granted anywhere on a pastoral lease except within 200yds. of buildings and water storages. It is considered desirable to increase the protected area and to widen the categories of rural improvements that are to be protected from detriment arising from mining operations. In the past, fences, in particular, have frequently suffered damage as a result of the carelessness or lack of consideration of mining operators.

The Bill also introduces a new section empowering the Minister of Lands to alter the boundaries of leases where it becomes apparent that the boundary described in the lease does not correspond with the boundary of the land in actual occupation. In many cases the land physically defined by fences or other means is not accurately represented in the plan comprised in the lease instrument because inadequate facilities existing when that instrument was drawn up prevented perfect surveys. To avoid confusion it is desirable that machinery should exist for correction of boundaries and registration of any corrections on the original lease at the Lands Titles Office.

Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 7 of the principal Act. That section deals with the constitution of the Pastoral Board and provides that the Governor may appoint an additional member from time to time. The sentence that is to be deleted provides that the Governor may direct that the Public Service Act shall not apply to the additional member. There is provision for this in the Public Service Act itself, so the amendment, therefore, prevents unnecessary duplication.

Clause 3 repeals section 8 of the principal Act, which provided for the continuation in office of those members of the Pastoral Board as it existed at the commencement of the principal Act in 1936. The purpose of this provision is of course now exhausted. Clause 4 repeals section 65 of the principal Act, which relates to the appointment of arbitrators to

make valuations where there is a disagreement between the Minister and a lessee. This function will now be performed by the Land and Valuation Court and the section is, therefore, no longer necessary.

Clause 5 amends section 132 of the principal Act. This is the section that seeks to protect pastoralists from damage resulting from mining operations. The Bill increases the protection of pastoralists in several ways. It includes water bores, water tanks and aeroplane landing strips in the categories of protected improvements and extends the area in which mining operations are not to be conducted to an area comprised within a radius of 445yds. from the protected improvement. It also provides that mining operations shall not take place within 25 yards of any fence. The maximum penalty for contravention of these provisions is fixed at \$500. The Minister of Lands may however give permission for the conduct of operations within the prohibited areas in appropriate circumstances.

Clause 6 introduces new section 137a to deal with the problem of correction of boundaries. New subsection (1) provides for alteration of boundaries as shown in leases to correspond with the boundaries of the land in actual physical occupation. New subsection (2) provides that the Minister may lodge memoranda of alterations to boundaries at the Lands Titles Office and the new subsection (3) directs the Registrar-General to note the alteration in the register book and as on any relevant registered instruments. Under new subsection (4) the Minister is empowered to make an adjustment to rental if the boundary alteration is such as to make an adjustment desirable.

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

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL (ADULT FRANCHISE)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 14. Page 1785.)

Mr. CRIMES (Spence): It will not surprise members to be told that I support the Bill. I consider the amendments foreshadowed by the Opposition to be completely impracticable and I consider that members opposite realize this in their hearts. I also think that, if any other State in the Commonwealth of Australia or any other country in the western world adopted such ridiculous proposals as the Opposition has adopted, that State or country would become the laughing stock of the western world.

Mr. McKee: They wouldn't laugh for long.

Mr. CRIMES: I am coming to the matter raised in the interjection. The Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader are fairly good actors, in that they seem, by their remarks, to inject much belief and sincerity into their support of the amendment. I suggest that, when we establish a film industry in South Australia, we would be well served if both offered their undoubted talents to the industry.

A point not answered by the Opposition during this debate is why, if the House of Review is so necessary for responsible Government, members opposite cannot point to any State or country that has a single House of Parliament (that is, a unicameral system) that is in a situation of chaos and confusion. Of course, members opposite cannot point to any such place. Compulsory voting has been mentioned many times and much has been made of it by Opposition members, but that is not an issue in this Bill, as the member for Elizabeth has said. However, assuming it is, is the Australian attitude towards compulsory voting as strong as opponents of the Bill have suggested? My opinion and that of many other people is that whenever a small minority complain or grumble about having to go to the polls compulsorily, they do so merely because Australians like to do a bit of grumbling now and again.

I have often stood outside polling booths as an Australian Labor Party campaign worker, handing out how-to-vote cards, and I know that people who have grumbled have grumbled amiably, and I have gained the impression that they do not mind when they are required by law, not necessarily to vote compulsorily, but to have their names marked off on the roll. I do not think there is any real feeling in the opposition to compulsory voting that is expressed, and it has not been expressed to any great extent.

If people were so opposed to compulsory voting and had gone to the polling booth to get their names marked off the roll and had subsequently voted, there would be more informal votes than we have, and undoubtedly many abusive remarks would be written across ballot-papers. Of course, there are some such remarks and also some humorous ones, but there is no tangible evidence that Australian people, once they know that they have a legal responsibility to attend a polling booth and vote, have any strong objection to doing so.

Many times, when I have been engaged in Australian Labor Party campaigns, I have been asked whether voting is compulsory, and when I have said that voting is not compulsory but that it is morally incumbent on the person to vote, although in most cases the person concerned does not know who the candidates are, he goes along anyway. It seems strange that, as so many legal compulsions flow from Parliamentary legislation, some people should object to compulsion at the very genesis of this legislation. After all, if people have to obey laws made by Parliament, why should they not logically have to attend the polling booth to vote for the people who make these laws? Education is probably one of the most important of the laws ever passed by a democratic Parliament, and I suggest that few people today would claim that education should be other than compulsory. One can see how times have changed, because they have changed to such a tremendous extent.

There was a time when a reactionary Whig Chancellor in the United Kingdom (Robert Lowe) thunderously denounced compulsory schooling for all British children on the ground that it represented a fundamental infringement of parental liberty. As indicated by this change of mind, we will come to a time when no-one will be prepared to advocate that voting for Parliamentary and possibly other Governmental and semi-governmental elections should be other than compulsory.

The Opposition equates responsible government with the presence in a Parliamentary system of an Upper House. It seems from its attitude that it will have that Upper House, in this case the Legislative Council, responsible to almost anyone other than the majority of the people. In other words, it says, "Let us safeguard the House against responsible democracy." From reading the history of Upper Houses in various countries, including our own, I consider that these institutions are always exclusively expressive of an atmosphere of placing property rights before the rights of the people. I refer to 1895 when George Reid was Premier of New South Wales. Incidentally, and rather importantly, he was not a Labor man but a free trade advocate of those times, although that is not the issue now. He had some significant things to say about Upper Houses. On one occasion he said:

The working classes are spoken of as selfish and grasping. But they have gone on for 40 years bearing nearly twice their share of the taxation of the country without organized opposition to the positive injustice affecting them. Put that alongside the conduct of the

Legislative Council and I would like you to tell me which is the narrow, selfish, grasping class in the community.

In 1901, Mr. W. A. Holman, then Leader of the Labor Opposition in New South Wales, said (and this is a point that has already been made in this debate by the member for Tea Tree Gully):

If the press wants to cut down superfluous politicians, why not begin with the Upper House? If they want to save time and to minimize expense, here is a simple way. These gentlemen, who keep so faithful a guardianship over the interests of a class, why should not they be reduced? They are the successors of dead and gone and forgotten statesmen.

This does not indicate any disrespect for these dead and gone and forgotten statesmen, but it does mean that in safeguarding Upper Houses from the onslaught of democratic principles we are keeping alive the ideas of those statesmen, which are also dead and which obviously should be forgotten. I should again like to quote the remarks of Mr. Holman, because they are relevant in this connection. In 1910, nine years after he made the comments to which I have already referred, Mr. Holman said:

They are like specimens that may be obtained from different geological strata. They are in no fear of judgment to come from the people.

This is exactly the Opposition's attitude: at the same time as the Opposition offers adult franchise to us it indicates that it is prepared to take it away by instituting a separate roll for the Legislative Council and a separate polling date for Legislative Council elections. It has been said that, if we had the adult franchise in the terms put forward by the Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, we would have a glorious opportunity of getting the majority of supporters of the Australian Labor Party and the citizens in the community generally to support A.L.P. candidates. This sounds reasonable, but when one examines the question more closely it is not so reasonable. When it comes to protecting privilege and wealth, those who possess such privilege and wealth are much keener to look around to see how they can get just this than are the people who do not have so great a stake in the society in which they live. Of course, the majority comprises the working people in the community.

It therefore means that the wealthier and more class-conscious people in our society will be careful not to miss voting in elections for the Legislative Council in the terms indicated by the Opposition in its amendments.

From what we have heard from the Opposition it has no justification whatsoever for the amendments it has foreshadowed or for its desire to defeat the Government's Bill. I well remember that, when I first made a speech in this House, which was not so long ago, I welcomed the fresh wind of democracy blowing through this Assembly with the election on May 30 of a Labor Government. However, it did not take me long to realize that when that wind blows farther down the corridor it becomes, to say the least, rather sour.

Mr. Payne: It gets pretty stale.

Mr. CRIMES: I think "stale" would be a better description because when one says "stale" one is referring to things of the past. I remember my earlier references to dead and forgotten things; the staleness is obviously implicit in those terms. The aim of this Bill (and I mentioned the fresh wind of democracy) is to function like a Clean Air Act in the democratic cleansing of the South Australian Parliamentary institution.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I did not intend initially to speak to this Bill. However, if I achieve nothing else, I shall break the monotony of the stream of Government members who have followed one another saying the same thing. I might be able to make one or two points in rebuttal of what those members have said and, perhaps, one or two new points. It is not surprising, when one considers the premise from which the various Parties approach this Bill, that the conclusions we arrive at are somewhat different. Members of the Labor Party make no bones about the fact that they are abolitionists. This has been said in their most up-to-date books and in their rules and platform, and it has been stated vehemently in this debate by several Labor members. I am firmly convinced that it is the judgment of history and of contemporary experience that great benefits accrue through the existence of an Upper House. At least 53 countries have a bicameral system. These are among the most successful democracies and they include the United Kingdom, America, France, Germany, Switzerland, Austria, Spain, Italy, Hungary, Portugal and the Netherlands.

Mr. Payne: Who has General Franco?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Perhaps we should omit Spain from the list of the most successful democracies, but most of these are the successful democracies. For the Upper House to have any function other than as an extension of the Lower House it is necessary for it to have a different franchise. These are the



two basic premises from which I approach this Bill. The member for Spence has said that none of us has taken pains to instance where the unicameral system is not considered a success and I suppose one could refer to dictatorships as being unicameral. However, opinion is far from unanimous regarding the success over the years of the Legislature in Queensland. In 1917 a referendum was held and the people voted to retain the bicameral system. In 1922 the Queensland Labor Government saw fit by what one must deem very devious means (appointing 15 members of its own Party to the Legislative Council) to abolish the Upper House. In a book entitled *The Government of the Australian States* Mr. A. A. Morrison, who was Senior Lecturer in History at the University of Queensland, says:

The long dominance of a single organized political Party further contributed to the decline of the Assembly by transferring public interest from Parliament to the Party. Long before polling day, it was obvious that no change in the Government was likely.

I think the word "gerrymander" had its origin during the 40 years the Labor Party was in power in Queensland.

Mr. Hopgood: It originated in the United States.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I stand corrected, but it could well have applied in Queensland. Mr. Morrison goes on to say:

Hence what the Parliamentary Labor Party decided in caucus inevitably became the law of the State. However closely fought the proposal may have been in caucus, the party voted solidly in the House. Once introduced into the Assembly, the Bill marched irresistibly through all stages, and no Government Bill was ever defeated and very few were even laid aside. Nor was there much hope of any amendment by the Assembly. It is not surprising that in such circumstances the standard of debate should deteriorate. From 1915 to 1922, while the Legislative Council was still in existence, the position was somewhat different. Some measures were introduced and then laid aside because of the development of unexpectedly strong opposition from the interests represented in the Council. I believe this is significant when we consider the position in South Australia at present. Mr. Morrison continues:

Sometimes, with the deliberate intention of securing further grievances against the Council, the Government introduced provisions which were certain to be rejected by the second chamber.

That is one opinion which differs from that of the member for Spence, who believes that the unicameral system is an unqualified success wherever it operates. I am convinced that the bicameral system has been proved to be a

most valuable system. I am not ashamed to say that the Upper House is a conservative House and that this is its proper function. If the Upper House is to be a House of Review, the legislative process will not be in all instances a particularly rapid one. If people have doubts and if the voices of minority groups are to be heard in Parliament, I believe that the proper function of Parliament is to listen to these voices, to weigh things up in the long term, and to make what it considers to be a correct decision. When only one House of Parliament exists, however, I believe that this function cannot be fulfilled. I make no apology for being firmly convinced that the bicameral system is desirable.

I think the member for Florey said that a furore had been aroused in the minds of the public regarding the Upper House. In the recent by-election in Midland only 20 per cent of those eligible to vote did so in the District of Playford. I think that shows that the general public is not unduly concerned about the Upper House. Although I know it is the aim of the Government to stir up trouble regarding the Upper House, I do not believe it is a vital matter in the minds of the public of South Australia. The member for Mount Gambier said he believed that there were many instances of the Legislative Council throwing out legislation. However, the only time this would worry the Labor Government would be during its term of office, but during the last term of office of the Labor Government the Legislative Council considered 244 Bills of which it rejected only 11, and many others were improved by amendment. The wisdom of the rejection of these 11 Bills was seen by the Government, an example being the road transport legislation. In fairness, I do not think Government members can say that the Legislative Council in this State is obstructive.

Mr. McKee: The point at issue is whether we should give full franchise. Can you get around to that point?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Having sat here for many hours listening to Government members talking about anything but the subject matter of the Bill, I do not think that the points I am making are altogether irrelevant.

Mr. Payne: But it is fair to ask your views.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the member for Mitchell will be patient, I will tell him my views on the franchise. As I say, the proper function of the Upper House is for it to be a deliberative House and more or less

to have the conservative role of protecting the citizens of the State against hasty and ill-considered legislation. Government members have made what I consider are some particularly ill-conceived and insulting personal references to members of the Legislative Council, and I do not think that this does them any credit, although by the same token I do not think it does members of another place any real harm. From my knowledge of Legislative Councillors, particularly those with whom I have been associated in the Midland District, I believe that they work hard. Although they do not sit in Parliament as much as we do, those with whom I have been associated, and I believe the other members also, do their duty and work hard in the interests of their constituents. If they do not come into members' districts, perhaps they are not invited.

Mr. Keneally: They don't have to be invited; they are representatives of the people.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I suggest that if any elector approached his Legislative Councillor he would be given the same service as that which he receives from any member on this side, and that is good service. Although I have not seen much of the workings of Labor members, I know of the work done by members on this side, and I know of the work done by those Legislative Councillors with whom I am acquainted. If an approach were made to these members to look into a matter on behalf of a constituent, they would be perfectly happy to do so.

Mr. Keneally: But the constituents don't know who they are. That's the point.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kavel!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I suggest that this is not peculiar to members of the Upper House, because I know perfectly well that some of the city members are not known to all their electors. I know this at first hand, but I will not waste the time of the House by recounting the instance, although I may say that it was not a member on this side who was not known to his constituents. Indeed, in this case, it was a man in his early 30's, whom one would think would know who was his member of Parliament. However, the Labor member concerned was apparently so active that the man in question did not know who he was! In these circumstances, if the Upper House is not to be an extension of the

Lower House, it is necessary that there be some difference in franchise.

The franchise was enlarged considerably, I think, last year, to include the spouses of all enrolled voters. Many people who can be enrolled will not bother to be enrolled. I believe that most people in this State are happy with the Legislature as it stands. Much has been said about the power of the Upper House, but let me point out that any measure introduced in the Upper House must be passed by the Lower House before it can become the law of the State.

Mr. Hopgood: Thank the Lord for that!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am inclined to agree, and I think this is an argument for the two-House system. If one applies the argument one way, it must also be applied the other way. Nevertheless, quite frankly, I do not believe that the Upper House should be the place where most legislation is initiated. I see the Upper House as a House of Review and, in the circumstances, its proper function is to examine the legislation passed here, to improve it and, if necessary, to introduce the occasional Bill itself. Having said this, I do not consider that the present franchise is grossly unfair. The Labor Party intends to tinker with the franchise regarding local government elections, a franchise with which I am sure most citizens in this State are happy. In these circumstances, and as members opposite make no bones about the fact that they intend to abolish this most useful House of Review, I intend to oppose the Bill and to support the foreshadowed amendments.

Mr. McKEE (Pirie): I am pleased once again to have the opportunity to support the provision contained in this measure. As the older members know, this matter has been kicked around the House on many previous occasions, but without much success. Anyhow, I am more than grateful when I realize that at this stage we are wearing down Opposition members. I think they know that this measure has been brought about by the efforts of the great Australian Labor Party, the people's Party, which is the biggest single political Party in Australia and the only political Party that stands for true democracy, namely, government by the people for the people. As I say, ours is the only true Party that represents democracy and that is why we have introduced this Bill. Honourable members opposite have hedged around and dodged the issue regarding the franchise, merely saying how good the Upper House is, how necessary it is, how hard it works, how friendly are its members, and

how they go around the country interviewing constituents who do not even know them.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Who said that?

Mr. McKEE: They have referred to all sorts of issue except the one dealt with by this Bill.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What happens when Legislative Council members come into your area? Do they visit it?

Mr. McKEE: They get there occasionally. They usually come to functions where there is plenty of grog and food, and they have a big tag around their necks to indicate who they are. Needless to say, the one or two people who support them make sure that they are well catered for with the occasional whisky and other refreshments. The Opposition is running away from giving the people some form of democracy. The only form of democracy that we hear about from them is the lip service that they give this matter occasionally. In fact, some members opposite are not even sure to which Party they belong today. I think a question was asked of the member for Eyre yesterday, and he had obviously read the statement in the press that the Country Party had given a clear instruction that its members were not to associate themselves with the Liberal Party. I certainly would not like to associate myself with that Party. Of course, the Country Party made this statement publicly; we have not merely heard it on the grapevine. Statements made yesterday by certain members opposite clearly demonstrated their hatred of and bitterness towards the average person. At the same time, they set themselves up as being greatly superior to ordinary citizens.

Mr. Wells: They show contempt for people.

Mr. McKEE: Yes. They believe they have the divine right to govern, about which we hear so much from the member for Rocky River, who believes he belongs to the class that has the right to rule. The member for Fisher spoke at great length yesterday about rights and privileges. As long as these rights and privileges apply only to him, his Party and the minority of the people his Party represents, that suits him and his followers. He believes that these rights and privileges are too good for the ordinary citizen—that ordinary citizens are not good enough to have a vote for a House as honourable as the Upper House and that it is disgraceful to think of an ordinary citizen voting to elect a member of Parliament to the Upper House! The member for Fisher is prepared to fight to the last ditch to make

sure that the ordinary people never get an opportunity to enjoy the special privileges that he refers to, or to share in the divine right to govern referred to by the member for Rocky River.

The member for Eyre, by interjection, I think, said that he believed that people should qualify for these privileges. It would be most interesting to know just how he qualified for the privileges or to know even how he acquired his qualifications. I should like to know why he should think that he is a more important citizen than are the people who work for him.

Mr. Wells: He obviously thinks that.

Mr. McKEE: Of course he does: he told us that. They all believe they belong to the master class.

Mr. Payne: He's talking about financial status.

Mr. McKEE: True, and that is what they think makes them the master class with a divine right to govern the people. The member for Eyre has often made statements that have shown his utter contempt for ordinary people. It is a pity that a reasonably young fellow like him should make these statements; it worries me to think that he could be around for a long time.

It is common knowledge that the voting system to elect members to the Legislative Council is shocking; it is entirely undemocratic. People abhor this system and therefore have contempt for the Upper House, so they refuse to enrol for it, holding it in contempt for the undemocratic system by which it is elected. They believe that the members of that House think they are of the class that has this divine right to rule, and they therefore prefer to ignore the Upper House, and I agree with them. If it is not good enough for the ordinary person to have a say in electing members to the Upper House, the right thing is for every person to ignore it. However, there is a ray of sunshine: I believe we are wearing them down. Also, I believe that the Scrooge-type diehards of the Establishment are a dying race. This is indicated by motions that are continually passed now by the Young Liberals.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Do they have to have a 75 per cent majority before they get a motion through?

Mr. McKEE: I do not know about that, but they are giving the older members of that Party some food for thought. Recently the Young Liberals passed motions (and no doubt there will be more to come) criticizing the Gorton Government, the franchise for the

Legislative Council, the treatment by the Commonwealth Government of pensioners, that Government's efforts with regard to hospitalization and education, and other things that the Liberal and Country League has been managing for most of the last 34 years. These young people have realized that there is no room left for the people of the old Establishment: I believe they are a dying race.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What about the member for Alexandra?

Mr. McKEE: Yes, and there are a few young fellows coming in as well. I do not know about a migrant who came out from England recently. The member for Alexandra does stand out in this House as a member of the old Establishment. One good thing is that time will beat these people; that is something in our favour. When they arrive down below they will be so busy shaking hands with their good old friends that they will forget about all the terrible things they did and how they suppressed the people while they were on earth. I support the Bill.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): I oppose the Bill, but I will support the amendments foreshadowed by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Jennings: You have to support the Bill to support the amendments.

Mr. BECKER: The honourable member had his opportunity to speak yesterday. The member for Pirie made remarks against the member for Fisher. However, the member for Fisher said that he favoured full adult franchise but that he did not like the motive behind the Bill: to abolish the other place. I share those sentiments. Like him, I am not against the common man—the worker. The member for Fisher and I have much the same feelings in this regard. The Legislative Council has operated in this State since 1851, serving the State well. South Australia has survived through the years, as it will survive in the future with the Legislative Council in operation. In the 37 years to 1967 about 2,400 Bills were presented to the Upper House, only 61 being rejected. That is not a bad record, and it proves that the Upper House is not a House of obstruction. I remind members opposite, too, that I am not quoting from *Winnie the Pooh*. Government members are concerned about the other House but I remind them that, as an election has not yet been held for the Legislative Council on the new boundaries, who is to know that the present ratio of 16 to four will continue after an election? I am a realist and I consider that that ratio

will not continue. We will probably lose some seats, but there is a good chance that in Central No. 1 District, where we of the Liberal and Country League have not had an opportunity to vote in a Council election, we will win one seat, perhaps two seats.

We never hear much about what the members for that district in the Legislative Council do, or see them in the area, but we have heard of what they did to poor old Stan Bevan: he got the axe. If the Government gains control of the Upper House (and it could) we will experience what has happened in Queensland. In 1922, Queensland had the greatest gerrymander of all time and the Queensland branch of the Australian Labor Party ruled that State, through the gerrymander, because it had abolished the Upper House. It was only after the Queensland Labor Party was formed, after the split in the Australian Labor Party, that the Liberal Party was able to return to Government there.

Mr. McKee: Abolition isn't part of the Bill.

Mr. BECKER: It may not be, but the Bill is leading up to that because in the Government there are opportunists who want the Upper House abolished. By so doing, they will have an opportunity to appoint three more Ministers, and I do not think any of those new Ministers will come from the back benches. The Ministers should come from the bench immediately behind the Ministers, but they will come from the intellectual group that has taken control of the workers' party, the Australian Labor Party. As I have said, I will support the amendments foreshadowed by the Leader, providing for voluntary voting, voluntary enrolment, and the holding of elections on different days. I consider that there should be such a system of electing members to the other place, and these amendments will give it to us. Then the system will be fair and democratic. Members opposite say that little interest is taken in the other place, but I remind them that in 1968, in the election in Northern District, there was a 97 per cent poll of eligible voters. That is not a bad record.

Let us consider what happened in the referendum on shop trading hours. That referendum was designed to assist the Government in the Midland by-election, and what a fiasco it proved to be! The referendum was a ridiculous waste of time and public money. The 50,000 people who did not want

to vote and did not vote will be fined for not having voted, because voting was compulsory. Let us consider the thousands of informal votes, and consider also the position that the Government is in today on shopping hours, merely because voting at the referendum was compulsory. Members opposite scream and yell about democracy, but no-one can define democracy. As long as Government members are not upset, that is democracy. I say one thing for the member for Tea Tree Gully: that, of all members opposite, she had the courage of her convictions when she said that she would campaign for the abolition of the Upper House.

Mr. JENNINGS: So would I.

Mr. BECKER: The member for Tea Tree Gully had the courage of her convictions, and that is more than some other members had when they were making their contributions to this debate.

Mr. KENEALLY: That's because we spoke to the Bill, and abolition isn't part of the Bill.

Mr. BECKER: The member for Elizabeth said that the Bill did not provide for compulsory voting. That is true, but compulsory voting is provided for in the Electoral Act and, if voting for the Legislative Council is held on the same day as voting for the House of Assembly, we will really have compulsory voting for the Legislative Council. In Melbourne on January 21, 1968, the former Parliamentary Leader of the Australian Labor Party in the Commonwealth Parliament (Mr. Calwell) said that Australia was just a land of hillbillies, compared with Russia. Naturally, he was referring to members opposite and their Party. That is exactly how they have behaved during this debate. When I look at members opposite, I know where the hillbillies are, and when I hear their speeches I know where the prairie confetti comes from.

Mr. RYAN (Price): If any member was thinking of opposing this Bill he would have been talked out of it by the speech made by the member for Hanson, who did not put one valid point on why anyone should oppose it. Much has been said about the Australian Labor Party and its connection with the future of the Legislative Council. I do not want to hide behind the fact that I, as a member of the Australian Labor Party, have signed a pledge that I will at all times support the rules of the Labor Party, and the ultimate aim of our Party is the abolition of the Upper House. The sooner that is achieved, the better this State will be for it.

Although the name of our Party has been bandied about in this House during the debate, the Party has never changed its name. We have never been known as the illegitimate child of politics, as the Liberal and Country League is known today. The Country Party has asked the Labor Party, of all Parties, not to link the Country Party with the illegitimate Party, the L.C.L., in future. The Country Party has told us, "If you want to refer to the Liberals, refer to them by their correct name, the Liberal Party of Australia or the South Australian Branch of the Liberal Party."

The Country Party does not want to be linked with the Liberal and Country Party, because the Country Party says that there is no such political organization. The Australian Labor Party has always been known by that name and always will be. We are not running away from our name or from our politics or intentions, especially our intentions regarding the Legislative Council. If the member for Hanson wants to know where I stand on this issue, I think I have told him clearly, and I will continue with that stand.

It is amazing that the House of Assembly was created by the Legislative Council. The member for Hanson may not know that. It was created many years ago and one of the conditions in the legislation that was introduced in the Legislative Council was that all adult males should be entitled to vote at House of Assembly elections. This was a condition imposed on the voters by the august Chamber that we know today. Members opposite have conveniently forgotten one aspect: they have spoken of compulsory voting but they have not said that the Bill does not use that term. It does not say that there shall be compulsory voting for the Legislative Council. It provides that there shall be one roll for all electors in this State. Does anyone deny that this is a real advantage in relation to voting? I have always believed that we in this country are Australians. We might consider ourselves to be South Australians, this State being a part of Australia, but in the first instance we are really Australians and as such should have an Australian outlook on many matters including politics. However, what do we find: that we are Australians when it comes to voting for the House of Representatives; that we are Australians when it comes to voting for the Senate; that we are Australians when it comes to House of Assembly voting; but we are South Australian, second-rate citizens when it comes to voting for the Legislative Council.

Every person in this State, whether he is eligible to vote or not, is concerned with the laws that Parliament makes. He is also concerned with the laws the Legislative Council passes, rejects or amends, and it is not a question of whether a person is or is not over 18 years of age or whether or not he has to vote: everyone is concerned with the laws of the country and the taxes imposed on them. Also, everyone is concerned with the way in which the Government spends money as well as with the laws made by both Houses of Parliament. If the laws of this State affect a person's living, why should he not have the right to determine who shall be his representative in the Parliament that makes the laws that will govern his behaviour? No-one can deny a person that right. It has been stated on many occasions that the Senate is a second-rate Upper House and should not exist. If any moves backward have been made regarding voting for such an Upper House, they have been made by the South Australian branch of the Liberal Party, especially when one considers its attitude to this Bill.

Members opposite who have spoken have expressed hatred of compulsion in any shape or form, especially compulsion as it affects voting for political purposes. Let us examine the complete somersault that members of the Liberal Party have made on this issue. When a long-overdue Bill providing for a redistribution was before this House last year, the Liberal Party eventually had to agree that this was what the people of this State wanted. It jumped on the bandwagon and finally agreed with the Labor Party that the Bill should be passed. That Bill was before members in this House and those in the Legislative Council. The Liberal Party feared that a redistribution of boundaries would put the Labor Party into office, and, despite what they say, the members of the Liberal Party in the Upper House are endorsed by the Liberal Party, the same as the members of the Labor Party in that House are endorsed by the Labor Party. The four Labor members in the Legislative Council do not try to hide the fact that they are the endorsed members of the Labor Party. However, the position is different regarding Liberal members, because they deny that they are endorsed by the Liberal Party. We know, however, that they could not be members of that Chamber unless endorsed by their Party. They must put into effect the policy of the Party that endorsed them and, if they do not do that, they suffer the same consequences as do Liberal members in this Chamber. If they

do not abide by the will of the Party that pre-selects them, their pre-selection will be withdrawn, and it does not make any difference whether they are members of the Australian Labor Party or of the South Australian branch of the Liberal Party: they are bound by the rules of their Party. How can the Legislative Council, therefore, be a House of Review?

Fearing that the redistribution might create a position whereby the Labor Party could become the Government by overcoming the gerrymander, and fearing that their future may be jeopardized as a result of such a redistribution, what did Liberal members of the Legislative Council do? They wrote into the Bill a provision which had nothing to do with the redistribution at that time: that there should be no interference with the powers of the Legislative Council. The Legislative Council could not be abolished unless by the compulsory vote of the electors on the House of Assembly roll. Where is the hatred of this compulsion when these people, to safeguard their own future, write into an Act a provision that their power cannot be interfered with and that the Legislative Council cannot be abolished unless by a referendum on the compulsory vote of all persons entitled to vote for the House of Assembly? One member of this House said on one occasion that it was putting poison in the hands of children to give the people the right to vote in the referendum. This is the most ridiculous turnabout that I have ever seen any political Party make. The Labor Party's attitude on this matter has not altered one iota. It has gradually whittled away the disadvantages it has faced in overcoming the gerrymander, and I have no doubt that it will overcome the difficulties of implementing Labor Party policy in respect of the Legislative Council.

I could give another instance of how the South Australian branch of the Liberal Party, as divorced from the Country Party, has changed its spots over the years. It would appear that the Liberal Party has been going backwards for many years; indeed, this is illustrated in the results of the election. Ever since I have been a member of this House the Labor Party has not lost an election. True, it has not been the Government on every occasion but, on the other hand, it has never been defeated at the polls. In 1855, the Constitution Bill was introduced. Mr. G. S. Kingston, who later became Sir George Kingston (so he would not have been a member of the Labor Party but would have been one of the elevated members of the Party opposite), was

elected a member of the Legislative Council in 1851, and remained a member until 1857.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Was he elected or appointed?

Mr. RYAN: He was elected, and he was a Liberal, not a member of the Liberal and Country Party (the illegitimate Party, as it is today). He was an elected member, and when the House of Assembly was created he became a member of the House of Assembly. He was a member of the House of Assembly from 1857 to 1880, and Speaker of the House from 1857 to 1860 and again from 1865 to 1880. I am giving these details, because on November 7, 1855, Mr. Kingston, as he then was, gave notice that he would move to amend the Constitution Bill, the second reading of which was set down for November 20, as follows:

That this Council is of opinion that, in order to meet the wishes of the colonists, as expressed at the recent general election, the Bills granting an amended Constitution to South Australia should contain enactments carrying out in detail the following principles:

- I. Responsible government.
- II. The extension of the elective franchise to every male twenty-one years of age, untainted by crime, who has been resident in and registered six months in the district.
- III. The Parliament to consist of two Chambers, both elective; the Upper House to consist of twelve and the Lower House of thirty-six members.
- IV. The election to the Upper House to be by all the electors of the Colony, voting as one district.
- V. The election to the Lower House to be by districts; for which purpose the colony shall be divided into electoral districts, comprising, as nearly as practicable equal numbers, with power of revision from time to time.
- VI. The qualifications for voters to both Houses to be the same.
- VII. No property qualification for members of either House.
- VIII. The Lower House to be elected for a period not exceeding five years.
- IX. In the Upper House, one half of the members to retire, and a fresh election to take place in their stead at every dissolution of the Lower House.

What did we see on May 30 last? Members talk about the Hon. Mr. Bevan's retiring! When the Government went to the people at the last election, members of the Legislative Council said, "You can't take us to the people; we're here for another two years yet," and yet this is called a democracy! The amendment to the Constitution Bill, to which I have been referring, concluded as follows:

All elections to be by ballot.

That took place in 1855, and it was a measure introduced by the man who became the first Speaker of the House of Assembly and who continued in that office for many years. I now refer to the attitude of the Legislative Council as expressed on December 2, 1969. On that date, the Hon. G. J. Gilfillan moved an amendment to the Constitution Act Amendment Bill then being considered in that place, that amendment seeking that the powers of the Legislative Council should not be altered and that the abolition of the Legislative Council should not be put into operation until such time as a majority of the electors approved of the Bill before it should be presented to the Governor for Her Majesty's assent. The voting that would take place for this purpose would be by referendum.

Why do Liberal Party members have such a hatred of compulsory voting, when they advocate compulsory voting by referendum to ensure that the Upper House is never to be interfered with? How can they be sincere? In my opinion, a person with that attitude can only be called a political hypocrite. Such people try to have it both ways. At least we have not shifted our ground, having advocated for many years what should happen to the Legislative Council. When we get to the stage where we can implement our policy, we will do what is contained in our rule book. There is no need for Opposition members to read our rule book; we know what is in it and we intend to implement those rules when we get the opportunity.

Members have said that if we interfere with the powers of the Legislative Council this will become a backward State. Reference has been made to what happened in the days of the Labor regime in Queensland. However, there has been a Liberal and Country Parties coalition Government in Queensland now for many years and no attempt has been made to reintroduce an Upper House. Do the Queensland people think that they are second-rate electors compared to South Australian electors? I think that the boot is on the other foot and that the South Australian voters are second-rate in this respect because, unfortunately, the Labor Party has not been able to improve the position, although it has tried to do so for many years.

Having had the opportunity to go to New Zealand, I can say that people there believe that their country is politically advanced compared to Australia. The Nationalist Government, which is politically similar to the Liberal

Government in Australia, has made no attempt to reintroduce an Upper House in New Zealand. On one occasion, when I was at the New Zealand Parliament House, I asked a Government member whether any move had been made to reintroduce an Upper House, and he was amazed, saying, "We would not take a backward step like that." Yet we are not supposed to be backward, even though we have an Upper House with a restricted franchise!

Although some members have referred to the foreshadowed amendments, we are not supposed to refer to them until we have the opportunity to discuss them in Committee. Therefore, I will conclude my remarks by saying that I wholeheartedly support the Bill. If anyone wants to come on the hustings with me, I shall be willing there to support my stand and the stand of my Party on this issue.

Mr. GROTH secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

#### CATTLE COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 13. Page 1686.)

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I support the Bill, which is thoroughly commendable. Partly, its purpose is to see that the full market value instead of only three-quarters of the market value is paid in cases of compensation. Evidently, this payment of three-quarters of the value was instituted when it was feared that the fund would be heavily drained. Possibly there was some feeling that by instituting a value lower than the market value there would be some deterrent against misuse of this provision. As things have turned out, the Act has worked well indeed, and there seems to be no need whatever to fear that it will be misused. Furthermore, the Act has been well administered, principally by the Agriculture Department and its inspectors.

I point to the happy relationship that has existed between the Animal Health Branch of the department, in particular, and the private

sector of the veterinary profession. As far as I know, co-operation has taken place at all times, and I believe this is partly the reason why this Act, as well as several similar Acts dealing with domestic animals, has worked so well. The Bill also alters the upper limit of compensation, increasing it from \$120 to \$200, as a result of the generally higher cattle prices that have prevailed since 1951 when the upper limit was last fixed. I believe that this is a justifiable alteration. Let us all hope that increasing the upper limit is justified in the light of future events in the cattle market.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I, too, support the Bill which, as the member for Alexandra has said, removes an anomaly that has existed since 1939 when the Act was first introduced and by virtue of which the owner of a diseased animal received only a percentage of the agreed market value. This payment has been under dispute, having caused difficulties between the people involved, whether veterinarians in the field, inspectors of the Agriculture Department or owners. Therefore, the removal of the anomaly is commendable. It is a little unfortunate that an alteration of the maximum payment that can be made requires the amendment of the Act on each occasion. In other Acts a sum of this type can be altered by regulation, gazetted, or proclaimed by the Governor-in-Council. It is unfortunate that, each time values change, the Act must be amended.

I commend the feature of the Bill that is explained in the last paragraph of the second reading explanation, where the Minister states that there is to be no increase in the tax levied on all stock sold through the abattoir or other channels to finance the compensation fund. This situation is possible only because of the recent action by the Minister of Agriculture. In a press release made available to members on October 1, he indicated that alterations had been made to the regulations under the Stock Diseases Act whereby it was necessary for cattle coming in from northern areas to be compulsorily tested for tuberculosis before they could be released for other than slaughter. In South Australia in 1967-68, 78,000 head of cattle were tested for T.B. and 227, or about .29 per cent, were positives. In 1968-69 the number of cattle tested for T.B. was 99,289, with 257, or about .26 per cent, positives. However, in 1969-70, of 150,037 cattle tested for T.B., 1,115 positives were taken out, or .74 per cent.



This is a significant increase in a State cattle population that has returned only a small number of positives for many years. This rather dramatic threefold increase has, from my own knowledge, been brought about by the dissemination through the herds of this State of many tubercular-affected cattle coming down from the northern areas without restriction in relation to testing for T.B. before their arrival.

The payment at the higher rate of \$200 now envisaged, which is realistic in terms of present market values, along with the amount of money that has been taken from this compensation fund for some of the expenses involved in conducting T.B. testing, could reduce the fund to a critical level without the Stock Diseases Act regulation I referred to. I am pleased to support the Bill, because of the guarantees that the Minister has given.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Determination of value of cattle, etc., destroyed as diseased."

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The market value of some healthy beasts, such as beef

bulls, in the Gepps Cross yards would be \$300. For heavy bullocks, the value would be about \$250. Obviously, in most cases the values would not be as high as those I have stated, but I am wondering whether the \$200 is considered satisfactory as the upper limit. I do not intend to move an amendment, but as it is extremely important the Minister may want to justify the fixing of this figure.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): The upper limit of \$200 has been accepted by the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated and the Stock-owners Association of South Australia as a reasonable figure. It does not follow that the amount would meet isolated cases such as the member for Alexandra has mentioned but, apparently, it is considered that this is a reasonable figure generally.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.14 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 20, at 2 p.m.