HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 26, 1970

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

PINNAROO RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the Bill.

SUPREME COURT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (PENSIONS)

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.

SUPERANNUATION 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.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION 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.

INDUSTRIAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL (PENSIONS)

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.

QUESTIONS

TRUSTEE COMPANIES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to introduce legislation this session with regard to the Trustee Act? Almost as soon as I became Attorney-General I invited the trustee companies in this State to let me know what amendments they desired to have made to their Act, and this was done. The previous Government intended to introduce legislation to bring that Act up to date, and I was disappointed that there was no time during the last session of Parliament for this to be done. I see in this morning's paper that Sir Roland Jacobs, when speaking at the annual meeting of the Executor Trustee and Agency Company of South Australia Limited, raised this matter and deprecated the delay that had occurred, when he said:

> I now have reason to hope that the Government has seen the importance and urgency of the need to amend this State's laws relating to trustee companies.

I certainly support him in saying that, and I urge the Government to introduce legislation—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is out of order in commenting. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have studied the file that existed when I came into office. I have also had some discussions on this matter, and further discussions are planned. I think that an appointment has been arranged for a discussion between me and representatives of the trustee companies.

Mr. Nankivell: It is on December 9.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am obliged to the honourable member for reminding me of the date. In due course I will make recommendations to Cabinet about this matter, but Cabinet has not yet made a decision.

PENSIONS

Mr. RYAN: I ask a question of you, Mr. Speaker. Will you instruct the Adelaide *Advertiser* to retract a statement that appears in this morning's newspaper that is not correct and is misleading to people who read the article? In this morning's *Advertiser* on page 11, under the heading, in big black print, "Pensions rise plan for M.P.'s", appears the following statement:

> Three Bills to grant cost of living increases to the pensions of public employees, judges and members of Parliament were introduced in the Assembly yesterday.

Whilst I would support this statement if it were true, I raise this matter because that is not true and should not have appeared in the press. The Premier yesterday gave a second reading explanation of this Bill, which provides an increase for ex-members of Parliament who received a pension before the amendment of the Act in 1969.

The SPEAKER: I shall invite the attention of the *Advertiser* to the article to which the honourable member has referred.

BEACH EROSION

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister of Local Government say when he will be able to name the members of the five-man special committee, which has been announced by the

Government and which is to be known as the Foreshore and Beaches Committee? This question is similar to the question I asked yesterday of the Minister for Conservation, who I thought would handle the matter. The Minister of Marine announced that on November 19 this committee would be appointed to solve the beach erosion problem, but no announcement has yet been made concerning the committee's composition. The beaches of Glenelg North and West Beach, which form the western boundary of my district, have suffered considerable damage through erosion. The beach at Glenelg North is badly in need of considerable work to prevent further erosion and I understand the Corporation of the City of Glenelg is awaiting Government action to proceed with restoring the foreshore. This matter is extremely urgent as the present state of the foreshore at Glenelg North is dangerous to young children using the beach and will become a major problem for parents during the school holiday period. To enable investigations to proceed immediately, I urge the Minister to announce forthwith who will be the members of this committee.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot announce the composition of the committee forthwith, because the members have not yet been appointed but, as soon as they are appointed, an appropriate announcement will be made.

CHRISTIES BEACH CROSSING

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on November 3 about a pedestrian crossing at Christies Beach?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In September, 1969, the Road Traffic Board informed the District Council of Noarlunga that a warrant existed for a school crossing near Elgin Avenue and Dyson Road, subject to monitors being provided. However, the council decided that it would not proceed with the crossing. Subsequently, on June 26, 1970, the council informed the board that it intended to reconsider its decision, and queried the operation and provision of the monitors. Discussions on the matter have taken place with council officers, and the council has been informed how its problem regarding monitors can be solved. No decision has yet been made.

MEDICAL FORMS

Mr. BROWN: I ask the Attorney-General, representing the Minister of Health, a question that is in three parts. First, can he say whether the Whyalla Medical Society represents the policy of the South Australian Branch of the Australian Medical Association? Secondly, in the opinion of the South Australian Public Health Department, do the Commonwealth Health Department's referral forms lend themselves to a system that is cumbersome, unpractical and inclined towards malpractice? Thirdly, if the reply to the first two parts of my question is in the affirmative, will the Minister of Health, on behalf of the State Government, take up this matter with the Commonwealth Minister for Health in an endeavour to have the forms altered; and, if the reply to the first two parts of my question is in the negative, will the Minister of Health request the South Australian Branch of the A.M.A. to use the Commonwealth referral forms in Whyalla? On November 18, 1970, the following notice appeared in the Whyalla local press:

> At a recent meeting of the Whyalla Medical Society it was decided that we, as general practitioners and specialists, will not use the Commonwealth Health Department referral forms, because the system is cumbersome and unpractical and implies an inclination towards malpractice which is not justified.

That notice is signed. If this is the true situation, it could lead to much inconvenience to the general public.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague and furnish the honourable member with a reply in due course.

FOSTER ROAD

Mr. WELLS: Has the Premier a reply to the question I asked on August 6 last about lighting on Foster Road in my district?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Foster Road is a district road under the care, control and management of the city of Enfield, and this applies also to the provision of lighting. Although it does appear that this road is not well lit, I understand that the provision of improved lighting is subject to the availability of council finance. Should the honourable member approach the city of Enfield on the matter, he may be able to speed up the provision of this lighting.

PARA VISTA SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the precise area to be developed as an oval at the Para Vista Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am always delighted to provide a reply for the member for Tea Tree Gully and Chairman of the Subordinate Legislation Committee. Officers of the Public Buildings Department have visited

Para Vista Primary School and plans have been prepared for the grassing and reticulation of the entire area at the western end of the school property which is bounded on either side by the school fence and on the eastern side by the access roadway from Montague Road. This means that the entire schoolyard to the west of the school buildings comprising a total area of 15,900 sq. yds. will be grassed and reticulated. The reticulation system recommended for Para Vista is of the quick coupling irrigation type. Some delay has been caused by the decision to provide an additional grassed area behind the limits of the oval, and funds for this are now being sought. It is expected that shortly after the funds are made available tenders can be called. In these circumstances, it does not seem necessary for a further visit to the school by officers of the Public Buildings Department.

PORT AUGUSTA ABORIGINES

Mr. KENEALLY: As the Minister in charge of housing, will the Premier investigate the possibility of making houses available in Port Augusta to the Social Welfare and Aboriginal Affairs Department under a similar arrangement to that which the Housing Trust currently has with the Commonwealth Railways Department and State departments? I understand that the Housing Trust provides for the Commonwealth Railways Department two houses a month plus 20 single-unit timber houses, as well as providing housing for the Electricity Trust, Highways Department and so on. An extreme shortage of accommodation at Port Augusta for Aborigines in many instances necessitates more than one family occupying a house. This results in a lowering of the tenancy standard and a consequent threat to tenancy security. An unfortunate by-product of the situation is the re-appearance of shanties in the sandhills surrounding Port Augusta.

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

Mr. KENEALLY: Does the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs know that Aborigines are congregating at Port Augusta apparently intending to secure employment in the current Government construction programme being undertaken there and, if he does, as there appears to be little employment available to these Aborigines, can he say what action the department can take to solve the problem? Because of the widely advertised Government building programme being undertaken at Port Augusta, it appears that Aborigines are going there certain that plenty of employment opportunities are available. This position is aggravated by the decrease in pastoral employment. I have recently been informed that there are at least 100 unemployed Aboriginal men there, many having dependent families.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will look into the matters referred to by the honourable member and bring down a considered reply in due course.

VICTORIA SQUARE LIGHTS

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider having installed, at the section of Victoria Square where trams travel south and north out of and into the square, traffic signals similar to those at the intersection of South Terrace and King William Street? The other evening an accident occurred at this point in Victoria Square, and I can assure the Minister that I have seen several near misses when the drivers have generally been unsighted by a tram proceeding into or out of this part of the square. As lights are installed at similar intersections, it would be in the interests of the current road safety campaign to install lights at this section of Victoria Square.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall certainly be only too pleased to have the matter examined. If, as the honourable member suggests, there is a dangerous situation, I assure him that every effort will be made to resolve it.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: PREMIER'S REPLY

The SPEAKER: I have received the following letter from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Hall):

> I desire today to move the following motion of urgency: that this House at its rising this day adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock, for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, accusations that my staff and I are spreading rumours that the Premier is receiving psychiatric treatment and that a contemptible campaign is being waged by Opposition members about Mr. Claessen, the Premier's Administrative Assistant.

Does any honourable member support the proposed motion?

Several members having risen:

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I move:

> That the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock,

for the purpose of discussing the following matter, namely, accusations that my staff and I are spreading rumours that the Premier is receiving psychiatric treatment and that a contemptible campaign is being waged by Opposition members about Mr. Claessen, the Premier's Administrative Assistant. I am sorry that the time not only of the Government of this State but also of its Parliament has to be taken up with this type of urgency motion. However, after the charges made here yesterday by the Premier, it is absolutely necessary that I move this motion. During this session, the House has discussed many items of great importance, ranging from rail standardization, the right of association in relation to compulsory unionism and the State's water supplies, to many other items that affect the community both individually and collectively.

Despite this, we heard in this House again yesterday (not for the first time) the strange cry of persecution from the Premier. May I again say how much I regret that the Premier's personal preoccupation is now taking up this Parliament's time. It was implied that collusion existed between the *News* and me, because the *News* printed this statement on its front page yesterday, and because I asked a question on it in this House. However, I point out that my Press Secretary purchased a copy of the *News* at 1.40 p.m. from the newsagency at the top of the Adelaide railway station ramp. The article therefore came to my attention just before I entered the Chamber yesterday. There is no doubt that the Premier is greatly annoyed by the Liberal and Country League's effective political work, by the effectiveness of the work of my staff, and by the way they have been able to present to the South Australian public the Opposition's viewpoint on many important matters that the House has discussed in the last four or five months.

I therefore deplore the Premier's technique of continually asking for sympathy by saying, as he does, that some assumed or imagined scandals are being raised in the community about him. It is about time the Premier stopped descending to making personal accusations against this Party whenever he wants to make a grand statement in this House: it is time he started acting like a leader. Of course, the same technique is being used this time as has been used previously. The Premier made a statement in this House on March 22, 1967, and he knows full well the passage to which I refer: it was when he replied to a question that was asked of him by the member for Unley. I shall read two extracts from this reply. The first states:

I do not know about that, but I know that whispering campaigns of the most scurrilous and derogatory nature are engendered by the Party opposite.

He went on to say:

This kind of thing is engendered by those who cannot fight on a policy in this State.

At that time there were some newspaper reports in Australia on this subject and, to show that this is not some recent thing that the Premier brought into the House yesterday, I desire to quote from those reports. However, let me say first that I do not quote them to further the rumour that the Premier has so often furthered by the publicity that he has given to it: I quote them to prove that these things were abroad in the community long before yesterday. On February 16, 1967, a paragraph in a report written for the *Australian* by Mr. Max Harris states:

Two weeks ago a house-to-house poll in Dunstan's electorate of Norwood produced the response from a couple of householders that they would not in future vote for him since they discovered he was "a half-caste Melanesian orphan bastard".

That is the same term as the Premier referred to in this House yesterday.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't you love saying it, too!

Mr. HALL: There were many other newspaper reports at that time. In fact, I have another on the back of this sheet. This is dated June 28, 1968, and again is from the *Australian* and written by Mr. Mungo MacCallum. In essence, the report praises the Premier, and it goes on to state:

Outside the office of Mr. Don Dunstan, Leader of the South Australian Opposition, his staff have pasted up various unflattering photos of the Premier, Mr. Steele Hall.

I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker: he was Leader of the Opposition then. The report continues:

On them they have drawn moustaches and buck teeth. It's childish, but it's understandable.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: There were also pictures of me, asleep.

Mr. HALL: If the Premier desists from talking about himself for a minute, I will say more about this.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You just want to do the talking about him, as usual.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: The report also states:

Mr. Dunstan has probably had to put up with more metaphorical smearing than any other politician in Australia and his staff are keen to do a little quiet send-up work in return.

I interpolate to say that even then there was an implication that he was paying me back for some campaign in the community in which I had been involved. The report continues:

He has been called a Communist (in fact, he is rather to the right of Whitlam), a half-caste (the dark good looks lend this a certain quiet erroneous credibility) and a homosexual. "Oh for heaven's sake, I've never heard that one," he said, roaring with laughter. "I thought I was being built up as the Labor Party's sex symbol."

Therefore, it was foolish for the Premier in this House yesterday to state and imply directly that I was now promoting the story which, as every person in this State who follows the newspaper reports is well aware, is a rumour in this community, because it has been reported fully in the newspapers and the Premier has referred to it in this House. Therefore, I reject the Premier's statement yesterday and his extremely serious accusation, made in that very sensitive digression by him from my question, that I and my staff were involved in this smear campaign against him.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You admit there's a smear campaign?

Mr. HALL: Would I start or continue or finish or have anything to do with a rumour that had been so well publicized three years ago? It would be utter nonsense to do that, if I wanted to do it—as if I would want to! As we all know, everyone who becomes involved in rumour spreading loses in the political field. That is the number one lesson, and not something that I want to be involved in. Of course, serious accusations have been made against my staff. Let me say this: I do not care what the Premier says about me. He has described one of my statements as a "bloody lie" in this House previously.

There being a noise in the public gallery:

The SPEAKER: Order! There must be complete silence in the galleries, otherwise I will have to clear them.

Mr. HALL: If a man is in public life in the political field, he must know what will come by way of political criticism. I do not condone character assassination, but a person in the political field must be prepared to accept it. Every politician of note knows of stories that circulate about him, and I would have no difficulty in recounting to this House some of the stories told about me. Does it help the State for me to stand here and, in an extremely sensitive manner, proclaim indignation? Mr. Speaker, it does not. It simply takes up useful time and diverts public attention from the issues of the day to the personal matter the Premier brought up yesterday.

However, the thing I bitterly resent is the reflection on and accusation against the female members of my staff, and I do not stand by silently and accept that. There are three female members of my staff, of whom Miss B. D. Minson is the most senior. She was appointed to the Public Service in the then Lands and Survey Department on January 2, 1929. She was employed in that department, which later became the Lands Department, until January, 1964. Early in January, 1964, she was appointed Steno-Secretary to the then Premier (Sir Thomas Playford). She was displaced in March, 1965, when the late Mr. Frank Walsh took office as Premier, and she was subsequently appointed to the Government Reporting Department as Steno-Secretary to the Leader of the Opposition (Sir Thomas Playford). She continued in this capacity when I was elected Leader in July, 1966, and she was transferred back to the Premier's Department in April, 1968. She returned to Parliament House with me, on my staff, in June this year. She was a member of the Council of the South Australian Public Service Association for nine years, from 1943 to 1952. No-one has served the State better in the capacity of a public servant than she has done. She transferred from a department to the Premier's staff, then from the Premier's staff back to this House, then back to the Premier's staff and now back here again, and I pay a full tribute to her for the service she has given the State.

Miss Minson is assisted in secretarial work by Mrs. Patricia Simpson, who entered the Public Service in January, 1966. Mrs. Simpson was employed in what was then the Aboriginal Affairs Department, with a break of some months, until April, 1968. She was then appointed to the Premier's Department as Receptionist and Shorthand-Typist. In June, 1970, she was transferred to the Government Reporting Department as Shorthand-Typist on the staff of the Leader of the Opposition. Premiers from other States and leading business men in South Australia have told me that, in her capacity as Receptionist in the Premier's

Department, she was one of the best receptionists they have ever met, and I again reject the insinuation and direct accusation made yesterday.

The third member of my female staff, Miss Joan Bullock, started her career in November, 1964, at the *Advertiser* newspaper as a secretary in the Display Advertising Department. She transferred to radio station 5AD in November, 1966, and worked there for 12 months. She was a producer of "Talk" radio programmes for two years and next worked in the Premier's Department from March until May 30, 1970, as a publicity assistant. My Government was then defeated. Between June and September she was employed as a publicity officer with the L.C.L. and was re-employed in the Public Service in September, 1970, as a research assistant to the Leader of the Opposition. Again, may I say that she is one of the most efficient research officers and press liaison officers that South Australia has produced.

Every one of those members of my staff refutes the accusation the Premier deemed fit to make yesterday. In making that accusation, the Premier has drawn into the argument more than just these people. He is using people as a result of his statement yesterday, and he has drawn in his driver whose veracity is now severely in question, because each of my staff denies making the statements the Premier has referred to. We find that the charge is reported in *Hansard*, a charge made when digressing in a reply to a reasonable question asked from this side of the House. It was an entirely reasonable question, probing and asking for information. May I repeat the question that brought so much ire and resentment from the Premier:

> In case the Premier could not hear the question because of the spate of interjections from members on his side, I will repeat it. Is the Premier aware of the number of speculative reports that his former Secretary when he was Leader of the Opposition will be appointed Police Commissioner on completing a term of study in Sydney? Is he aware that this afternoon's newspaper carries such a speculative article on its front page? If he is aware of such reports, can he say whether the study leave is being taken along the lines of my question last Wednesday, and will he also comment on the reports to which I have referred?

There was nothing insulting in this: it is entirely proper that as Leader of the Opposition I should know. Should I be denied this information?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You knew without asking the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. HALL: Mr. Speaker, may I continue—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You knew that the rumour was rubbish.

Mr. HALL: It is an utter fabrication to say that I began the rumour.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I am not saying you started it, but anyone with any common sense would know it was rubbish.

Mr. HALL: It was a subject for speculation circulating in the community in as wide a sphere as is the circulation of the afternoon newspaper. I asked, in kindly and reasonable terms, whether the Premier would comment on it: I did not try to limit him to any facet, but asked him to comment. I allowed him full rein so that he could say anything about it and perhaps say something nice about Mr. Claessen. However, he went on to speak at length about his medical history, which had no connection whatever with my question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Speaker must hear what is transpiring in this House, and I shall not warn members continually about interjections: they must cease.

Mr. HALL: I shall not weary the House by repeating all the statement: it was well reported in the newspaper this morning. The Premier referred to the fact that this Party was spreading the story that he had to receive psychiatric treatment, and then he made this despicable charge:

> Female members of the staff of the Leader of the Opposition told my driver, before anyone else in this State had heard it—

that, indeed, is a strange assertion—

> that this was the sort of thing I was supposed to be subject to, and I think this indicates that individual members of Parliament, members of the Liberal Party, have spread that rumour throughout this State.

Let us consider this part of the statement, "Female members of the staff of the Leader of the Opposition told my driver, before anyone else in the State had heard it," in relation to the Premier's radio broadcast last night, when he said:

> Three weeks before the State election a further rumour started that stated that each Friday I had to go away for shock treatment.

Which of those reports is correct in the mind of the Premier? Which one does he stand by today? Is he talking about the staff of the Leader of the Opposition, the three persons to whom I have referred, or is he speaking

about the staff of the ex-Premier? What is his timing: last week, three months ago, three weeks before the election, or what? He owes it to the people that he has defamed to tell them and the House who stands charged and who is accused. No doubt, of the three women to whom I have referred on my staff, one stands out to receive the full impact and the brunt of the criticism (Miss Bullock), because she is the only one associated with contacting the news media.

May I tell the Premier (and I have not made it up) that the reaction in the community today obviously recognizes that Miss Bullock is the one who is being singled out for the Premier's denunciation and accusation. That is who the public thinks it is. Why does the Premier make this charge that we all deny? Does he do it to discredit me? Does he do it to try to discredit one of the ablest research and press officers in the State, because he thinks that she furthered some rumour about him? If that is so, why is it that there appeared in the *Sunday Review,* a Melbourne paper, on October 18, an article under the by-line and name of Mr. Bruce Muirden, who, at that time and I believe for some time before, had been on the public payroll as a press secretary of the Government, and who apparently was allowed the latitude to write praise-worthy articles about the Government in newspapers published in other States, no doubt for reward? This is a strange action, I find, and may I say, improper; but it is extraneous to this argument. This press secretary, on October 18, had this to say about his Premier in what was generally a eulogistic article in which every word was meant to praise the Premier. No doubt that is what he was paid for. This is what this expert said:

> Don Dunstan, the ultra-professional, the snappy dresser, the acute and perceptive thinker, the phrase-maker—

he was earning his money—

> half the State, roughly, trusts him, whatever the media say.
> The other half? Well, some pretty vicious rumours have been spread against him by a considerable minority. He's under constant psychiatric treatment (to many that's gospel truth, not loose club talk); he's a homosexual; he's another casanova. None of them very nice, but all earnestly expounded around Adelaide.

Who wrote that? It was a Government press secretary. Yet the Premier, in this House, accuses Miss Bullock of spreading rumours and accusations against him. Let us review the situation. The Premier has had this persecution complex for some years and has occasionally alluded to it in the House. This matter has been freely reported in newspapers in other States, and I believe that several years ago the Premier appeared on a television programme in South Australia in connection with what he termed these accusations being made against him.

Now, having generally accused my Party of these things over the years, he has defined and narrowed his accusations down to my staff. Why? The accusation is that the female staff member concerned has spread scurrilous and lying gossip, I suppose? That is about the strength of the Premier's accusation. If that is what he thinks of this person, why did Mr. Mitchell, a Government press secretary, offer her a job in the Premier's Department in July as an A-grade journalist at double her existing salary? Why was that offer made again last week? That is what I want to know. Why was that offer renewed last week when there was a change of Ministers and when Mr. Mitchell said to Miss Bullock, "We need another press secretary; you can do very well personally assisting Mr. Broomhill"? This is the woman the Premier defamed yesterday.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: I suppose it is funny to destroy a person's character and to intimidate a person who will not join the Premier's staff! This is what the Premier has done, I do not like it, and I will defend my staff against such scrurrilous attacks. I repeat that this House would be well rid of this personality complex that the Premier keeps exhibiting. I suggest that the Premier should act as a Leader and not make these accusations every time he wants to make a dramatic stand in this State. I assure him that his accusations are completely unfounded, and they are refuted by the staff to whom I have referred. Further, those accusations are greatly resented, and I deny them completely.

Mr. EVANS seconded the motion *pro forma.*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I do not intend at this stage to enter into the debate, except to say that it is obvious from what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition here today that remarks of mine have been attributed to certain personalities. I wish to make it clear that, although I accept that my remarks could have been interpreted in the way the Leader has interpreted them, I did not intend those

remarks to refer to the Leader's present personal staff. The persons from whom my driver received the information to which I referred yesterday were employed in administration and were not his personal staff, and it was at a time when the Leader was still Premier of the State. As I appreciate that the way in which the remarks were reported yesterday could lead to the conclusion drawn by the Leader, I take this first opportunity to correct that and to say that that was not the allegation I intended to make yesterday; nor do I make it now.

The SPEAKER: In pursuance of Standing Orders the motion is now—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): A few points need to be made on this matter. Everyone to whom I have spoken in recent days knows of the rumour that has been circulating about the Premier since well before the last election. I have taken the opportunity to ask several people, whom I have seen since yesterday, about this matter. I have had the rumour related to me by various people over five or six months, and so has my wife, in my district. So, I believe, has every member of this House: every single member has heard the rumour over a period dating back to about the end of April. It has been current in one way or another for as long as that. The rumour is general, but it is untrue. We have a right to object to that sort of rumour circulating, and I for one, because of the way the rumour has come to my ears and because of the source whence it has come, believe that it has been circulated by people associated with the Liberal and Country League. The Premier has been the subject of vicious rumour over the years; everyone knows this to be the case. However, when the Premier objects to those rumours, the Leader of the Opposition immediately says, "The Premier descends to accusations."

True, if one is a politician, one can expect to be subjected occasionally to personal criticism and much unfair attack, but I do not think any politician can expect that he will be subjected to the kind of garbage that has been used against the Premier over such a long period. I think that every citizen of South Australia would say that a man subjected to that sort of personal criticism and viciousness had a right occasionally to get upset about it. The question asked yesterday was whether there was any truth in the speculative reports suggesting that Mr. Claessen was likely to be the next Police Commissioner. I believe that every member opposite, including the Leader, knew that such a speculative rumour was preposterous. From the word "go" they knew that it was completely and utterly preposterous and untrue. We expect some members of the Opposition to show common sense, and also we expect the Leader to show it. Furthermore, I believe in the first place that the speculative rumour was circulated only because Mr. Claessen is part-Ceylonese. I believe that the *News*, in publishing the report on this matter yesterday, showed a complete lack of responsibility in giving currency to something that it knew to be false, just to sell newspapers, and that the Leader of the Opposition, from the questions he has asked, has shown a similar irresponsibility. Every member of the House, when he is in Opposition, gets fed with rumours that could form the basis of a possible question, but the normal standards that apply require members to ignore such rumours and not to ask the sort of question that is based on rumours.

Mr. Venning: Don't you believe—

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the member for Rocky River wants to speak on the matter, he will have the opportunity in a moment. All members know of cases where stories have been told them which could have been raised in the House to give them an airing or some publicity but which have not been raised because members know that the rumour on which they are based is completely outrageous and untrue. Part of the job of any member is to avoid asking the kind of irresponsible question asked by the Leader yesterday. Although the Premier rightly objected to the question and associated it with other rumours that have been circulating in the community, he has now been made the subject of a further attack. The Leader believes that any member must learn to take what is coming to him.

Mr. Clark: Even if it is invented.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Apparently, and even if the Leader wants to dish it out. I believe that by doing this sort of thing and descending to personalities we degrade the standard of politics in South Australia.

Mr. Venning: You're always talking personalities.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Rocky River is out of order: interjections are out of order.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member suggests that I indulge excessively in personalities. I refute that, throwing the

statement directly back into his face. I have been known to argue hard on issues and I always will, but I believe that to the best of my ability I try to stick to the issues. Because any person believes that someone who is politically opposed to him holds views that are wrong, that does not make the person who holds those views evil or disreputable. In this House, we must set a standard for the community that makes clear that people are entitled to hold certain views, which others might regard as evil in some way, without the person who holds those views being tainted in any way by them. Although this is absolutely fundamental, this principle has been ignored and discredited time and time again in recent years in this House. It is time that it stopped and that members on both sides contributed to see that it stopped.

The SPEAKER: Pursuant to Standing Orders, the motion is withdrawn.

Motion withdrawn.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works): Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! I am afraid that I was on my feet when the Minister arose, and the motion had already been withdrawn.

EIGHT MILE CREEK SETTLEMENT (DRAINAGE MAINTENANCE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Minister of Works) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Eight Mile Creek Settlement (Drainage Maintenance) Act, 1959-1965. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

It makes a number of amendments to the rating provisions of the Eight Mile Creek Settlement (Drainage Maintenance) Act. The principal Act, as honourable members are no doubt aware, provides for the maintenance and upkeep of the drainage system serving portions of the hundreds of MacDonnell and Caroline, and imposes a levy upon landholders in the area by which the cost of such maintenance may be defrayed.

For the purpose of levying rates, the Land Board constituted under the Crown Lands Act is charged with the duty of making an assessment of the unimproved value of all land within the area. It is felt that this function can now, following the establishment of a separate Valuation Department, be carried out more appropriately by the Valuer-General. The Bill therefore amends the principal Act to enable the board to utilize the services of the Valuer-General. The principal Act provides for an appeal against a valuation in the first instance to the Minister followed by a further appeal to the Local Court. Now that the Land and Valuation Court has been established, it seems appropriate that this further appeal from the decision of the Minister should be heard by that court. The Bill therefore makes an appropriate amendment to achieve that purpose. The Bill also raises the interest payable on overdue rates from 5 per cent to 10 per cent a year. This brings the principal Act into conformity with the Crown Lands Act in this respect.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 inserts a definition of the Land and Valuation Court in the principal Act. Clause 3 amends section 5 of the principal Act. The amendment enables the Land Board to delegate its valuing functions to the Valuer-General.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister is making a second reading explanation, and there is too much audible conversation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: New subsections (2) and (2a) are substituted. These subsections provide for reports to be made by the valuer and furnished to the landholder. Clause 4 makes a consequential amendment. Clauses 5, 6, 7 and 8 provide for an appeal from a decision of the Minister on a question of valuation to be heard by the Land and Valuation Court. Clause 9 amends section 13 of the principal Act. The section as amended will provide for a penalty at the rate of 10 per cent a year to accrue on overdue rates.

Mr. RODDA secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

THE FESTIVAL HALL (CITY OF ADELAIDE) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received. Ordered that report be printed.

Clause 1—"Short title."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): To give members an opportunity to digest the report, I will read it and discuss the amendments as they arise. The first two paragraphs of the report relate to the formal business before the Select Committee. Paragraphs 3 to 8 read as follows:

3. In the original concept for the development of the present area of the site for the festival theatre, it was proposed that both an upper and lower plaza be included in the design of the theatre and its surroundings—the cost of the lower plaza to be included in the legislation covering the financial agreement between the Government and the Adelaide City Council while the upper plaza should be constructed by the Government at its own cost. The Railways Commissioner expressed concern that the construction of the upper plaza could inhibit access by commercial vehicles to the railway area and accordingly tentative plans were submitted to the committee for redesign of the area to be developed without provision for the upper plaza. While the terms of the Bill considered by the committee do not include provisions relating to the construction of the upper plaza, the committee nevertheless considered that any alteration in proposals for development of the area could affect the economics of the project and should be considered by the committee. On the evidence submitted to it on the proposed alterations, the committee is satisfied that the project for the festival theatre could proceed under the Bill as it now stands, regardless of the development of the surrounding area which may have to be subject to later legislation. This view is supported by the Adelaide City Council who, in evidence given by the Town Clerk, expressed its agreement with the Bill but requested an amendment to clause 10 relating to the assessment of rates.

4. In evidence before the committee, a submission was made on behalf of the Adelaide City Council that the assessing of rates for the festival theatre project, as provided in the Bill, would cause a loss to be shown on the operations of the theatre considerably in excess of whatever losses, if any, may be incurred. To clarify this position it is recommended that an amendment be made to the Bill in clause 10, on page 7, line 19, after the words "in respect of" to insert the words "council rates or", and in line 20 to leave out the words "by the council".

5. The plan appearing as a schedule to the Bill creates three new land sections (Nos. 654, 655 and 656) which are fixed by relation to monuments and are to be excised from the existing railways land grant. In his evidence to the committee the Registrar-General pointed out that the plan of the present railways land grant, except in one instance, had no relationship to the new sections to be created and accordingly a survey would be required to correct the plan in the schedule to acceptable survey data for title purposes. To enable this survey to be made, it is recommended that an amendment be made to clause 10, on page 10, line 4, after the words "as the case requires", to insert the words "upon being furnished with such information as he considers necessary".

6. The creation of the new sections, as set out in the schedule to the Bill, meant that a small parcel of land northwards of the new sections would remain in the railways land grant. This small parcel would be of no practical use and to incorporate it in the new sections the committee recommends that amendments be made to clause 10 of the Bill to extend the area of acquisition northwards and that a new schedule including the extension be inserted in the Bill.

7. Your committee, after consideration of the evidence placed before it, is satisfied that the project for the festival theatre can proceed if this Bill is passed, regardless of the development of the surrounding area which may be subject to later legislation.

8. Your committee is of the opinion that there is no opposition to the Bill, and recommends that it be passed with the amendments shown in the schedule to this report.

With reference to paragraph 6 of the report, if the area were not extended northwards, we would have an extraordinary piece of land between the land held by the Government for the further development of the site and Elder Park, and no-one could make out precisely what use that could ever have been put to, so it was considered necessary to amend the schedule.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Enactment of sections 6-18 of principal Act."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

In new section 8 (4) after "in respect of" second occurring to insert "council rates or" and to strike out "by the council"; in new section 11 (*b*) (i) to strike out "L, C, N, M and L" and insert "C, D, E, F and C"; in new section 11 (*b*) (ii) to strike out "C, N, A, B and C" and insert "B, C, F, G, H and B"; in new section 11 (*b*) (iii) to strike out "B, A, O, P, Q, R and B" and insert "A, B, H, J, K, L, M and A"; and in new section 16 (1) (*c*) after "requires" to insert "upon being furnished with such information as he considers necessary".

Mr. COUMBE: I support the amendments. The members of the Select Committee have seen the amendments and thoroughly agree to the new schedule. I agree that the action that the Premier has referred to should be taken about the piece of land to be left. The lettering mentioned in the amendments merely delineates the land titles more accurately in the new alignments that have been formed. The Premier assured the committee that, when it was time to consider the demolition of the Government Printing Office, this matter would

be the subject of further legislation and further financial arrangements would be made. On that assurance, I commend the amendments.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 11—"Enactment of schedule of principal Act."

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN moved:

To strike out the schedule and insert new schedule.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Mrs. BYRNE (Tea Tree Gully) brought up the report of the Select Committee, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received and read. Ordered that report be printed.

THE REPORT

The Select Committee to which the House of Assembly referred the Local Government Act Amendment Bill, 1970, has the honour to report:

1. In the course of its inquiry your committee held one meeting and took evidence from the following persons:
   - Mr. R. J. Daugherty, Senior Assistant Parliamentary Draftsman, Adelaide.
   - Mr. M. W. Maxwell, Assistant Commissioner, Administration and Finance, Highways Department, Walkerville.
   - Mr. D. L. Whittington, representing the Adelaide City Council.
2. Advertisements were inserted in the *Advertiser* and the *News* inviting persons who wished to give evidence on the Bill to appear before the committee. No evidence was received as a result of these advertisements.
3. On the evidence placed before it, your committee is satisfied that the arrangement entered into between the Government and the Corporation of the City of Adelaide, to which this Bill gives effect, is desirable and of benefit to the corporation.
4. Your committee is of opinion that there is no opposition to the Bill and recommends that it be passed without amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

APPRENTICES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from November 25. Page 3098.)

Mr. BROWN (Whyalla): First, I agree with what the member for Torrens said when supporting this Bill. The honourable member may have been associated with apprentices from the employers' side, but I have been associated with them from the employees' side.

Mr. Coumbe: I have been associated from both sides.

Mr. BROWN: I am pleased to hear that, because it means that the honourable member is supporting the Bill both ways. I deal particularly with the clauses that decrease the apprenticeship period from five years to four years. Tremendous changes have been made in the training of apprentices in the past two decades. True, most employers who employ many apprentices have recognized that in these days people have more opportunity to learn and that greater facilities are available for technical education.

For example, some years ago it was considered that to be trained in heavy industry one needed only to have a first-year technical training, but today third-year training at least is required and in most cases the person must pass the Intermediate examination. I believe that employers and employees in heavy industry would accept the reduction of the five-year term to four years. It is ironical that, although a boy can be trained for a particular trade in heavy industry, there seems to be developing gradually the idea that when the boy finishes his trade he does not work on the floor of the shop but uses his technical experience in the drawing office of the employer.

In that way, unfortunately to some degree, heavy industry loses the benefit of the training he has had on the floor. This situation has been brought about by the high development of efficiency and technical knowledge by the employer in these industries. Although the boy has been willing and able to learn his trade, the efficiency of the employer has improved so much that the demand is for technical knowledge rather than for using the training in a trade. As late as this year I was associated with two boys who had passed their Leaving examination at a technical school but were not old enough to obtain a four-year term of apprenticeship and had to accept a five-year term. The Act has unfortunately been based on age rather than on technical know-how.

Mr. Coumbe: Why were they too young?

Mr. BROWN: They were not 17 years. Under the Act, a person must be 17 years of age to accept a term of four years, although it does not matter what knowledge or technical know-how he may have and, as a result, a

whole year of technical training may be wasted. At present, particularly in Whyalla, there is a tremendous recruitment of oversea tradesmen, especially from European countries. Rather ironically (and many may not agree with me) I believe that the German migrant tradesman is the best tradesman entering this country. He, as well as his counterparts in all other European countries, serves a three-year apprenticeship, but not in the way we understand it in Australia.

A person from these countries may serve an apprenticeship as a maintenance engineer (what we would probably call a fitter and turner), or as a construction engineer (what we might call, say, a boilermaker). I believe that we shall soon need to amend the Act along these lines, as well as make other amendments. Great developments are occurring at present within the various trades, and at some time in the future three of probably the largest trade unions in the country could amalgamate. If this type of amalgamation occurs, I believe that, despite opposition that may come from both sides of industry, there will be a tendency to develop a trade along the lines of a specific industry. In other words, a boy will enter a heavy industry as a tradesman in heavy industry, and a boy will enter a light industry as a tradesman in light industry. I believe that there will be a tendency in the future for amalgamations to occur, so that the curricula in various trades will have to be altered, as will the whole status of a boy's training. I welcome the amendments to the Act, but I believe that the future developments to which I have referred will need to be studied closely and that further amendments to the Act may soon be necessary. I support the Bill.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): When this Act was being considered by the House some years ago, I said that the period of training should be reduced to three years, and my statement was treated with much disrespect by members opposite. However, I am glad to see that they are now catching up with the idea.

Mr. Evans: They are waking up to it.

Mr. McANANEY: Yes. An apprentice who has to train for five years to become, say, a plumber merely becomes bored stiff, and the introduction of more intensive training over a reduced period is a step in the right direction. As I have said, I am glad to see that the Government is catching up with my futuristic ideas. I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): First, I thank those members who have spoken for supporting the Bill, thus ensuring its speedy passage through the House. I know that they agree that this is an important piece of legislation. I appreciate the interest of members, particularly the member for Torrens, in the welfare of apprentices who are involved in training. I support the remarks of the honourable member regarding Mr. Crawford Hayes, the Commissioner. Having known Crawford Hayes for many years, I have always found him to be keen and conscientious; he is highly respected by everyone who knows him and admired by apprentices for the way in which he looks after their interests. As the Minister for Conservation explained when introducing the Bill, its purpose is to reduce from five years to four years the maximum term of indentures of an apprentice, all other States having agreed that a term of four years is a sufficient training period for an apprentice. It is generally accepted that young people are now staying longer at school and attaining a higher standard of education.

Another reason for the reduction in the term is the extreme shortage of tradesmen today. As the member for Torrens said last evening, parents should encourage their children to enter the building industry and other skilled trades and professions. This applies particularly to the building industry, in which I believe there is a great future for anyone who desires to follow this trade, bearing in mind the vast expansion and development taking place.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5—"Times and occasions for attendance at technical school."

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

> In paragraph (*b*) after "apprenticeship" to insert "first occurring"; and in paragraph (*c*) to strike out "of apprenticeship" and insert " 'in addition after the completion of the second year of apprenticeship and during the third year of an apprenticeship' and inserting in lieu thereof the passage 'during the year following completion of the second year' ".

This amendment does not affect the purpose of this provision but merely clarifies it.

Mr. COUMBE: I have no objection to the amendment. Apparently when the Act was last amended, these words were omitted in the drafting.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 6 to 9 passed.

Clause 10—"Attendance at apprentice school."

Mr. COUMBE: New section 22 (1b) deals with a country apprentice who has to attend a centre away from his place of residence and occupation to do a crash course in technical and theoretical work. This new subsection provides that the employer shall provide accommodation or reimburse the apprentice for its cost. I realize that only several weeks in a year is involved and that the apprentice attends school for only three years. Surely it would be fair to treat an apprentice, who is a tertiary student, in the same way as secondary students, particularly in Matriculation classes, are treated by the Minister of Education, who pays such students boarding and travelling allowances in certain circumstances. In the interests of decentralization, I am keen to see more country apprentices employed, and I would hate to see anything stand in the way of a prospective employer indenturing an apprentice.

An employer may be deterred if he thinks he has to pay several weeks' accommodation for an apprentice without receiving reimbursement. An easy way out of this would be to strike out all words after "instruction class" and insert the words "the apprentice shall be paid by the Director-General of Education (who, incidentally, is a member of the Apprenticeship Commission) an allowance approved by the commission in respect of the costs of that accommodation." The difficulty is that, as this involves the payment of money, as a private member I am precluded from moving the amendment. Having given the Minister a copy of the amendment, I suggest that he would be acting reasonably by moving it. This will not cost much, because there are not many country apprentices.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Then the employers shouldn't mind paying.

Mr. COUMBE: True, but I am trying to provide for decentralization and I want to encourage employers to employ apprentices rather than put something in the way of their doing so.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I sympathize with the honourable member, who has been most persuasive. He asked me last evening to consider moving this amendment, but I cannot comply with his wishes. The honourable member has explained the amendment. There does not seem to be any similarity between an apprentice who will be away from home for two weeks of a year and a tertiary student who has to board in Adelaide for the whole of the school year. Therefore, I cannot agree to move the amendment.

Mr. COUMBE: I regret that, and I think that the Minister's excuse for not moving the amendment is a bit lame.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ryan): Order! There is no amendment at this stage.

Mr. COUMBE: I realize that. As the Minister knows, I am unable to move this amendment, and I regret that he has not acceded to my suggestion that he should do so.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Only a few apprentices are involved. The honourable member believes that the amendment could increase the number of country apprentices; I agree that this is possible. However, employers do not have to release their apprentices during working hours for instruction at technical colleges, as do employers in the metropolitan area and the larger country cities. This clause will make it much easier for them to meet these costs.

Clause passed.

Clauses 11 and 12 passed.

Clause 13—"Notification of employment of apprentice."

Mr. COUMBE: I move to insert the following new section:

26c. (1) If at any time during the term of his apprenticeship an apprentice—

(*a*) is, in the opinion of his employer, wilfully disobedient to a lawful order or direction given by, or under the authority of, the employer;

or

(*b*) is guilty, in the opinion of his employer, of dishonesty or gross misbehaviour,

the employer may suspend the apprentice from his employment for a period not exceeding fourteen days.

(2) An employer who suspends an apprentice under this section shall forthwith notify the chairman of the Commission of the suspension and the reasons therefor.

Penalty: One hundred dollars.

(3) The Commission shall consider any suspension under this section and shall confirm or quash the suspension and, if the suspension is confirmed, may increase or decrease the period of suspension.

(4) If a suspension is quashed by the Commission the employer shall recompense the apprentice for any payment lost during the period of suspension and the period of suspension shall be deemed to be service under the indentures.

This amendment is based on the current practice in Queensland, and has been recommended by Mr. Justice Beattie (President of the New South Wales Industrial Commission), whose report relating to apprentices has been regarded as a Bible in industrial relations. I understand that consideration has been given to the inclusion of this type of legislation in the New South Wales Industrial Code. Yesterday, I paid a tribute to Mr. Hayes (Chairman of the Apprenticeship Commission), who, although not obliged to do so, does certain things extremely well. Although I have not discussed this matter with him, I believe Commissioner Hayes has no objection to having this type of provision inserted in the Act; indeed, I believe he would fully support such action, which strengthens the hands of the Chairman of the commission.

Where disobedience or gross misbehaviour by an apprentice occurs, that apprentice can be suspended. Members know that, if an adult commits this type of offence, he can be dismissed instantly, although he has the right to appeal to the Industrial Commission. My amendment provides that the same sort of procedure should apply in relation to apprentices, as applies in Queensland and as has been recommended by Mr. Justice Beattie. If an offence is committed, the employer can suspend, not dismiss, the apprentice. He should then immediately report his actions and the reason therefor to the commission, which will then hear the matter. I have provided that in any case the suspension shall not be for longer than 14 days and, once the commission hears the matter, it has the right either to uphold or quash the suspension, or vary its duration.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: The employer would be reluctant to take the apprentice back.

Mr. COUMBE: Not necessarily, because, as the Minister would know, Commissioner Hayes has been able in many cases to overcome difficulties, and in other cases he has wisely reported to the commission that, in the interests of both parties, an indenture should be cancelled. If a suspension is quashed, I have provided that the time and salary lost by the apprentice during his suspension should be made up.

Mr. Brown: If an employer suspends an apprentice it presupposes that the latter is guilty of having done something.

Mr. COUMBE: I am saying that, if the employer suspends an apprentice because of something the apprentice has done, the former should report the matter to the commission to enable it to determine the case.

Mr. Brown: But for how long should a person be suspended?

Mr. COUMBE: I have provided that the employer may suspend for a period not exceeding 14 days and that the commission can, when considering the case, vary the duration of the suspension.

Mr. Brown: It doesn't work that way.

Mr. COUMBE: This is what is happening in Queensland, and is a situation on which Mr. Justice Beattie has reported and advised. His report, which the relevant Minister eagerly awaited, took much time to compile. However, what the honourable member for Whyalla has said could happen. If a misdemeanour of the type to which I have referred is committed, the employer can report it to the commission. However, at present he does not have the power to suspend, as a result of which an apprentice could continue to work even after he punches his employer on the nose. If an apprentice lives at Whyalla, he could continue to work until the Chairman of the commission could get to Whyalla. Therefore, disciplinary action could not be taken for some time. If my amendment is passed, action could be taken immediately.

Mr. Brown: What if the apprentice's action is provoked?

Mr. COUMBE: Then that would be a matter for the commission to decide. I have provided in my amendment that, if the commission quashes the suspension, the apprentice shall be reinstated and any loss of time and pay shall immediately be made up. The Committee must be consistent and provide for similar action to be taken against apprentices as is taken against adult employees. This action would be in the interests of the apprentice, the master, and the parent or guardian of the apprentice. My amendment spells out what is happening at present, and I do not think that the Apprenticeship Commission, particularly the Chairman, would object to the inclusion of this provision.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I do not consider that additional provision need be made regarding disciplinary action. I understand that in the past difficulties have been overcome, and they will be overcome in future by other provisions in this Bill. The member for Torrens has suggested that the employer should be given the right to suspend an apprentice from employment for certain reasons. By

clause 3, together with some of the provisions of section 13 of the principal Act, the right to suspend an apprentice is given to the Apprenticeship Commission, and I consider that this is the correct procedure.

Mr. Coumbe: It meets only every fortnight.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: It can delegate powers now.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The commission has authority to delegate powers to the Chairman of the Apprenticeship Commission. The Government considers that this gives sufficient power to deal with those cases that occur when an apprentice needs to be suspended and that it is not necessary to give this power to employers.

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister's statement confirms what I have been saying. He is delegating powers to the Chairman, and the amendment is to give the Chairman powers that he will be able to operate under.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Your amendment mentions the opinion of the employer, not the opinion of the Chairman.

Mr. COUMBE: I agree, but not all apprentices are in the metropolitan area, where the Chairman is. I still consider that my amendment is reasonable.

Mr. Crimes: It would prejudice the apprentice's case.

Mr. COUMBE: The Industrial Code provides that an adult employee may be dismissed summarily, but he has the right to appeal to the Industrial Commission. My amendment provides that, whilst the employer may not dismiss an apprentice, he may suspend the apprentice, and the commission may deal with the matter.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Difficulties have occurred in the past because only the Apprenticeship Commission has been able to suspend an apprentice and it has been necessary for the Chairman to contact each member of the commission when a case has arisen. However, as the Chairman can now exercise this authority under delegated power, these difficulties will no longer exist. The honourable member claims that the amendment spells out that the employer shall have the right to suspend. I consider that these difficulties can be overcome by the delegation of power to the Chairman, and I cannot accept the amendment.

Mr. SLATER: I oppose the amendment. I am not sure whether the reference to 14 days means 14 working days or 14 calendar days.

Mr. Coumbe: Under the Acts Interpretation Act, it would be 14 working days.

Mr. SLATER: The Apprenticeship Commission has been established to protect both employer and employee. Many times, as Secretary of the Boot Trade Union, I have attended conferences of representatives of all parties involved in a difficulty, and we have been able to reach amicable arrangements, resulting in the apprentices being able to work on without further difficulty. However, if an apprentice were suspended, the position would be irretrievable. He would not be able to return to work with the same degree of satisfaction as he is able to get now.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

Noes (24)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee (teller), McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo and Wells.

Majority of 5 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (14 to 16) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's suggested amendment:

Clause 6, page 4, after line 36—Insert new subsection as follows:

"(6) The amount of any additional levy imposed under subsection (5) of this section and recovered pursuant to this Act shall be paid into the Planning and Development Fund established under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1969."

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

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendment be disagreed to.

The purpose of the amendment is to require all moneys collected to be paid into the development fund, but if that were done the use of the money would be confined to the acquiring of open spaces by the State Planning Authority. It would confine the use of the money to development purposes in

respect of properties purchased by that authority, and not allow it to be used on other joint acquisitions made from time to time within the terms of the Metropolitan Adelaide Development Plan, or on land already acquired to which we wished to divert some of this money for development. The impost was to provide some servicing money and some capital money for loans for the acquisition of open-space areas by the authority but, in addition, money was to be used to develop existing properties that are open-space areas within the metropolitan area. I see no benefit in tying up this money by putting it into the development fund. We raise semi-government loans for the fund and will need money to service them, plus additional capital moneys for the State Planning Authority, but we should not reduce the flexibility of the use of this money. I assure the Committee that all of the money, and more, will be required for the purposes for which it is being raised.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the suggested amendment would interfere with the maximum use of money for acquisition and development of open spaces.

DANGEROUS DRUGS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 5, line 2 (clause 6)—Leave out "paragraph" and insert "paragraphs".

No. 2. Page 5 (clause 6)—After line 7 insert new paragraph as follows:

> "(*bb*) providing that licences may be granted in accordance with the regulations by the Minister permitting the cultivation of prohibited plants:".

No. 3. Page 6 (clause 11)—After line 24 insert new subclause as follows:

> "(1aa) Where a person is convicted of an offence against this Act and the offence involved the supply of, or an offer to supply, a drug to which this Act applies to a person under the age of eighteen years, he shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment of not less than one year in addition to the penalty awarded under any other provision of this Act."

Amendments Nos. 1 *and* 2.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 and 2 be agreed to.

The effect of these amendments is to authorize the granting of licences to cultivate the prohibited plants. As I understand it, the reason given in the Legislative Council for these amendments is that there are legitimate industrial uses for these plants and that, by licensing, it would be possible for people to grow the plants for legitimate uses. This matter having been checked by the Public Health Department, the Minister of Health is satisfied that there are legitimate industrial uses. He is also satisfied that the growth of the plants concerned can be adequately controlled by means of licensing and that there is no danger to be feared from a licensing system that would enable these plants to be grown for legitimate purposes.

Dr. TONKIN: I agree to the amendments. I think the reasons that the Attorney-General has already outlined are sufficient and that the safeguards are adequate for these amendments to pass.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I move:

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

This amendment seeks to provide a mandatory minimum sentence of one year's imprisonment for offences of the type described in the amendment. I strongly oppose any provision in an Act of Parliament of this kind which fetters the discretion of the court in sentencing. The circumstances vary enormously from case to case, and individual offenders vary enormously from person to person. It is of great importance in the administration of justice that the judge, upon whom rests the responsibility of fixing the appropriate sentence, should have a discretion to mitigate what might otherwise be regarded as the normal penalty. It may well be considered that a sentence of this kind would not be out of the way in many or perhaps most cases of this kind; so much depends on the circumstances of the individual, the circumstances of the case, and the prospect of rehabilitating the offender.

This is true generally in any criminal matter. In the case of any offender, all other considerations may be outweighed in a particular case by the importance of rehabilitating the person who has committed the criminal act. It might be an isolated criminal act committed in circumstances of great stress or circumstances of great mitigation, and it would be extremely wrong, in my view, to fetter the discretion of the judge in any such case. The sort of offence that is contemplated by this Bill intensifies the necessity of retaining a discretion in the judge, because it is the sad truth that many people who are involved in what might generally be

called trafficking offences are themselves drug addicts: they are those unfortunate people who are unable to control an appetite for drugs. They are addicted to the use of drugs and are forced, if one may use that expression in this context, into committing trafficking offences by the desperate urge of their own appetite for further drugs.

In other words, these people are obliged to sell drugs to others in order to get the money to procure drugs for themselves. Many of them are extremely sad cases, and in such cases the court's attention must be given to what is required to rehabilitate an offender who is himself a drug addict. To require the court to impose a sentence of one year's imprisonment, irrespective of the circumstances and irrespective of what seems to be the appropriate way of dealing with the offender concerned, would in my view be a retrograde and even quite barbaric approach to punishment. Therefore, I ask the Committee to disagree to the amendment.

Dr. TONKIN: I agree with all that the Attorney-General has said. I am sure this amendment was motivated by the Hon. H. K. Kemp's natural concern to protect young people and by his natural and understandable concern, which I think we all share, to deal severely with people who supply drugs not only to young people but to people generally. There is a great need for strict penalties, and I believe that the existing provisions in the Bill provide these. I believe that drug traffickers who are not themselves dependent on and motivated by the aspect to which the Attorney-General has referred are guilty in many cases of murder, because their activities can lead to the physical and mental destruction of individuals. I will not go again into the matter of physical dependence; I hope that all members will recall that physical dependence is a state where the body becomes so dependent on a drug that the individual cannot help himself any longer. Those dependants who cannot help themselves engage in drug trafficking to maintain their own supplies.

This amendment is certainly well-intentioned, but it also contradicts the spirit of new section 14a, which allows for the provisions of the Offenders Probation Act to apply to persons convicted under this Act. With the Attorney-General, I believe that any court will consider all matters and, when such circumstances are shown to the court, will deal firmly indeed with those people who are suppliers without being dependants. I believe the courts will deal most leniently, coming down on the side of treatment, with those people who are, in fact, dependants. I support the motion.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 was adopted:

Because the amendment deprives the court of its proper discretion with respect to the imposition of penalties.

ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ENROLMENT)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from October 21. Page 1949.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): So many Bills to amend the Constitution Act have been brought in this session with the object of subjugating the Legislative Council and anyone else who stands in the way of the Labor Party that I am confused about which Bill this is. However, as this is a Bill not to amend the Constitution Act but to amend the Electoral Act, the matter is simplified as the Government needs only a normal majority to get it through rather than the constitutional majority which it has and which is necessary to get through constitutional Bills. I know that I will disappoint the Attorney-General if I do not go through the usual channels of concern that I express in this House for the future of the second Chamber. It amazes members opposite that one can have a genuine view that there ought to be a voluntary vote for the Upper House, but why that should amuse and amaze them, I do not know. The Upper House is a House of independent thought, as I know well.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: This amuses members opposite, because there is no independent thought between Labor members of this House and those of the Upper House.

Mr. Clark: Now you're being political.

Mr. HALL: I am sorry to get into politics on this matter: it must be disappointing for the honourable member. However, I was elected here as a politician, and one who thinks along the lines of what is best for the State. Basically, the widening of the franchise of the Council must be completed so that every citizen in the State who is qualified to vote for the House of Assembly will also be qualified to vote for the Legislative Council. Having supported that view in conferences

of my Party and in this House, I will continue to take that stand until that position is reached. However, even though I happen to be running along with the Labor Party in that little part of its policy, there is no need for me to go any further just to be nice. Let us get back to the practicalities of the situation.

We need a House of Review that is not a mirror image of this House. We need to have a different democratic House elected by some different type of system. At present, the Council is divided into five multiple districts, each of which returns four members, although that could be subject to change or redistribution in the future. That method of distribution, along with the fact that members are elected for terms of six years, means that there is a tremendous overlap of interest and an important time factor involved as between the two Houses. I believe it is sensible to continue, too, with the voluntary voting system that we have for the Upper House.

In the House of Assembly, the Government is elected and here we have the reflection of the immediate or three-year view of the people. In this Chamber policies are framed and the general day-to-day administration takes place, overseen by Ministers. Although Legislative Councillors are elected for six years, half of the members of that House are elected every three years, and this creates an overlap of interest. A contrast is provided which I have observed both as a back-bench member of this House and as Premier and which I have found to be extremely valuable for the State. This Government and the previous Walsh and Dunstan Labor Governments have accepted amendments proposed by the Legislative Council. I remember how much embarrassment the Labor Party was saved by the rejection by the Upper House of the transport control legislation that had been introduced by the Walsh Government. The policy adopted at that time by the Legislative Council then became the policy of the Labor Party at the ensuing election. I believe the Labor Party owes a dinner or garden party to Legislative Council members for the embarrassment they saved the Labor Party at that time. Instead, members opposite abuse the Legislative Council, even though they have been saved so much by the work of that House. All members who have been here for any great length of time must admit that a second House brings a different view to matters than is brought to them in this place, where the political cut and thrust occurs. The Council might be even more useful than it is if its members engaged less in the political world and in the day-to-day Party events and concentrated more deeply on reviewing legislation.

Mrs. Byrne: They've got the time to do it.

Mr. HALL: Is the honourable member so very busy?

Mrs. Byrne: Yes, I always am.

Mr. HALL: Yes, she constantly writes letters to her electors. Members of the Upper House have a real role to play in the Parliamentary Government of South Australia, and they can best play it with a voluntary vote to sustain them in their elections. I therefore oppose the Bill.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I, too, oppose the Bill, which constitutes further inroads into those freedoms that we have enjoyed for many years by providing for compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting for the Legislative Council. Like my Leader, two or three weeks ago I voted for adult franchise for the Legislative Council, this being something in which I believe. However, I do not believe and will never believe in compulsory voting for the Legislative Council. I also believe strongly in the bicameral system of Parliament. It has been the judgment of history that the democratic process is best served by the bicameral system, and the present Government has reason to be thankful that we have the Upper House, both now and when it was in office previously.

Members opposite are fond of saying that Queensland and New Zealand have abolished their Upper Houses. Although this is so, they are in a small minority; by far the greatest number of Parliaments in the world have a two-house system. Hitler had a one-house Parliament too, so I do not think the fact that a minority of Governments throughout the world has abolished the bicameral system means a thing. I believe the Legislative Council must therefore be retained, its work being invaluable to good Government. Having said that, I should say that nothing would be achieved if the Upper House were simply an extension of whatever Party dominates the House of Assembly. In other words, a difference in franchise is essential. I have already said that I believe in full adult franchise, so any difference in franchise must lie elsewhere. Members opposite say that, because half of the members of the Legislative Council retire every three years, this is sufficient to ensure the possibility of a difference. However, I do not

think it is sufficient: the retention of voluntary enrolment and voluntary voting will increase this possibility of difference. Indeed, I will go even further and suggest that, in addition, there should be separate rolls and that polls should be conducted on different days.

In the second reading explanation, delivered by the Attorney-General, the word "democracy" ran like a thread. Members opposite are fond of using this word, but when they use it in conjunction with the word "compulsory" they are getting away from the meaning of democracy and are equating it with a dictatorship. The two words are a contradiction of terms. But we are rapidly losing our democracy in this State. I said during the Address in Reply debate that even if we could not say we were the best governed State in the Commonwealth, we could at least say we were the most governed. To me, democracy means as little compulsion as possible.

Compelling people to go to the polls is in itself undemocratic. British law as it has evolved allows us a remarkable amount of freedom, and the laws that restrain us mainly involve protection of the rights of others. We are now seeing growing in South Australia the promulgation of laws to promote sectional and political interests. This is simply an abuse of power. We have seen compulsory unionism and compulsory uniform shopping hours, even though the referendum showed a preference for retaining the *status quo*. We see the intent to introduce compulsory voting for local government, and now compulsory voting for the Legislative Council. Why? Could it be that the Government is afraid of the apathy of its own supporters? Could it be that it is frightened that, if there is a decent football match on that day, Labor supporters would not bother to vote?

Mr. Groth: That's what you are afraid of.

Mr. CARNIE: I remind the member for Salisbury that we certainly saw this supposition verified in the voting figures of the recent Legislative Council by-election. In his second reading explanation, the Attorney-General said:

To treat the franchise—

of voting—

which is the basic democratic right as being a privilege is to misunderstand the whole nature of democratic society and democratic institutions.

However, I believe that any misunderstanding is on the Attorney's part. This sentence is full of contradictions of terms. I have always had the apparently quaint idea that a democratic right was a privilege, but now the Attorney-General tells me that I have been wrong all this time. As I said, this sentence was full of contradictions of terms, and this carried on right through the speech. The Attorney-General speaks of the widest possible participation in the democratic process—but again by compulsion.

However, the Attorney made one statement with which I agree; he said that any important right of citizenship carries with it an obligation. Of course it does, and everyone who is entitled to vote should exercise that right. If one does not do so, one is falling in one's duty. However, I will never believe that, if people choose to be irresponsible enough not to wish to cast a vote, they should be forced under threat of legal action to do so. I do not believe we have the right to say to anyone, "You are not allowed to vote"; nor do I believe we have the right to say to anyone, "You must vote."

There are many points in the Attorney-General's speech with which I must take issue. He said that there is no basis for distinguishing between the two Houses. What good is a House of Review if it is simply a duplication of the House of Assembly—if it simply rubber stamps legislation? There must be a possibility of difference, and this can be best achieved by the retention of voluntary enrolment and voluntary voting. I should like to see many things introduced to ensure that there remains a possibility of difference between the two Houses. I should like to see a constitutional assurance of redistribution of boundaries, as well as a constitutional assurance that rural areas will have equal representation with the city. Along with this, I should like to see proportional representation. We must achieve an electorate that is in some way different from that which sends people to the House of Assembly. Although I cannot enlarge on these matters, as they are not contained in the Bill, I firmly believe that until something along these lines is introduced we will not have true democracy in this State. The Attorney-General also said that this Bill would afford an opportunity for people entitled to vote to be enrolled, to enable them to exercise that right. I take exception to this use of the word "opportunity". Opportunity implies some freedom of choice. Indeed, that is the dictionary definition of the word. However, this Bill gives no freedom of choice at all. No-one will be asked whether he wishes to be enrolled on the Legislative Council roll; it will be automatic enrolment and, once enrolled, one is compelled to vote.

The Attorney-General also said that the law should encourage the widest possible participation in the democratic process by the exercise of votes. In view of what we know now about the purposes of this Bill, the use of the word "encourage" would be rather amusing if it were not for the serious import of its meaning. I assume that the Attorney-General means that people will be duly fined if they do not vote. Does he mean that they will be encouraged by the carrot or by the stick? I suggest that the Attorney-General be a little more careful in his choice of words. He should not use words such as "encourage" and "opportunity" when he means "compel" and "compulsion". I think that he would command more respect if he was more open in his meaning. Obviously, his intention is to cloak the true import of the Bill. I do not like this rushing forward into compulsion. We will reach the stage in this State when everything that is not illegal is compulsory. The Attorney-General used such words as "rights, opportunity, encourage, and obligation", but shining right through his words was the true importance of this Bill, namely, to force on to people something that they have shown they do not want.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): I congratulate the member for Flinders on one of the clearest expositions of the DeGarisian doctrine that I have heard. We did not hear about the family vote or the permanent will of the people because it is fairly obvious that this doctrine has become rather more sophisticated than the first crude outpourings that we heard from another place.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Can you explain what is meant by the family vote?

Mr. HOPGOOD: I have difficulty in doing that, except that I can say that this sort of notion was abroad at a time in social history when the head of the house was the head in many ways, including his influence on the political attitudes of other members of the family. It is obvious that the import of this is to ensure that the vote cast will be the same as the vote that would be cast if other members of the family had the same vote.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I thought it meant that, the more children one had, the more votes one got. I was looking forward to that.

Mr. HOPGOOD: There are those of us who look forward to strengthening our vote in our districts. I stress that the household vote should have gone by the board long ago because it is a survival from the day when giving the franchise to members of a family was considered unnecessary, because all that it did was provide a carbon copy of the vote cast by the head of the household. The member for Flinders has told us that democracy means having as little control as possible. This is the typical *laissez faire* attitude that members opposite have adopted on other occasions. I remind those members that freedom for the pike is death to the minnows.

Through the years, with the extension of the democratic process, people have introduced means whereby they could try to control in the public sense, whether economically or socially, the private operations of individuals. At one time we had a state of *laissez faire* in politics. That period was known as the feudal period, when barons had their armies and private individuals could enslave other persons. The growth of democracy has seen an attempt to bring political control over those who would enslave others and use political power against them. We also see that in the economic sphere. Democracy has brought controls by the electorate as a win over the pike in the interests of the minnows, because economic slavery is as much a reality as is political slavery.

Mr. Mathwin: Is that why they have voluntary voting in England?

Mr. HOPGOOD: The honourable member will hear what I think about the voluntary voting system in England. We have taken various political practices from Great Britain and, in administering them, have improved them considerably. I suggest that compulsory voting is one area in which this has happened. I stress that a person is not compelled to vote: he is merely compelled to go to the booth. The member for Flinders may say that there is not much difference between those compulsions, but there is a difference. Once a person's name is struck off the roll, he need not vote. He can write rude words on the ballot paper, if he likes. We merely direct him to go to the booth.

I ask members to tell me what would happen in the absence of this compulsion. In this State before 1944, when a Liberal Government introduced compulsory voting, the political Parties tried strenuously at each election, such as by using motor cars, to get people to go to the polling booth to cast a vote. All that compulsory voting does is nationalize this "getting out the vote", and I believe that

this is the fairest way. It gives no unfair advantage to those with a monopoly of wealth or to those who, because of Party funds, can afford fleets of motor cars and paid organizers and canvassers. It equalizes the situation, giving all Parties an equal opportunity. I repeat that people would not be left unmolested on election day, under voluntary voting. There would be open canvassing to get people to the ballot and, in all sorts of quiet ways (and I regret to have to say this) various forms of subtle bribery would be used to see that they voted.

Under compulsory voting, once a person gets to the booth, whether he votes is a matter for him. The member for Flinders has spoken of the differences between our Houses of Parliament and has stated ways in which there should be differences. Some of these horrify me. I understand that, when he spoke of equal representation for city and country, he meant that the one-third of the electors in the State who live outside the metropolitan area should have opportunity in votes equal to that of the other two-thirds of the electors. I do not know how this lines up with liberal democracy. If democracy means anything, it means one man one vote and one vote one value.

Our forefathers fought to abolish the plural voting system, and the logical corollary is that all votes should be of equal value. The member for Flinders has referred to voting at council elections, and I see no reason why voting at such elections should be on a different basis from voting at Commonwealth or State elections. What do we mean when we speak of differences between the two Houses of Parliament? The issues in State and Commonwealth politics rest with the two great political Parties. Between them, those Parties monopolize our various Legislatures. The only thing that the member for Flinders or his colleagues can mean by opening up the possibility of a different complexion in one House from that in the other is that the Party complexion in one House is different from that in the other. The honourable member wants to entrench a Liberal majority in the Upper House. Is he willing to countenance the possibility that, with a Liberal majority in the Lower House, there should be a Labor majority in the Upper House in order to act as a brake on extreme Liberal legislation? I do not think that he would be willing to countenance that, and what he wants is a permanently entrenched Liberal majority in the Upper House.

These dodges are revealed for what they are. They are not an attempt to protect the Upper House: there is an entrenching clause in the Constitution and that is entrenched, too. Members opposite say that an accidental majority can sweep away the Upper House, but that is nonsense. I am not sure that there is any special advantage for one Party or the other in compulsion. I have suggested that it would seem there would be an advantage to those candidates who were wealthy. This situation occurs in the United States of America, where it is difficult for an ordinary man to enter the political realm because he does not have the finance to do so. He does it by selling himself to one of the various capitalist combines, which may support him in return for concessions. In the United States there is a primary voting system and, generally, the individual must be wealthy. We do not have that problem here, but voluntary voting may introduce it.

It is interesting to read old newspapers of, say, 30 years or 40 years ago, that were published in South Australia. It was stated in the *Advertiser* and the *Register* that the voluntary voting system favoured the Labor Party. The current argument then was that the Labor vote was consolidated in the city and in country urban areas, was strongly organized largely by trade unions, and was relatively easy to get out. On the other hand, the Liberal vote was dispersed in country areas, and if the poll was held at harvest time the Liberal voter could be found on the back of a tractor or plough and, therefore, it was difficult for these people to get to the poll. The import of those newspapers, which were highly biased towards the conservative side of politics, was to get people to the polls: the Liberal voters must do that because the Labor voters would be there. I do not believe we should look at different Party advantages or disadvantages when considering these matters. The new candidate of modest means would be at a considerable disadvantage because of the money that could be spent by his wealthy opponent in getting out the vote.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the wealthy unions?

Mr. HOPGOOD: I invite the honourable member to consider the sum that would have been spent by the Labor and Liberal Parties in South Australia for the recent State election. It would not be difficult to do an arithmetical sum in terms of the amount of television

time taken up, although it is significant that in the last Senate poll the L.C.L. did not put one piece of literature in a letterbox.

Mr. Evans: It did not have the money.

Mr. HOPGOOD: I am not sure what that means: perhaps it is saving its run for later or the Party did not have the canvassers to put out the literature. If the Liberal Party considers that, by introducing voluntary voting, it will use its assumed wealth to gain an advantage, one wonders whether it will consult North Terrace to find out how the Party treasury is standing at present. Perhaps the Party may be in dire financial straits. In terms of compulsory voting for the Upper House we are basically speaking about by-elections, because the polls for the two Houses are generally held on the same day.

I do not know whether a Legislative Council poll has been held on a different day from that of the House of Assembly: perhaps the poll held in 1890 was held on a different day. It is theoretically possible for the Upper House to face its electors on a different day from that on which the House of Assembly election is held, but this generally does not happen. I see no particular kudos accruing to a member of the Legislative Council because he has been returned with a small vote. If only 5,000 or 6,000 people have gone to the poll, that is no index of how people feel at that time. If I were elected on such a vote I do not think I would feel in any privileged position or that I could represent properly the people who returned me, because only a small percentage of those who could vote would have done so.

I believe that the getting out process of the vote in Australia is nationalized, and should be: the candidate with modest means has to be protected against the use of wealth by his opponent or opponents. I see no special value in any difference between the Houses of Parliament in this State apart from those that have been canvassed by Government members: that is, Council members are elected for six years on different boundaries from those obtaining for the Lower House, and half its members retire at a time. For these reasons I support the Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): The member for Mawson pretended to give a political science lecture, but it is a funny thing how every one on the other side always comes back to the old Labor line on compulsory voting as part of the philosophy of that Party. They believe in compulsion in everything, trying to make people good, and this is just one other example of it. The arguments pro and con on compulsory voting or non-compulsory voting have been raked over pretty well in this House during this session and in previous sessions, and there is little new to add to it. Looking to the Bill as such, I find myself in some trouble over it (and members opposite would take some comfort from that), because I oppose the major proposal in the Bill which is to make voting compulsory for the Legislative Council. But there are a few sprats and mackerels in it (consequential amendments which I support—the reduction in the age from 21 years to 18 years for the witnessing of postal votes, and so on); these things are good.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Why not—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I cannot hear the Deputy Premier's interjection.

THE SPEAKER: He is out of order. There must be no interchange.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I thought you would say that, Sir, but he is still going on. This Bill, as those consequential amendments show, is part of a set of Bills introduced to change the voting processes in South Australia. In fact, because of the defeat of the companion Bill to make the franchise for the Legislative Council a full one, I wondered whether the Government would go on with this measure. Indeed, this Bill depends to some extent on that measure, which was dealt with summarily in another place, to my regret. However, the Government is proceeding with this measure, and therefore we have to deal with it.

Mr. Hopgood: We don't want to let them off the hook.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is a revealing interjection from the member for Mawson, as was one he made when I was speaking the other day on the trading hours Bill. I do not think I need say anything about it; it is merely another illustration of the motives of members opposite. They do not care too much really about this Bill or about compulsory voting, so long as they can embarrass those in another place for their own purposes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It's impossible.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Members opposite never give up trying to embarrass members in another place, and the member for Mawson is one of those who tries as hard as anyone else. I oppose compulsory voting for the Legislative Council for two reasons, really. First, I have yet to be convinced that a compulsory vote is "democratic", but, more important, in this

instance I believe, as the member for Flinders made clear in his excellent speech a little while ago, there must be a distinction in the franchises of the two Houses. I have often said that in this place. The first time that I said it was in 1965 when I received much support from members opposite, the Walsh Government having introduced a Bill for full franchise for the Legislative Council. Supporting that measure, I made it clear that there had to be, if the two-House system was to work properly (and I acknowledge that members opposite do not want it), a distinction between the franchises of the two Houses. I think it is unjust that that distinction should be based on excluding any citizen from the right to vote. Therefore, we must look to other ways of doing it.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It can still be done if—

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It can still be done, the convenient way of doing it being to have, as the distinction between the two Houses, voluntary enrolment (which this Bill would do away with), voluntary voting, a different term for all members in the two Houses and, as has been suggested by members on this side during the present session, a different day for voting. If we have compulsory enrolment and compulsory voting for this House, the only way to get a true voluntary vote for the other House is by having an election on another day. Members opposite, because it happens to suit their argument—

Mr. Clark: Isn't that the reason why you are opposing it?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suggest that the member for Elizabeth (the pedagogue from Gawler) wait a moment. Because it happens to suit members opposite to have the election on the same day, they rubbish us for suggesting a separate day but, heavens above, the way they are going, if they had their way they would have people trotting off compulsorily to the polls almost every Saturday. We saw a political disaster recently that resulted in the dismissal of a Minister. We have had in the last day the insistence on compulsory polls for changes in the shopping districts, and so on. It ill behoves the Party opposite to suggest that there should not be a separate day for Legislative Council elections, when they themeselves are taking people to the polls far more frequently than would members on this side.

Mr. Clark: That's democracy.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is not democracy to compel people to do that. Members opposite can argue until they are blue in the face—

Mr. Ryan: The only thing blue about you is that you are a Liberal.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Price is as red as a beetroot.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham has the floor, and interjections must cease.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Thank you, Sir. It is a contradiction in terms to say that a compulsory vote is part of a democratic process. I thought it was a most extraordinary statement for the Attorney-General to make, as he did in his second reading explanation, when he said:

> The community has found no difficulty over a long period of years in understanding and appreciating that the only way in which a true democratic consensus can be obtained is for all citizens to be compelled by the process of law to face the issues that arise at an election and to exercise their franchise.

That is a simple contradiction in terms. I am prepared to accept the compulsory system of voting for this House, although I do not believe it is particularly democratic, because it is something that I have always known throughout the whole of my voting life, and I am prepared to tolerate it and to use it, even though I have doubts about the pure democratic theory of it. I have often said in this place previously that I was surprised when I first went to the United States and was reproached with our system of Government, being told that I did not come from a democracy, because we compelled people to vote.

Mr. Mathwin: Hear, hear!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Glenelg, who comes from the old country, where voting is also voluntary, echoes that sentiment. I know that the honourable member is a real thorn in the side of Government members, who would get rid of him if they could. However, he is pretty well entrenched, and members opposite will have a hard job to move him. This is the view that is held by most people in most democracies: that to compel people to vote is undemocratic. Australia is one of the few countries in the world where we have a compulsory vote. Members opposite, because it suits their arguments, limit their horizons to Australia when they talk about this matter; they do not talk about other Parliamentary democracies of the world where voting is voluntary, because that would destroy their argument. In most Parliamentary

democracies there is a voluntary vote, and that is regarded as a perfectly satisfactory and proper way of electing members of Parliament.

The Hon. L. J. King: We're more advanced than that.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Attorney says that, yet he does not advance one single argument to show why compulsory voting is a more advanced form of voting than is voluntary voting. The only reason why he makes that assertion is that it is the policy of his Party, and he must stick to it, whether he likes it or not. It is not proper for members opposite to chide members on this side because several of us have been canvassing in recent months the thought of voluntary voting for the House of Assembly, yet the Attorney-General has done this. In his second reading explanation he said that, smarting under electoral defeat, we were looking for some system that would suit us better.

I remind members opposite that, when I came into this House, the Labor Party (and the Premier, and the members for Ross Smith and Elizabeth were members then) was enthusiastically in favour of proportional representation for this House. Session after session dear old Mick O'Halloran used to introduce Bills to bring in proportional representation in South Australia. Suddenly, one June Queen's Birthday holiday weekend, their masters considered that this was no longer a good system. We never heard a jolly word about it after that: the members for Ross Smith and Elizabeth and others never brought up the subject again, because it no longer conformed to Party policy. It is just possible that some members opposite believed in proportional representation before the change was made in their policy. If they did believe in it, they have been very silent since. For example, it appears that the member for Ross Smith never believed in it, but he voted for it in this place session after session until there was a change in the policy of his Party.

The Hon. L. J. King: That's what's known as teamwork.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It may be teamwork. I have referred to this matter particularly for the benefit of the Attorney-General because he has chided some of us with maybe changing our views on the question of voluntary or compulsory voting. I point out that all members of his Party compulsorily changed their views on another aspect of the voting process. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STAMP DUTIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (BETTING)

Returned from the Legislative Council with an amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, December 1, at 2 p.m.