

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, March 4, 1971

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

## ELECTRICITY TRUST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA 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.

## QUESTIONS

## MORATORIUM ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr. HALL: In view of the large and wasteful expenditure of public money, as revealed in an answer to a question in this House on Tuesday, in pursuance of the objectives of the Moratorium Royal Commission, will the Premier take early action to terminate the operation of the Commission?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No.

## EMPIRE TIMES

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Has the Attorney-General come to any conclusion and, if so, has he taken any action with regard to the *Empire Times*? During the earlier part of this session, I think in September or October last, at the request of a number of people in Adelaide, I drew to the Attorney's attention a couple of issues of this Flinders University paper. Subsequently, my Commonwealth colleague, Mr. McLeay, made some comments on the matters that were reported, as also were some comments in reply by the Attorney-General. On December 8 last I wrote to the Attorney, following Mr. McLeay's comment. On December 10, the Attorney was kind enough to reply to my letter within two days. His reply, in part, is as follows:

The police are investigating the September issue of *Empire Times*, to which you referred in your question in the House. The results of those investigations are not yet known. I have received a letter from Mr. McLeay, M.H.R., which refers to the October issue of *Empire Times*. I do not have a copy of this issue but have asked the police to investigate the complaint which has been made by Mr. McLeay regarding its contents.

I have not heard from the Attorney since, either about the issue to which I referred him or about the subsequent issue. I think that the six months rule applies to these prosecutions in any case and that the period of six months will soon have expired in respect

of the earlier issue. Therefore, I assume that the Attorney has had a report and that he has considered the matter.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am conscious of the six months period to which the honourable member refers. For that reason, I spoke to the Chief Secretary yesterday about this very matter. The honourable member is incorrect in assuming that I have had a report: I have not.

Mr. Millhouse: I did not say that the Attorney-General had had a report; I said I assumed he had.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am merely pointing out that the honourable member's assumption is unfounded. However, the Chief Secretary informed me when I spoke to him yesterday that a report was about to be presented. I expect that it will come to my notice (I hope, in the next few days), and upon receiving it I shall have an opportunity of deciding whether a prosecution should be laid.

## HOUSING REPAIR

Mr. WELLS: Will the Premier, as Minister in charge of housing, attempt to have rectified a situation entailing the sale of an unsatisfactory house by the Housing Trust to one of my constituents? This constituent, who lives at Ingle Farm, bought a house from the Housing Trust 18 months ago. He had much trouble with certain defects in it, but they were rectified. However, six months ago he noted that the red bricks making up the outside walls of his house were fading and his house was rapidly assuming a piebald appearance. It is becoming worse. He contacted the Housing Trust, which sent an inspector to see the house. He apparently agreed that its condition was unsatisfactory and undertook to contact the contractor to have him examine it. This happened, but when my constituent contacted the Housing Trust later he was told that nothing could be done about it. This is a disgraceful situation, and I ask the Minister for his assistance to have it rectified.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member will give me the name and address of his constituent and the date of the contract, I will have the matter taken up with the Housing Trust.

## POP FESTIVAL

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Can the Minister of Works say what were the results of research carried out on the contamination of

the Myponga watershed during the recent Myponga pop festival? I understand that a study has been made.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have not the report with me but I brought it down with me last week in case an honourable member was interested in the pollution level as a result of the Myponga pop festival. Prior to, during and after the festival, I had officers of the department check the area. In addition, we had on the site a mobile chlorinating plant which operated during the festival. Some of my officers were present to supervise the cleaning up of the area, the disposal of surface rubbish, and so on. Subsequent tests revealed that the pollution level increased only slightly. To give members an idea of the level of the increase, from memory I can say that it was the equivalent of what would be produced by four cows grazing there for one year. As a result, I did not proceed with any prosecution. However, I believe that it may be necessary for the department to have more stringent control over functions of this type. I should be concerned about any proliferation of events of this nature in the watershed area. The festival in question did not give cause for alarm, although it was not inexpensive to supervise the event in the way I have described to ensure that there were no adverse effects. I believe that this type of expense should not be a continuing item to be borne by the department. I do not intend to prosecute as a result of the event referred to.

#### VICTORIAN EDUCATION

Mr. CLARK: Can the Minister of Education say what action has been taken by the Victorian Government to restrict expenditure on education, for the local newspapers seem to have treated the matter as unimportant, making no reference to it?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On an Australian Broadcasting Commission news broadcast yesterday, I heard some account of the actions taken in Victoria. Therefore, I was concerned to find out just what was the position in that State as a consequence of the actions taken by the Commonwealth Government. I have been disturbed that no reference has been made in the Adelaide newspapers to the expenditure cuts that the Victorian Government has made in regard to education. I believe this is unfortunate: it means, in effect, that the press is not facing up to its overall responsibility to the community. In Victoria, 300 temporary teachers are to be dismissed by the Education Department, and a complete

freeze has been placed on any further employment or recruitment of teachers by the department. The three teacher organizations in the State have apparently been virulent in their criticism of these reductions, saying that, in one or two cases, this will leave schools in a drastic position without adequate staff to carry on. What the outcome of this will be is hard to say. As honourable members will know, the Victorian education system is plagued by much strife at present. However, I think it is important that the people of South Australia, including members of this House, should know the kind of action that has been taken in a Liberal State on this matter in response to the decisions of the Prime Minister and his Government, as announced at the recent Premiers' Conference.

#### WESTERN TEACHERS COLLEGE

Mr. COUMBE: In view of questions asked earlier this session about the construction of the Western Teachers College, can the Minister of Education give some information not only about the site of the project but also about the stage design work has reached on this important project?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A design for the proposed new Western Teachers College is going ahead, although we are still at the stage of producing a plan that is within the financial feasibility of the State. Initial attempts to do that were a little excessive in cost, but I will not go into that matter in precise detail. In view of the increased building costs that will probably result from the national wage case decision, the money available for this triennium, which takes us to the middle of May, 1973, is unlikely to be sufficient both to build the Murray Park Teachers College and to purchase land for the Western Teachers College. Unless the Commonwealth Government modifies its programme prior to the next triennium, some State funds may have to be used.

Mr. Coumbe: Are you saying that the land has not been purchased?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Notices of intention have been sent to the owners; so, the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act have been instituted and we can get entry into the land when it is required. The question of land acquisition will not delay the building of Western Teachers College. What will hold up that project is the availability of funds and, unless additional funds are made available from the Commonwealth Government prior to

mid-1973 either for school buildings generally or for teachers colleges specifically, it is clear that we will not be able financially to commence the construction of the new Western Teachers College prior to 1973-74. However, at this stage we are still going on with the necessary design work that must be done before the project is referred to the Public Works Standing Committee.

Mr. Coumbe: Will you spend money this triennium?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We hope to spend money this triennium.

Mr. Coumbe: Wasn't that a condition?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At one stage we asked the Commonwealth Government whether it would agree to provide finance for the Western Teachers College next triennium if we spent money this triennium, but the answer was "No". So, at this stage the only way whereby work on Western Teachers College could commence prior to July, 1973, would be by taking money away from our normal school-building programme. If the Commonwealth Government persists in its current attitude of not providing any additional funds for school buildings, that will not be possible. That situation is clear already, and it will mean that work cannot commence prior to July, 1973. This position may be forced upon us by whatever decision the Commonwealth Government makes. All I can say is that necessary design and planning work will continue so that, whenever we have funds available, we will be able to commence work on the project.

#### KEITH MAIN

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Works report to the House on the progress of lateral constructions leading from the main from Tailern Bend to Keith? I have received requests from landholders in the hundred of Stirling, in the western part of the Victoria District. Some landholders in that area are greatly concerned about when they can expect to receive reticulated water from the main, and I should be pleased if the Minister would give any information that he has, or bring down a report to the House on the matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will bring down a report, because I may not give the correct information off the cuff. I have received several deputations from landowners (I am not certain whether they were from the area that the honourable member has mentioned or from the surrounding area)

about speeding up construction of the main. Because of the desperate situation that some persons are in, I will obtain a report. However, I think it will be some time before their needs can be met. Nothing has been done to slow down the work in this area, or anything of that nature. As far as I am aware, the work is a little ahead of schedule. However, I will check that.

#### POISON

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Lands to the question I asked last week about the laying on roads of the poison 1080?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague states:

From time to time the Woods and Forests Department lays 1080 baits for vermin destruction on roads abutting or near forest reserves. Bi-monthly notice of intention to lay these baits is inserted in the press in the district where such action is contemplated. As a further safeguard, notices are placed at each end of the section of road 21 days before the laying of poison baits along the distance indicated. Only persons authorized in writing by the Minister of Lands are permitted to carry out this work. No objections to this practice have been received by the foresters in charge of the various districts in the South-East.

#### CLARENDON RESERVOIR

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my recent question regarding the suitability of the Clarendon dam site?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: At this stage in the investigations of the Clarendon dam site, there is nothing to suggest that it will be unsuitable, especially as there is greater tolerance in foundation requirements for the proposed rockfill dam compared with that required for a concrete dam, as I think I said the other day. However, a final decision must, of necessity, wait until all geological investigations are complete, including the construction of the adit. The fact that a very suitable quarry for the rock required in the dam has been discovered adjacent to the dam sites must weigh heavily in its favour. During July, 1970, the possible construction programme for the dam was examined in the light of funds likely to be available for this project. Subject to recommendation from the Public Works Committee and approval by the Government, planning following the construction of the exploratory adit between January and July, 1971, allowed for the construction of the diversion

tunnel and tower base between February and August, 1972, and work on the main dam contract between June, 1973, and May, 1976. With no further change in the present financial situation, the overall completion date is not likely to be delayed, although some delay in the timing of the diversion tunnel is probable. Meanwhile, land for the project is being obtained as it comes on to the market.

#### TEA TREE GULLY WATER SUPPLY

Mrs. BYRNE: Because of the present fire risk, will the Minister of Works reconsider his recent decision regarding the provision of a water supply for residents of Tea Tree Gully in streets east of Haines Road? The Minister will recall that on various dates, both during his term of office and before, I have raised this matter by question and by correspondence. On the last occasion the Minister said that the Engineering and Water Supply Department had no proposals to lay water mains east of Haines Road, because a high-level water system would be required to serve the area and such a scheme could not be contemplated for a considerable time because of the sparse development in that area in relation to the high cost of the scheme. I point out to the Minister that on January 8 a bush fire threatened this area, in which is situated houses near dry grazing country (some of this land is razed) and a pine grove owned by the city of Tea Tree Gully.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Because of the further representation by the honourable member I shall be pleased to re-examine the matter.

#### WHEAT POOL

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Works a reply from the Minister of Agriculture to my question of February 25 about wheat payments?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: My colleague reports that the South Australian Manager of the Australian Wheat Board advises that at present the 1968-69 wheat pool is in debt, but as proceeds from credit sales are received during the period March to November, 1971, the final amount available will be about 13.75c a bushel. The board intends to recommend to the Minister for Primary Industry that 10c a bushel be distributed next July; the balance should be available before the end of the calendar year.

#### WATER FILTERS

Mr. McRAE: Can the Minister of Works say whether the Engineering and Water Supply Department has approved of or recommended any commercial brand of water filter for use on domestic taps, and will the Minister comment on the usefulness of any such gadgets? Recently, in the Para Hills area a company has been selling small water filters, which its representatives say contains a secret commercial ingredient, at \$5.40 on the basis that the company will replace the secret ingredient once every three months. The company has told my constituents that this gadget has the endorsement of the Engineering and Water Supply Department and was created by Weapons Research Establishment, of all things. This company has been working in an area in my district that has been affected by the sort of water referred to by the Minister yesterday, or the day before. For the benefit of other constituents and the public generally, can the Minister say whether the allegation is true that the department has recommended this gadget in any way, and does he consider that this type of apparatus has any use?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: So far as I am aware the Engineering and Water Supply Department would not approve of any sort of filter, water softener, or device used for the treatment of water. However, because I cannot speak for the department, or officers of the department, without checking I will do so, but I will certainly have something to say if the department is involved in this sort of thing, although I have no doubt that it is not. It seems to me that those responsible for marketing this sort of product have taken advantage of a situation that has occurred as a result of the addition of fluoride to the water supply, but their claims (as far as I am aware) are completely unreasonable and, in some cases, completely untrue. I do not know the type of device to which the honourable member has referred, but if he could obtain for me a sample item I should be pleased to have my department examine it. I shall be pleased to obtain a report on the sort of devices that are available, although I do not think it would be fair or reasonable of me to ask the department actually to comment on their efficiency or otherwise. However, I believe that if a person is prepared to pay a price he can obtain a home-unit filter that is efficient but far dearer, of course, than the \$5-odd device referred to by the honourable member. I will examine the honourable member's question in detail, discuss it with my officers, and bring down a report.

### MENINGIE DRAINAGE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Local Government considered the proposals submitted by the Meningie council regarding drainage for that town and, if he has, will he say whether those proposals have been approved? Further, in the event of ratepayers not agreeing to the raising of the necessary sum, which I understand is \$20,000 more than the figure referred to in the original submission, will the Minister say whether there is any possibility of helping the council construct the proposed scheme as submitted by Electrolux?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Having considered this matter over a period, and having had a deputation on it some time ago from the Meningie council, I have approved the scheme in principle, as is required under the Local Government Act, subject to the satisfactory working of the scheme. However, as the honourable member may care to have further details associated with this matter, I will try to obtain more specific detail, and let him have it next week.

### NURIOOTPA VINE COMMITTEE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to investigate the possibility of purchasing certain land so that the operations of the Nuriootpa Vine Improvement Research Committee can be extended? I have been requested by the organization to raise this matter. It comprises grapegrowers and other interested people, and the research centre does excellent work in vine selection and improvement at Nuriootpa, but its operations are curtailed, because additional land is needed fairly urgently. As I believe that land is available immediately across the road from the centre, this seems a most opportune time to purchase the additional land, as suitable land may not be available in the future. I should appreciate an investigation and decision regarding this matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to refer the matter to my colleague.

### CONTRACEPTIVE PAMPHLET

Mr. VENNING: Has the Minister of Education any further information about the pamphlet on contraceptives that was to be distributed outside our schools? Last week the member for Davenport asked the Minister a question about this matter, and the Minister replied that he had not heard much about it other than having read what was in the newspaper. Yesterday I received a letter from a constituent,

who is the Chairman of the Southern and Northern Yorke Peninsula Area Associations of School Welfare Clubs. At a meeting, which was attended by 160 mothers, held to discuss this matter, distribution of this pamphlet was condemned, and it was agreed that the Minister should be contacted and his views on the situation obtained. Has the Minister any information on this matter in addition to the information supplied when the previous question was asked by the member for Davenport?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I have not seen a copy of the pamphlet. As the honourable member will appreciate, I am not responsible for the activities of an outside organization. He will also appreciate that the meeting to which he referred took place the day before it was reported in the *Advertiser* and prior to subsequent reports that made it clear that the Women's Liberation Movement did not intend to distribute the pamphlet outside schools. I can only go on the reports that have appeared in the press on this matter, and it is difficult to get a completely accurate picture of what is happening or what might happen. As far as the department is concerned, it co-operates with the Family Life Movement, whose members give lectures to senior students only, and only with the approval of the parents concerned. I think I made it clear previously that the distribution of such a pamphlet inside schools in a propagandist way is not the sort of thing the department would like to see. But, without issuing instructions on the matter, I have every confidence in the discretion of our headmasters to deal with problems as they arise.

Regarding the position outside of schools, this is a matter of local control. Some councils have by-laws governing the distribution of literature. In general, the Education Department is not in a position to do anything to prevent members of the general public handing out literature in the streets outside schools, and I think the honourable member will appreciate that. This matter created much excitement as a result of the original press report. Subsequently, a letter from a representative of the Women's Liberation Movement appeared in the *Advertiser* and it stated that the only intention of the movement was to hand out the pamphlet to senior students at schools where the movement had been invited to talk to senior students. This is completely at variance with the early press reports. I do not know what is the correct position regarding the movement's intentions. The honourable member, together

with other honourable members, can have confidence in the ability, discretion and common sense of the headmasters and senior staffs in the schools.

#### PARLIAMENT HOUSE STAFF

Dr. TONKIN: Mr. Speaker, will you consider the employment of temporary clerical assistance to aid members' secretaries in coping with large quantities (if my mail is of any judge of the situation) of letters now being received about *Oh! Calcutta!*?

The SPEAKER: I shall consider the matter.

*Later:*

The SPEAKER: One steno-secretary is absent today on sick leave and, temporarily, this throws an additional burden on the remaining secretaries. I do not consider that the present transitory spate of letters about *Oh! Calcutta!* warrants any further assistance being provided.

#### PARLIAMENT HOUSE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr. CARNIE: Can the Premier say whether it is the Government's intention to proceed with the Parliament House redevelopment plan announced late last year? On February 9, the Premier was reported as saying that, in view of the economic situation, the plan to renovate Parliament House would have to go out of the window. I understand that the Public Works Committee has not been officially told of this situation but is still taking evidence on the project. If the committee recommends that the work be done, does the Government, in view of the Premier's statement, intend to follow the committee's recommendation?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government has not withdrawn the reference from the committee, simply because eventually work will have to be done on this place. Therefore, the Government needs to be in a position to do some work at some time, and no work of a major nature can be carried out without the Public Works Committee's originally having looked at it. No doubt the honourable member will be aware that last week the air-conditioning in this House broke down, and for a period it looked as though we would be for all time completely without air-conditioning here, because it seemed as though we could not repair it. Much of the equipment and installations in this place is not merely obsolete but is in a dangerous condition. Therefore, the material is before the committee. I can tell the honourable member that if we

get a recommendation from the committee it will not, in the present financial circumstances facing this State, be proceeded with in total at all. However, I did point out that certain essential maintenance work in relation to this House would have to be carried out. It would be a disastrous thing for this State if the Parliament House electricity system, which is in a shocking and parlous condition, was ever to break down to such an extent that it caused a fire and the place burned down around our ears.

#### PETERBOROUGH ADULT EDUCATION

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Education tell me when construction will commence on the welding shops at the Mid North Adult Education Centre at Peterborough? On December 11 last year the council of that centre received notification from the Director of Technical Education that approval had been given for the erection of these welding shops at this centre and that details had been forwarded to the Public Buildings Department. However, no indication was given as to the approximate time when this building would be erected, and the council would like some indication of this so that planning can commence.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will make inquiries and bring back an answer for the honourable member in due course.

#### BRIGHTON ROAD

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport use his influence to have an early re-start made on the widening of Brighton Road? A report in today's *Advertiser*, under the heading "Speed-Up in Road Work" states:

"Work on widening arterial roads would be accelerated in an attempt to keep pace with increasing volumes of traffic," the Commissioner of Highways (Mr. Johnke) said today.

As the Minister is well aware, the gang has been away from Brighton Road, I think since November. This road takes a colossal volume of traffic, particularly at weekends. Will he use his influence in this matter?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Last week in this House I announced the adoption by the Government of the Breuning report, which provided for speeding up the widening of arterial roads. I regret that the honourable member who has asked this question did not support the Government on this matter. Despite that, I will see whether we can get the widening of Brighton Road also speeded up.

## RECLAIMED WATER

Mr. FERGUSON: Can the Premier say whether any report has been furnished by the Health Department concerning the availability of water reclaimed from Bolivar effluent? There seems to be some discrepancy between the answer I received yesterday from the Premier and one given by the Minister of Agriculture on this subject. I think yesterday the Premier implied that a report from the Health Department had not yet been completed.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was the Agriculture Department.

Mr. FERGUSON: Yes, but I asked whether the report of the Health Department was available, and the Premier gave me to understand that it was not but that the Agriculture Department was making further investigations and that probably upon the completion of those investigations a report would be available. The Minister of Agriculture, in his reply concerning the availability of this water, said that a report had been received by the Engineering and Water Supply Department from the Health Department and from the Agriculture Department, and he went on to itemize the various investigations that the Agriculture Department was further making. However, he did not refer to the Health Department's making any further investigations.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Health Department is not making further investigations; that department has gone as far as it can go in the matter. We are dependent on the results of investigations by the Agriculture Department. I pointed out yesterday to the honourable member that we had originally been given to understand that we would have a report from the Agriculture Department early this year, but in fact on a re-evaluation of the work that needs to be done by that department it now appeared that we would not get that report until about the end of this calendar year.

Mr. Ferguson: Has there been a report made to date?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There has been a report from the Health Department and the Agriculture Department, taking the thing as far as they can go. However, neither of those departments is able to reach firm conclusions until the work now outlined by the Agriculture Department has been completed.

## MAIN SOUTH ROAD

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport take up with the Highways Department the possibility of controlling traffic ingress and egress at the Victoria Hotel on the Main South Road at O'Halloran Hill? Because of the lack of any kerbing or any other control at this part of the Main South Road, motor cars can move on to that road from the parking area adjacent to the hotel at any point along a distance of about 150yds. The down traffic from Adelaide along the road is rounding a considerable curve about 200yds. closer to town and therefore comes on to this spot blind. Anyone wishing to go from the hotel back to Adelaide has to cut diagonally across the traffic pattern and through a gap in the traffic island. This situation was brought very vividly to my notice about three weeks ago in an incident that could have resulted in a Mawson by-election.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will get a detailed report for the honourable member on this matter. Speaking from memory, I think he is pinpointing a weakness that currently exists. Where a road is declared a controlled road, that control can be exercised at present only on properties that are altered after the Act has its effect. We have an amendment to bring forward in an amending Bill so that cases such as the one referred to by the honourable member can be looked after. I will get further information on the matter and let the honourable member have it.

## JERVOIS WATER SUPPLY

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Works tell me when it is likely that a filtration and chlorination plant can be added to the reticulated water supply to the Jervois area? Secondly, can he assure me that the treatment of effluent from the Murray Bridge sewage works, some 15 miles above Jervois, is not affecting the quality of the water? I should like to read at least one short paragraph from a letter from the Secretary of the Jervois Co-operative Dairying Society Limited, who writes.

Our bacteriologist, Mr. R. Quill, Hawkesbury College, N.S.W., has definitely identified yeast contained in the water supply, which has been substantiated by independent laboratory tests. This yeast, together and coupled with other micro-organisms, have had a very detrimental effect on our cheese quality and production . . . We have had many knowledgeable experts concerned with the industry inspecting and examining the factory recently, some of these

being: South Australian Department of Agriculture Dairy Division; Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization; Kraft Foods Limited Technical Advisory Service; and D. Lavery and Sons, Technical Supervisor.

While it is obvious that perhaps the owners of the premises themselves could do something about chlorination and filtration, that is only part of the answer, of course, because all the dairymen are using water from that same reticulated supply.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will obtain a detailed report for the honourable member.

#### MAGPIES

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister for Conservation look at the sections of the Fauna Conservation Act concerning the destruction of magpies with a view to increasing the protection of those birds? At present, the Act allows a magpie to be killed if it attacks a person. Sometimes this means that the bird is destroyed on the word of one person, as happened recently in my district. I am not criticizing the police officer concerned who carried out the destruction of the bird. It was a distasteful job for him. He took every care to see that the bird did not suffer, but local residents assure me that this bird was tame and well known in the area, calling regularly at several houses for food.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I will examine the matter raised by the honourable member and get a reply.

#### DOCTORS

Mr. GUNN: I direct my question to the Attorney-General, representing the Chief Secretary. Will the Government consider tightening up the bonding scheme for the training of doctors? Recently, there was appointed to Kimba a doctor who had trained under the scheme, but he refused to take up his appointment, thus leaving the people without a doctor. They had been promised that this doctor would be made available to them. I am led to believe that this doctor had no intention of going to Kimba but underwent the training scheme so that he could qualify and make use of the Government scheme for his own purposes.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the matter to my colleague and get an answer.

#### MOUNT GAMBIER HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Mount Gambier High School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: A contract has been let for the preparatory earthworks, seeding and reticulation of the Mount Gambier High School oval. The work is about to commence and the Public Buildings Department confidently expects that seeding of the oval will be undertaken during this autumn.

#### SCHOOL BOOKS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Education say what are the circumstances in which John Scott Educational Books Supply has been given the contract for the supply of school books to students in a number of schools in Elizabeth? Is it the policy of the Government for private firms to be given contracts of this kind? I have been approached by a resident of Elizabeth, a parent of a child at one of the high schools in that city, with regard to this matter. I have been handed a couple of book lists which this firm supplies, at the top of which are the words "5th Year: Book list for 1971" and "2nd Year: Book list for 1971", both for Elizabeth High School. Also, I have been shown copies of circulars sent out by the headmaster. I desire to make it clear that I am not necessarily criticizing this scheme, but I understand that there has been much discontent in Elizabeth because a number of the books have not yet been delivered, even though in some cases they have been paid for. The advice given to parents was that the books should be secured during the month of January, well before school began. In fact, one circular states:

There are now several schools using this scheme. Queues will be avoided by buying before the end of January.

It has been pointed out to me that, where the request was complied with, it caused some financial strain in some cases, particularly where children were going into high school and needed new uniforms, which necessitated a substantial outlay; then came the books on top of that, following within a few days of Christmas. I have not heard of this practice being adopted widely in other areas but apparently it is adopted by most, if not all, of the secondary schools in the Elizabeth area.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The practice whereby a certain firm gets a sort of franchise to provide books to a particular school and takes off the hands of the school the clerical work involved in the procedure while still ensuring a certain return for the school was first instituted in 1969, when the member for Davenport was Minister. I think it applied,



first of all, at the Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School, although I would not be sure of my facts on that.

Mrs. Steele: It was pioneered then.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, and the scheme has gradually spread to several other areas. For instance, Victor Harbour has such a scheme. The member for Price says it is a very successful scheme for the Port Adelaide Girls Technical High School. I know it is partially adopted in Whyalla and elsewhere. Past experience of the scheme has been, in the main, that it has ensured an early supply of books. Some special problems may have occurred this year. I will certainly have this matter investigated as a consequence of the honourable member's question, and particularly any difficulty experienced in the Elizabeth area. I point out, however, that traditionally as a result of the methods of purchasing books at secondary level, there have been difficulties in the supply of books and delays have invariably occurred. In fact, there have been complaints about books not being available as late as the second term. Traditionally, we have had serious problems in this area, and the department is concerned to ensure that books are available at the earliest possible moment. I will have the particular problem raised by the honourable member examined.

#### MARDEN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. SLATER: Can the Minister of Education say whether a tree-planting programme will be undertaken in the grounds or surrounding the oval at the new Marden High School, for at this stage the school is completely devoid of vegetation, and hence there is no shade?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The planting of trees is the responsibility of the parents' organizations. Although I am not certain of this, I do not think that the department even subsidizes the planting of trees. Under the policy introduced in 1967 by Mr. Loveday when he was Minister of Education, the provision of ovals at the new schools has been made the responsibility of the Education Department, that load having been taken off the parents. I will check whether or not a subsidy is provided for trees. However, the department would not have a programme for tree-planting at the school referred to; this would be the responsibility of the school in consultation with the school council and the parents and friends' organization. The honourable member should take up the matter with the Headmaster of the

school to see what he intends to do about it: he may already have it in hand, having discussed it with the parents on the school council and with the parents and friends' organization.

#### MURRAY LAKES

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I wish to ask the Minister of Works a question about the future of Lakes Alexandrina and Albert. When I asked a question about this on November 10, the Minister gave several figures which showed that, under the present entitlement provided in the River Murray Waters Agreement (and unless an increase is obtained by our ratifying the Dartmouth agreement—the only way we can obtain an increase—that will remain our entitlement) there is likely to be a deficiency of over 250,000 acre feet in years of controlled flow. This means that in some years Lake Albert will dry out almost completely or will become merely a swamp, and the level of Lake Alexandrina will fall greatly, with that lake also possibly taking on the aspect of a swamp. These matters have not been fully brought home to the people of South Australia. Many primary production enterprises operate around the lakes, which are also the centre of a growing tourist industry involving much investment. Will the Minister forecast what will happen to these lakes if work on the Dartmouth dam is not proceeded with? Also, can he say what will happen to them if the Chowilla dam is imposed on the system after the construction of the Dartmouth dam?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Regarding the effect of the building of Dartmouth on Lakes Albert and Alexandrina, I can say only that, if the honourable member is worried that the construction of the Dartmouth dam will not proceed, I can tell him that I believe the legislation currently before the House will resolve that situation.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I was asked a question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I suggest that the Minister is not in order in canvassing matters that are on the Notice Paper.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Why was the question allowed? The member for Alexandra canvassed this matter in asking his question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The question had nothing to do with that.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member in asking his question—

The SPEAKER: Order! I take it that the Minister is now speaking to the point of order.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, I am trying to reply to the question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Sir, I have raised a point of order because, in answering the member for Alexandra, the Minister deliberately brought in a matter that is on the Notice Paper, even though the question was not concerned with that matter. I take the point of order that he is not entitled to canvass a matter currently on the Notice Paper and the subject of debate.

The SPEAKER: Unfortunately, I did not hear what the Minister was saying, as I was otherwise occupied. I am confident that the honourable Minister is aware of Standing Orders and would not disobey them.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will not reply to the question, for it concerns the construction of both Dartmouth and Chowilla dams and, as the member for Mitcham has said, that matter is before the House. Therefore, under Standing Orders I cannot reply.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense!

The SPEAKER: Order! A few moments ago the member for Mitcham raised a point of order at a time when my attention was otherwise occupied. I expect the courtesy to be extended to the office of Speaker that he asks to be applied to other members. When I call for order, I mean that I want members to observe order: I will not tolerate cross-fire comments across the Chamber from any member, and I want to make that perfectly clear.

Mr. Millhouse: Sir—

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Throw him out.

The SPEAKER: Order! Someone interjected while I was on my feet. Again I direct members' attention to this unseemly conduct in the Chamber. Members must observe Standing Orders or otherwise suffer the consequences.

#### COMMONWEALTH GRANT

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Treasurer forecast what he expects the Commonwealth Grants Commission, in its final summation of the affairs of the State, is likely to recommend as a grant to the State? On February 23, the Treasurer, in outlining his financial statement to the House, said:

The Grants Commission accepted that a case had been made and recommended to the Commonwealth that a special advance grant of \$5,000,000 be paid. The Commonwealth accepted that recommendation. I expect that, when the year's actual results are known, we will be able to sustain a case before the commission that some further grant is justified in respect of 1970-71.

As I understand that the commission met in Adelaide recently, I should think the Treasurer or his officers would have made submissions to it and would possibly have some indication now of what further grant will be made. The Treasurer may not be able to give an accurate reply at this stage, but it would help Opposition members, in regard to the whole question of the financial statement and the implications flowing from it, if the Treasurer could give members a rough idea of what he expects the commission to recommend as a special grant or grant-in-aid to South Australia.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: At this stage it is impossible to forecast what the Grants Commission will recommend by way of a further grant for this financial year. Had the financial results forecast by the States in their Budgets been maintained, a more accurate forecast could have been made. The honourable member will be aware that, in fixing the grant, the commission will be prepared to bring us to the Budget standard that has actually obtained this financial year in New South Wales and Victoria, provided that our services are not more generous and our tax raisings not more lenient than those that apply in those two States. At this stage of the proceedings it is impossible to forecast the Budget standards of New South Wales and Victoria because we do not know what their deficits will be, and it is impossible for us to forecast what they will be. In Victoria there was a budgeted deficit of about \$16,000,000 or \$17,000,000, but the forecast Budget deficit only a short time ago was \$41,000,000. In his most recent statement Sir Henry Bolte said that he aimed to reduce that deficit by about \$10,000,000; that would make Victoria's Budget deficit about \$31,000,000. New South Wales has published contradictory figures on its position. It budgeted for a deficit of about \$8,000,000. Then, at the Premiers' Conference it forecast a Budget deficit of \$50,000,000. However, at election time a week later Mr. Askin was talking about a Budget deficit of \$30,000,000.

It is hard to say what Budget standard we can look to, and we have insufficient evidence from our attendance before the commission

to make a forecast. Until we can forecast what the Budget standard deficit will be in the other States we do not know what standard the Grants Commission will set as a deficit, per capita, in South Australia to which the commission would want to bring us in order to give us the equivalent of the other States, provided that we have met the commission's conditions. Until we know those figures we have no accurate means of forecasting. We will know more after the Premiers' Conference on April 5, when figures from all States will be put before the Commonwealth Government as to what will be the actual Budget achievement of the States this year. Regarding the hearings of the Grants Commission in South Australia, I did appear before the commission but it made clear from the outset that it was visiting South Australia simply in an exploratory manner to acquaint itself with the standard of our services. At that stage the commission was not taking evidence on comparable budgetary standards and it was not forecasting what it would be doing.

#### HOUSING FINANCE

Mr. McRAE: Will the Attorney-General consider setting up a Select Committee to inquire into the question of temporary finance in respect of domestic dwellings? Recently, I have often mentioned difficulties that have occurred in financing the purchase of domestic dwellings, where that financing is by temporary finance through a finance company with a later permanent loan from a bank. This seems to be a far-reaching question that affects many people. Will the Attorney-General consider setting up a Select Committee to hear evidence and report back to the Government and the House on a reasonable solution to this important problem?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The problem to which the honourable member has referred is serious and has worried many people for years. Very serious problems arise in many ways, not the least important of which is the situation in which a purchaser finds that, after having committed himself to a temporary loan for one reason or another, he cannot obtain a permanent loan. The consequences can be disastrous to people who have acted in good faith at every stage of the transaction. Of course, I have not yet given sufficient thought to the honourable member's suggestion, but I am conscious of the problem and I will seriously consider his suggestion.

#### GREYHOUND RACING

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Attorney-General ask the Chief Secretary whether the Government agrees with the decision of the Totalizator Agency Board that greyhound racing clubs may not compete for business with other forms of racing in which the T.A.B. is involved? A press report indicates that the greyhound racing club based at Strathalbyn has been denied the right to conduct meetings with T.A.B. services on the night that had previously been arranged. The club has been informed that it may now hold meetings on Monday nights alternately with the South Australian Greyhound Racing Club, which is to conduct meetings at the Gawler oval. The problem is that T.A.B. returns to the clubs are a very important part of the total financial involvement to which they are committing themselves in relation to facilities and the availability of land that can be leased for racing purposes. If the T.A.B. can prevent the club based at Strathalbyn from racing on a night that suits it (having regard to trading and other local events), will we also find that T.A.B. licences for the Strathalbyn club and the club based at Gawler will be denied them on the nights arranged when trotting meetings are held on Monday nights instead of Tuesday nights? When that happens there will again be competition for business in respect of T.A.B. undertakings.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the honourable member's question to the Chief Secretary and bring down a reply.

#### SWIMMING POOLS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the Government intends to introduce amending legislation or regulations this year to require safety installations at private swimming pools? As there seems to be a steady increase in the number of private swimming pools and as few safety precautions are taken, it would help if safety measures could be laid down that would apply to pools built next summer.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: My department is aware of the considerable increase in the number of private swimming pools and it is considering ways of bringing them under control. I will have the honourable member's question investigated further and bring down a report.

### MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY

Mrs. STEELE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked late last year about the diploma course in medical technology at the Institute of Technology? I have some further information that I should like to give the Minister in explanation of the question. My earlier question related to two aspects: first, the future of the course in medical technology, about which there was some difficulty; and, secondly, a certain student who had already completed the first two years of his course and who had been told by the Institute of Technology that he could not do the third year because of the difficulty of finance and the fact that no lecturers were available in the subject. The information I have now is that towards the end of last year the medical technologists' profession made an offer to the institute, proposing to alter the structure of the curriculum so that arrangements could be made for Mr. Gale to complete his studies this year, but the institute turned down this proposition. Further, there are now on the permanent staff of the institute a microbiologist and a biochemist, both of whom could help Mr. Gale in those specific third-year subjects of his course. I also understand that the Minister, when receiving a deputation recently, was asked whether he would consider requesting the institute to reconsider its decision not to accept the offer by the profession last year to restructure the course so that this third-year student could complete his course. In view of that and the further information that I have been given in the last few days, I now ask the Minister whether he can reply to my question or whether he will obtain an answer from the institute as to what it intends to do in relation to Mr. Gale, who is a second-year student wishing to complete his third year and to complete the certificate.

As far as the future of the medical technology course is concerned, I understand that a private pathologist has paid for a medical technologist to be seconded to the institute for 12 months so that the ordinary certificate course can proceed, but there is also an advanced certificate course. I also ask the Minister what is the future of the advanced certificate in medical technology.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As the honourable member would be aware, in the period since the question was first asked in the House there have been certain discussions, involving the profession, the Institute of Technology,

and me, as Minister. I saw the deputation to which the honourable member has referred and agreed to write to the institute, making a further approach on behalf of the deputation so that Mr. Gale could complete his third year this year. Yesterday I received a reply from the institute. I have not got it with me at present and, as I do not want to speak other than in line with the exact details of that letter, I will bring down a detailed reply for the honourable member on Tuesday, and by that time I will have replied by letter to the persons concerned.

### WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION

Mr. BECKER: Will the Attorney-General investigate the principle involved and the method adopted by the Public Trustee in handling estates where workmen's compensation paid as a result of the death of a husband is held by the trustee on behalf of the widow? The husband of one of my constituents was killed in an accident at his employment 7½ years ago. He was covered by workmen's compensation and, although he left a will, the compensation was paid to the Public Trustee, to whom my constituent applied recently to increase the earning rate of interest on the amount still held. She had to engage a solicitor to apply to the Supreme Court to do this. My constituent has two married children and she recently applied to the Public Trustee to have the amount held by him transferred to her to enable her to repay the mortgage on her house, which she owned jointly with her late husband. The reply from the Deputy Public Trustee, dated December 11 last, states:

Your letter of December 4, 1970. The position in this matter has not altered and requests for payment will be dealt with in the normal way. The funds are not automatically transferred to you upon your request. If you are dissatisfied with the present state of affairs you are at liberty to instruct a solicitor to apply to the Supreme Court on your behalf for payment of funds to you.

I ask whether this costly procedure can be improved.

The Hon. L. J. KING: In the type of case mentioned by the honourable member the Public Trustee is charged with the responsibility of safeguarding the compensation for the benefit of the widow and it is not the practice to pay the amount in a lump sum but rather to hold it and invest it and to make payment to the widow periodically for the purpose of her maintenance and to meet any other commitments that the Public Trustee

deems proper. There are circumstances in which the Public Trustee will pay the lump sum to the widow and, as the Deputy Public Trustee points out in the letter, the widow may apply to the Supreme Court if she is dissatisfied with the Public Trustee's assessment of the situation. This has been a long-standing practice and is based on the view that, when a workman dies suddenly as a result of an accident, it may be inexpedient to simply pay the lump sum to the widow, who may be in an emotional state as a result of the death or may not be accustomed to handling large sums. It may be doing her a great disservice simply to put a lump sum into her hands. It may be that this view is less valid in 1971 than it was years ago. Nevertheless, the view still prevails, and it is still the practice of the court to direct payment to the Public Trustee. Once that happens, the matter becomes one for the exercise of the Public Trustee's discretion whether the lump sum should be paid out at any stage for any specific reason. He has exercised his discretion in the case mentioned by the honourable member, and the widow's only alternative, if she is dissatisfied, is to apply to the court.

I think that, as long as the view prevails that lump sum payments should be protected in this way rather than paid to the widow, inevitably the Public Trustee will have to exercise a discretion, and it is also inevitable that from time to time widows will be dissatisfied with the manner of the exercise of that discretion and, therefore, will be advised to go to the court to have the matter tested there. I do not know that I can add anything further about the problem the honourable member has referred to. I am willing to take up the matter with the Public Trustee to find out whether there should be any reassessment of the circumstances in which lump sum payments are made, in the light of modern conditions, and I will do that, because this matter has occurred to me from time to time. Perhaps in this regard we have not kept abreast of the advance of times regarding the greater ability of women to handle money than they may have had in times gone by. I will discuss the matter with the Public Trustee from that point of view. I do not know that there is anything more I can do, but if the honourable member wants me to take up the case with the Public Trustee I will do so, if he gives me the particulars.

#### LOAN FUNDS

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Premier and Treasurer say which departments have had the Loan funds allocated to them by Parliament at the beginning of this financial year cut or have had works postponed or delayed because the Loan funds must now be used to finance the deficit, which I understand was \$5,000,000 in the Budget estimate made at the end of January, 1971, compared with a credit of \$5,000,000 in January, 1970?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As the honourable member would know, there was a forecast of a deficit this year of about \$4,750,000, and a little more than \$4,000,000 was provided in surplus on the Loan Account to hold against a prospective Budget deficit of that kind. Naturally, there have been some savings made on Loan Account, because it seems as if some measures will not come to account this year and some slowing down of minor works will occur. This has not happened in specific departments but in an overall review of the Loan programme. I expect significant savings so that the financial position in the State will be maintained in respect of that aspect, together with so much of the extra revenue money we can provide this year from measures which have been announced or which are before Parliament. I assure the honourable member that, as a result of the Government's action, this State will be in a happier financial position, in fact, than will any other State in Australia at the end of this financial year.

#### FLASHING LIGHTS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport reconsider the request of Ipec Australia Limited to have amber lights fitted to the hood of its service vehicles so that they can operate to warn approaching motorists of accidents and broken-down vehicles being in a dangerous position on the roads? I have been told that this matter has been considered for some time but the request has been refused. In all other States (Eastern States and Western Australia) the company has received permission to operate the flashing lights when its service vehicles are placed in a dangerous position, either when attending at a breakdown of a company vehicle or when helping with vehicles owned by the general public. I understand that the company spends more time helping the general public than it does on its own vehicles. The Police Departments of this State and of other States have applauded the company's action in putting these vehicles on the roads and for the equipment carried in these vehicles. I have been

told that the drivers of these vehicles are trained in accident procedure and in the administration of first-aid. At times when there have been washaways, land slides, or fuel or other slippery material on the roads, all of which are dangerous to the general safety of motorists, these vehicles can be used to warn an approaching motorist of the danger.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is starting to comment.

Mr. EVANS: I think it is essential that we know all the facts leading up to this question, because it is an area in which we could save lives in this State. The company has been informed in a letter from the Road Traffic Board that as long as its vehicles are placed in a dangerous position on the road—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is debating the matter: he should ask his question.

Mr. EVANS: The explanation is that the company has been told that it may use removable flashing lights and not fixed flashing lights. If the fixed lights must be removed and removable ones used the company could find it impracticable, and this service would be lost to the community. Will the Minister investigate this matter?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The information the honourable member has placed before the House is nothing more than what has already been placed before me by a deputation arising out of the refusal by (and I think I am correct in saying this) the former Government to agree to the request of Ipec. Applications to use this type of device have not been restricted merely to Ipec: there have been applications from other organizations. I asked the Road Traffic Board to re-examine the facts that Ipec and others had placed before me. The fact, as the honourable member has said, that these are permitted in some other States—

Mr. Evans: In all others, except Tasmania.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know whether this practice is permitted in all other States, but I doubt that it would be. However, that is of no great moment.

The SPEAKER: Order! We are not debating this matter. That would be out of order.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Road Traffic Board, consisting of the Commissioner of Highways as chairman, the Commissioner of Police and Mr. Pash (Town Clerk of the Corporation of the City of Prospect), has again considered this matter and stated that

it is not prepared to issue authority to Ipec to have these lights permanently fitted to its vehicles. Apparently, the honourable member does not realize that portable lights are available which have a magnetic base and which can be placed on the vehicle and will stay there. These lights are used by other people and are considered to be completely satisfactory. It is with these thoughts in mind that the Road Traffic Board has again reviewed the matter and confirmed its previous decision. I agree with the board that it is not the function of the board, nor in the interests of the community of South Australia, to give privileges to one section unless they are to be extended to all sections. If the right to fit flashing lights were to be extended to all vehicles, their value would be lost from a safety point of view on the road.

#### CLOTHING COMPENSATION

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Education have this matter further investigated? With your leave, Mr. Speaker, and the concurrence of the House I shall explain the question.

The SPEAKER: What is the question?

Mr. MATHWIN: That is the question: will the Minister of Education have this matter further investigated?

The SPEAKER: What matter?

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

The SPEAKER: Unless the honourable member can rephrase his question I cannot permit it. It is purely hypothetical and does not comply with Standing Orders.

Mr. MATHWIN: It concerns a complaint I have received about a claim in respect of a pair of boy's trousers that were torn on a school seat, and I should like to explain the question if I may. I have received a letter from a constituent whose child attends the Brighton High School. The boy was placed in a different desk from his own for a lesson; the desk was broken and he tore his trousers. His mother applied to the department for compensation for the trousers but was refused, and a letter was sent to her from the department. I should like to read part of it, as follows:

I am informed that the broken desk to which you referred was not reported to the class teacher, and therefore was not brought to the attention of the Headmaster until you made contact with him concerning this matter. The

Head had the desk removed from the classroom immediately thereafter. From inquiries that have been made there does not appear to have been any negligence on the part of the Education Department in this case, and I regret therefore that the department cannot accept any liability.

Will the Minister examine this matter?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member was quoting from the letter that I wrote to his constituent, who has now approached him. No doubt the honourable member appreciates, if he thinks about it, that probably many trousers, skirts and other forms of clothing are torn or damaged in some way each year within a school. I have no doubt that he can work out that, if responsibility were accepted by the Education Department in one case, every case would involve the same kind of principle, and we would be up for a large sum indeed. We could even run into the situation where little Johnny would say to himself, "I need a new pair of pants; I know I can take the Education Department down for them. Here we go!"

Mr. Millhouse: That's unworthy.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not saying that it applies in this case.

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order. The member for Mitcham must not interject.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member would also be aware, I think, that some of the furniture in our schools is unsuitable when it comes to making sure that wear and tear on clothes is at a minimum. I can think of two types of chair that have caused trouble over the years, one more recent type having a plastic top, which has been described previously in this House (not by me) as having certain deleterious effects on children's backsides; and the other type, which is a steel-framed mesh chair, that has been responsible over the years for causing, I suppose, considerable wear and tear to the clothing of schoolchildren. If the honourable member can give me any further information indicating that the school has been in some way negligent, I shall be pleased to reconsider the matter. If his constituent has given him any further information which he can pass on to me and which he thinks might be relevant, again, I shall be willing to consider the matter further.

#### ADELAIDE ABATTOIRS

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to the question I recently asked about the Adelaide abattoir?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The Minister of Agriculture states that reports on the periodic statutory investigations into the efficiency of the plant, machinery, administration, and operations of the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board are laid before Parliament in accordance with the provisions of the Act and are available to all honourable members. With reference to the ban at the Gepps Cross works on the slaughtering of sheep for export, the Minister has explained on several occasions that the restriction has been imposed by the United States Department of Agriculture, whose veterinary officers have apparently considered that the extraordinarily high standards of hygiene demanded by them were not met in all respects by the Gepps Cross works. The Minister reported in some detail on this matter in Parliament on November 3 last, and this is recorded on page 2226 of *Hansard* of that date.

Mr. Venning: What did he say?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Read it and find out! The member for Frome is assured that, in spite of the frustrations that these bans are causing, the Metropolitan and Export Abattoirs Board is doing everything possible (and as quickly as possible) to anticipate defects that may be detected by the United States inspecting authorities, and to bring its facilities up to the high standard they require. The Minister makes it quite clear that there is no ban on the killing of mutton—

Mr. Venning: Or lamb.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is replying to a question, and I have previously warned about interjections. I again warn honourable members not to interject when a Minister is replying.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will repeat that sentence. The Minister makes it quite clear that there is no ban on the killing of mutton for the United Kingdom market, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics market and other world markets. The Gepps Cross works has always processed mutton for these markets, and this is being done at present.

#### CRYSTAL BROOK SCHOOL

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say what is taking place at present regarding the arrangements for drainage and asphaltting work at the Crystal Brook Primary School? I have received a letter from the Crystal Brook school committee this morning asking me to contact the Minister to see what progress he can report, this matter having been

referred to the Minister last September and to visiting officers of the Education Department and Public Buildings Department last December. The letter states in part:

To date nothing has been done, and it is extremely urgent that work be undertaken as soon as possible to enable the present unsatisfactory conditions to be rectified before the winter period. As an example of the unsatisfactory conditions, your attention is drawn to the fact that, although a new shelter shed has been erected, it is virtually unusable during wet periods, as drainage water flows over the floor and creates a complete quagmire.

Will the Minister look into this matter and bring down a report for me?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to do that for the honourable member.

#### SCHOOL REPAIRS

Mr. GUNN: Can the Minister of Education say why his department is withholding approval for teachers to go ahead with urgent minor repairs at their schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: To my knowledge, a headmaster has authority to spend up to a limit of, I think, \$120 on urgent minor repairs, and I do not believe that that has been changed. If the honourable member knows of any instance where it is alleged that approval has been withheld and is willing to give me details, I will certainly look into it for him.

#### SOUTH-EASTERN FREEWAY

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I recently asked about the estimated completion date of work on that section of the South-Eastern Freeway between Stirling and Verdun?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is expected that the section of the South-Eastern Freeway between Stirling and Verdun will be completed and open to traffic by April, 1972. This date is subject to the availability of steel for use in the several bridge structures along the route.

#### HOLY WEEK

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier avoid asking the House to sit during Holy Week? These sittings of the House began on the eve of Ash Wednesday, and the Government has announced that they will continue until Easter. Therefore, I suppose we could call them Lenten sittings. I point out to the Premier that Holy Week is to many people, including many in this House, the most sacred week of the year, and Good Friday, of course, is the most

sacred day of the year. If we sit that week, and if the House follows the pattern that has occurred often in the past, there is a good chance that we will sit into Good Friday.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Rubbish!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister says "Rubbish"—

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The number of times in which this House has, at the end of a session, sat through Thursday evening well into Friday is legion as the Minister well knows.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You're still talking rubbish, as you well know.

The SPEAKER: Interjections are out of order. The member for Mitcham is asking a question.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Premier will no doubt agree that it is undesirable that Parliament should sit on Good Friday. I hope he will agree that it is desirable that neither House should meet at all during that week. I know that it would perhaps cause some inconvenience to come back after Easter, but I suggest to him that it would be preferable to sitting during Holy Week.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I regret that I must ask the House to sit during that week. We will not be coming back after Easter, and I expect that the House will complete its sittings on Maundy Thursday. I assure the honourable member that the sitting will not be going over into Good Friday.

#### MEAT PRICES

Mr. McANANEY: As I understand that the Prices Commissioner is investigating the prices of meat, will the Premier, as Minister in charge of the Prices Branch, make the Commissioner's report available to Parliament or obtain a report from the Commissioner on the various prices of meat?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Ycs.

#### JUSTICES OF THE PEACE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General say whether new principles have been adopted by him in making recommendations regarding the appointment of justices of the peace? I have noted that during the time he has been in office the number of appointments has been quite small, due mainly, I think, to the fact that I cleared up most of the outstanding nominations before the last election.



The Hon. L. J. King: On the last day.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, at the last Executive Council meeting. I wanted to do that in case the worst happened, as it did. I have asked the Attorney on several occasions about the recommendations for appointment, and he has said that he is considering new procedures, etc. I see that he had himself and several other Parliamentarians appointed a week or so ago, and I congratulate them.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I ask whether the appointments he has recommended have been on the time-honoured principles which were used by me and by my predecessors, or whether he has adopted new principles; and, if he has adopted new principles, what they are.

The Hon. L. J. KING: No new principles have been adopted. The only change is that I increased the notional quota in many areas when I considered appointments last December. I have been considering since coming into office the possibility of altering the system for appointing justices, but no change has yet been made either in the system or in the principles relating to appointment.

#### HANDICAPPED PEOPLE

Mr. SIMMONS: Can the Minister of Works say what special facilities for handicapped people have been provided in public buildings? The January, 1971, issue of *Rehabilitation in Australia*, a magazine published by the Australian Council for Rehabilitation of Disabled, states:

The newly-appointed Minister of Public Works in Victoria has just announced that in future all Government buildings in Victoria will make provision for handicapped people. The Tasmanian Government has set the pace for wide action in Tasmania on architectural barriers. It has legislated building regulations which prescribe that 11 classes of buildings for the use of the public be designed and constructed to give effect to the recommendations contained in Australian Standard CA52, which relates to accessibility and use of facilities by handicapped people. The buildings include hotels, motels, various categories of commercial buildings, auditoria, sporting facilities and car parks.

At the University of New England (New South Wales) the Students Representative Council is concerned about adequate provision for handicapped students. The present design of all buildings is being looked at in the light of the needs of the handicapped and one residential college will be provided with special features so that students can live

on the campus. The library is being modified; the gymnasium is already quite adequate, and the new indoor pool will be designed with provision for the needs of the handicapped. These are three tremendous advances which by their example set the pattern which other Governments and other people surely will follow.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Facilities for the handicapped in buildings is a subject given attention by the South Australian Committee on Architectural Standards and Design of the Australian Council for Rehabilitation. The Public Buildings Department is represented on the committee by a senior architect in the research field. The committee considers the need for facilities for the disabled in all buildings and areas used by the general public, whether controlled by the Government, councils or privately. I think the State Library is an example of where certain facilities have been provided.

#### BOOKSELLERS

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Premier give me a reply to the question I asked on November 5, 1970 (some four months ago), regarding the letter of October 26, 1970, addressed to Mr. A. M. Ramsay by Mr. Branson, of Rigby Limited? This was a long letter, a copy of which was sent to me, concerning the position of South Australian industries. On December 7, 1970, I wrote to the Premier what I considered a courteous letter asking for a reply, but I did not receive even an acknowledgment. Therefore, can the Premier give me a reply now, or, if it is not with him, will he take steps to see that a reply is available next week?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I regret that I do not recollect the circumstances the honourable member has outlined or his letter, nor have I a note listing it as a question that is outstanding. However, I will investigate the matter and see whether I can obtain a reply.

#### LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Local and District Criminal Courts Act, 1926-1970, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

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

One of its principal objects is the proposed amendment of section 16 of the principal Act, which deals with the appointment of officers to local courts. As the section now stands, all clerks have to be appointed and removed in accordance with the Public Service Act. Current practice now has police officers filling the position of local court clerks in almost every country court, with the result that the Public Service Board has to consider many appointments and transfers of police officers, who of course are not ordinarily public servants. The appointments then go to the Attorney-General for final approval. The proposed amendment provides that appointments of police officers as clerks shall be dealt with by the Attorney-General alone, thus simplifying procedures and reducing the burden carried by the Public Service Board. A similar amendment was effected in 1964 with respect to the appointment of local court bailiffs.

This Bill seeks to correct two relatively minor errors in the principal Act. One error occurred when the principal Act underwent extensive amendment in 1969. Section 66 (c) of the amending Act of 1969 purports to strike out from the principal Act a passage that in fact, due to an overlooked previous amendment, did not then exist. Consequently, the amending Act cannot be fully incorporated into the principal Act, and the consolidation of this Act currently being carried out by the Commissioner of Statute Revision cannot further proceed until the error has been remedied. For this reason, I recommend that the Bill go through with as little delay as possible.

The second error, which appears in the Act of 1926 and which has been adverted to by various local court judges over the years, occurs in section 166. This section refers to section 165 as though it is the section that gives power to order payment of judgments in instalments, whereas in fact sections 177, 179, 181 and 182 are the sections granting such a power. The reference to section 165 is, therefore, clearly incorrect and, for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of section 166, ought to be substituted by the correct reference.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 16 of the principal Act by striking out subsection (3) and inserting two new subsections. New subsection (3) provides that local court clerks who are members of the Police Force shall be appointed and

removed by the Attorney-General. New subsection (4) provides that all other clerks, officers, servants and the bailiff of the Local Court of Adelaide shall be appointed, removed or suspended in accordance with the Public Service Act.

Clause 3 inserts in section 166 of the principal Act a passage specifying the correct sections of the Act that deal with orders for payment by instalments, and the incorrect reference is deleted. Clause 4 repeals and re-enacts paragraph III of section 259 of the principal Act. The reference in new paragraph III to the sum of \$8,000 is the passage that the amending Act of 1969 unsuccessfully attempted to insert. This clause also provides that the repeal and re-enactment shall be deemed to have come into operation at the same time as the amending Act of 1969 came into operation. Clause 5 repeals the offending section of the amending Act of 1969.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### MARKETABLE SECURITIES BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to make provision with respect to instruments of transfer of certain marketable securities; to repeal the Marketable Securities Transfer Act, 1967; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

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

It emanates from the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. Honourable members may recall that the Marketable Securities Transfer Act, the precursor of the present Bill, was enacted by the South Australian Parliament in 1967. This Act was warmly welcomed in commercial circles, for it led to considerable economies in the processing of transactions involving company shares and other securities. It was realized, however, even before this Act was passed, that there remained certain unresolved questions both of Governmental policy and legal detail that might well require treatment in a subsequent enactment. This Bill accordingly seeks to deal rather more comprehensively with the various aspects of security transfer.

The basic object of the Bill remains the same as that of the previous Act. It provides a system of security transfer in which the signature of the transferee is dispensed with. There are, however, three major differences between

the present Bill and the 1967 Act. First, the Bill enables "authorized trustee corporations" to utilize the statutory transfer system. An "authorized trustee corporation" is a corporation declared as such by the regulations. Since the existing Act was enacted in 1967, the standing committee has received from trustee companies and banking companies, which engage in a large volume of share trading on behalf of their various clients, many requests that the right to use the more expeditious system of statutory transfer be extended to them. This appeared to be a reasonable request and, accordingly, the present Bill contains provisions enabling the Government to extend the right to use the statutory system to bodies of this nature. Secondly, the Bill provides a more expeditious method of splitting share parcels than is possible under the existing legislation. This is a technical matter that I shall explain in detail when discussing the provisions of the Bill. Thirdly, the Bill provides that the various undertakings to be imposed upon a broker utilizing the transfer system are to be imposed in every case by local South Australian law, whether or not he happens to be dealing in the securities of a South Australian or a foreign company. This follows a joint opinion of the Solicitors-General for Victoria and the Commonwealth on the question of brokers' warranties.

The provisions of the Bill are as follows: Clause 1 deals with the title and the commencement of the new Act. I might mention that it is hoped that the new uniform legislation can be brought into operation simultaneously in all States on July 1, 1971. Clause 2 repeals the existing Marketable Securities Transfer Act, 1967. Transitional provisions are enacted that will, in effect, permit existing transactions to be completed under the Act of 1967 notwithstanding the commencement of the new legislation.

Clause 3 enacts certain definitions necessary for the purposes of the new Act. An "authorized trustee corporation" is defined as a body corporate that is declared to be an authorized trustee corporation under the regulations. A "beneficial owner" means, for the purposes of the new Act, a person upon whose behalf an authorized trustee corporation is holding a marketable security or right thereto. The definition of "corresponding law" draws attention to the fact that under subclause (2) it is envisaged that the corresponding Acts of the other States will be declared to be "corresponding laws" for the purposes of the new Act.

A "marketable security" is defined as a share in or a debenture of a South Australian company or a prescribed corporation and includes a prescribed security. A "prescribed corporation" means either a corporation incorporated in the State that is not a company or an unincorporated body with shares listed on the Stock Exchange. The inclusion of "prescribed securities" within the definition of "marketable security" enables the Governor to provide by regulation that the new Act will extend to interests to which Division V of Part IV of the Companies Act applies, for example, shares in a unit trust.

Clause 4 provides that where a document constitutes a sufficient instrument of transfer under the new Act it shall be an adequate instrument to transfer the securities for the purposes of the Companies Act, or any other Act or law governing the transfer of the securities. Clause 5 prescribes the form of a sufficient instrument of transfer for the purposes of the new Act. This clause is to be read in conjunction with the schedule to the Bill which contains the various forms referred to in the clause. The transfer procedure operates as follows:

- (a) In the simplest case where A sells shares to B, and B purchases the whole parcel of shares, A signs part 1 of form 1 and B's broker completes part 2 of form 1. The completed form is forwarded with share scrip to the company for registration of the transfer.
- (b) Where A sells a parcel of shares and they are purchased in separate allotments by B and C, A signs part 1 of form 1 and A's broker completes part 1 of form 2 for each separate transaction. Form 1 is forwarded to the Stock Exchange together with share scrip and the partially completed broker's forms. The Stock Exchange marks the broker's forms with a stamp indicating that the transactions disclosed in the forms are covered by share scrip that will be forwarded to the company. The form signed by the transferor and the share scrip is then forwarded to the company. The broker's forms are sent on for completion by the buying brokers and then forwarded to the company.
- (c) It is possible that, after a parcel of shares has been split in the manner set out in the previous paragraph, a purchaser

may dispose of his allotment before the relevant documents are forwarded for registration. This may entail a further splitting of his parcel. Under the present system it is frequently necessary for the shares to be registered in the name of the previous purchaser before this subsequent splitting of the share parcel can be accomplished. In order to overcome the delays that result from registration and reregistration where turnover of shares is rapid and share parcels are being divided up, a new form (form 3) has been introduced into the schedule. This enables the Stock Exchange to certify upon presentation of a previously marked broker's form that the transactions comprised in the subsequent form are covered by share scrip. This will obviate the necessity for registration of the prior change in ownership of the shares by the company.

Forms, 5, 6, and 7 are used in a corresponding way in relation to rights to marketable securities. It is to be observed that, while in ordinary cases the statutory transfer system dispenses with the signature of the transferee, this does not apply where there is an uncalled liability on the shares that is capable of enforcement by the company. In this case the transferee's acceptance of the shares and the attendant liability must be evidenced by completion of form 4. This requirement does not apply, however, to partially paid shares in a no-liability company because, in this case, the company cannot enforce payment of a call; the shares are forfeited if the call is not paid.

Clause 6 is a corresponding provision relating to the use of the statutory transfer system by authorized trustee corporations. In this case the relevant forms for use by an authorized trustee corporation are forms 8, 9, 10, and 11. These forms correspond in function to forms 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively. Clause 7 prescribes, in effect, that a statutory transfer of securities shall have the same effect as a transfer at common law. The transferee is deemed to have agreed to accept the securities upon the same terms as they were held by the transferor and to be bound by the memorandum and articles of the company.

Clause 8 provides for certain statutory undertakings to be imposed upon brokers and brokers' agents. The broker is deemed to have warranted the accuracy of the statements

contained in the instrument of transfer; to have warranted the title of the transferor to the securities to which the transfer relates; and to have undertaken to indemnify the company, the transferee and the transferee's broker against any loss that may arise from a forged or unauthorized transfer of the securities. These obligations apply whether the broker is dealing with the securities of a South Australian or a foreign company.

Clause 9 enables the company to which an instrument of transfer in the statutory form is presented to assume that a stamp that purports to be the stamp of the transferor's or the transferee's broker, or the stamp of a prescribed stock exchange, is such a stamp. In the case of an authorized trustee corporation, the company is entitled to assume that the trustee corporation is in fact holding the securities on behalf of the nominated transferor and that the transfer was not made by way of sale, gift or exchange of the marketable securities.

Clause 10 defines the ambit of the operation of the new Act. The new Act is to have effect notwithstanding any other enactment or any instrument affecting the transfer of marketable securities. Thus the Act would override provisions in the memorandum and articles of a company requiring a specific form of transfer inconsistent with the provisions of the Act. Subclause (2) provides that the Act does not affect the terms and conditions upon which marketable securities are sold. Subclause (3) provides that a company still retains the right to refuse to register a transferee as a shareholder, provided that it has some legitimate ground of objection apart from an objection based upon the form of the transfer.

Subclause (4) provides that registration of a transfer pursuant to a statutory instrument of transfer shall be deemed not to be a breach of any memorandum, articles, trust deed or other instrument affecting marketable securities. Subclause (5) provides that the new Act does not prevent the use of any other form of transfer that is otherwise permitted by law. Subclause (6) provides that securities may be transferred in accordance with the new Act to a trustee or legal representative notwithstanding any law or the provisions of any instrument creating or affecting the trust or testamentary disposition.

Clause 11 provides that the omission from any register, certificate or other document relating to marketable securities of a statement of the occupation of the person who is, or is entitled to be, registered as the holder of the

marketable securities, shall not constitute a breach of any memorandum, articles, trust deed, or other instrument or enactment relating to the marketable securities. Clause 12 provides that, notwithstanding anything in the memorandum and articles of a company, it shall not be necessary for any instrument of transfer (including instruments of transfer that are not executed in pursuance of the new Act) to state the occupation of the transferor or transferee or for the signature of the transferor or transferee to be witnessed.

Clause 13 sets out a number of offences relating to the illegal completion or purported completion of instruments of transfer under the new Act. Clause 14 empowers the Governor to make regulations. In particular, he may by regulation declare that specified bodies corporate are authorized trustee corporations for the purposes of the new Act; that a nominated stock exchange is a prescribed stock exchange for the purposes of the Act; and that an interest of a prescribed class under Division V of Part IV of the Companies Act is a prescribed security and hence a marketable security under the provisions of the new Act.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ROAD AND RAILWAY TRANSPORT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Road and Railway Transport Act, 1930-1964. Read a first time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I move:  
*That this Bill be now read a second time.*

It proposes to increase from 28 days to 60 days the time in which the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works must review and report on a proposal made by the Transport Control Board for the closure of a railway line or part of a line. As the principal Act now stands, the committee has only 28 days in which it must decide whether an order for closure should be made. In view of the quantity of work carried out by the committee under a variety of Acts, the specified period of 28 days imposes a severe strain on the resources of the committee and disrupts its schedule of work. Moreover, four weeks is in itself an inadequate time for the detailed and thorough investigation needed in connection with the closure of some railway lines.

The Government believes, as indeed did the previous Government, that a period of 60 days would be a fair and reasonable time for the committee to furnish its reports. The Bill also seeks to increase from 25c to \$1 the maximum fee chargeable for a duplicate licence when the original has been lost or destroyed. It is self-evident that such an increase is necessary and long overdue. The Bill also contains various Statute law revision amendments.

I will now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clauses 2 and 3 amend sections 5 and 9, respectively of the principal Act by up-dating all references to the Public Service Act. Clause 4 amends section 10 of the principal Act which deals with the Transport Control Board's power to close and reopen railways. The passage "sixty days" is substituted for the passage "twenty-eight days".

Clause 5 amends section 14 of the principal Act by changing the references to old currency to decimal currency. Clause 6 amends section 20 of the principal Act, which deals with the supplying of duplicate licences, by changing the maximum fee chargeable to \$1. Clauses 7 to 18 (inclusive) amend sections 22, 22a, 24, 27b, 28a, 28b, 35a, 35b, 35c, 35d, 36, and 40 respectively of the principal Act by changing to decimal currency all references to old currency contained therein.

Mr. CARNIE secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FRANCHISE)

Adjourned debate on second reading.  
(Continued from March 3. Page 3762.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): This Bill, like so many other Bills we have seen this session, has been introduced as a result of pronouncements in the Labor Party's policy speech. Part of that speech said:

In order to ensure that citizens have adequate services in their local communities, their participation in local government is vital. The Labor Government established the Local Government Act Revision Committee, which has now reported its recommendations. This report must be discussed with local government, and the Labor Government will undertake this urgently throughout South Australia to get a broadly agreed basis for proceeding with the complete revision of local government activity and the legislation governing it. However, local government is not merely the concern of people who pay rates. It has to provide facilities to people of all ages and classes throughout the State.

The Bill, as presented to us, is a significant departure in many ways from what was set out in that policy statement. It was said that the Bill would be discussed with local government with a view to getting a broadly agreed basis for the Bill. I suggest that there is no broadly agreed basis for this Bill as drafted. From all the evidence we have, I believe that the exact opposite is the case.

The honorary body largely concerned with local government affairs is the Local Government Association. About six months ago the proposed changes to the legislation were forwarded to the association, which conducted a comprehensive survey throughout the State. The overwhelming response to the survey resulted in the Local Government Association entirely rejecting the major provisions in the draft Bill. Although some second thoughts were given to the measure in Elizabeth, the provisions relating to the change in franchise, the roll to be adopted, and the method of enrolment (the major provisions) were completely rejected by the association. In the intervening months there has been no change in its attitude. Consequently, the Government has become engaged in another face-saving operation.

This Bill contains, in the latter part, some provisions that were recommended by the Local Government Association. One would not quarrel with many of those provisions, although some deserve, and will receive, criticism. However, the major part of the Bill is the first part, which relates to those who are disfranchised, to a change in the franchise, and to the operation of the franchise in local government elections. The original proposals were for the enrolment of all those on the State electoral roll, and for compulsory voting. However, the Government has in some measure yielded to the tremendous wave of unpopularity that these proposals generated, and it has engaged in the rather familiar procedure of trying to wriggle out of a difficult position. Consequently, it has incorporated in the Bill some measures that were recommended by the association together with some completely unacceptable provisions that make the Bill, as a whole, unacceptable.

Regarding the franchise, the Government has made a significant change in its policy by adopting a procedure similar to that adopted in Victoria; residents will be given the option of deciding whether they wish to have compulsory or voluntary voting. The mere fact that that system operates in Victoria

is no valid argument for adopting it here, unless it can be proved that it has been beneficial in Victoria. However, from the information we have, I do not think it has been beneficial in that State. In areas of Victoria where voting is compulsory, the councils are lucky to get 85 per cent of the people to the polls.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What do we get here?

Mr. Burdon: It is only 5 per cent or 6 per cent in South Australia.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It must be remembered that I was referring to a compulsory vote. People who do not vote are transgressing the law and are liable to be prosecuted. So, in Victoria there are two classes of people: first, some people who do not vote and are liable to prosecution and, secondly, other people (who may be living only a street away but in another council area) who do not have to vote. The matter of choice has been referred to, and I will deal with it a little later. I do not think a system whereby there will be some areas with voluntary voting and some with compulsory voting will lead to any improvement; rather, it will lead to confusion and difficult relations with people who have not voted. It is very difficult to chase up people who do not vote, and there are other ramifications—for example, the added expense of administering this new form of democracy *a la* Labor Party.

Regarding the question of choice, how are the electors to decide whether voting is to be compulsory or voluntary? First, it is up to the council. Then any 100 electors, be they ratepayers or not, can by petition demand a poll. The council then arbitrarily decides whether there will be a compulsory vote or a voluntary vote for this determination. All of this seems to me to be a fairly shaky procedure. This is done under the guise of giving people a choice of what they want. Of course, it would not be very difficult for a pressure group to whip up support among the population (including ultimately, if the Labor Party manage to enact some of its provisions, anyone over 18 years of age) and demand a poll. If this poll is a voluntary one, they could whip up some more supporters.

Despite that members on the Government side have said that politics enter into local government affairs, I do not consider that they do to any significant extent, certainly not to the extent that they do in other places in this

country, and certainly not to the extent that they do overseas, where the methods of election are different from those that we have here. In fact, I agree completely with the sentiments expressed that we have in this State a local government system that is, in many ways, far superior to that which exists in other States and other countries, and I consider that this is one of the direct results of the franchise that we have in South Australia.

I think that, fundamentally, there is something very fallacious in the method by which this decision is to be made. Once the decision has been made, it will lead to considerable confusion and difficulty throughout various areas in the State because in some areas the franchise will be compulsory and in other areas it will be voluntary. The Government is prepared to admit that the ownership of some property, be it large or small, entitles one, in some circumstances, to a vote.

In this Bill there is the option. One can choose to vote in respect of one's place of residence or in respect of where property is owned on which rates are payable. There is also something very fallacious in this argument. On one hand, the Government is prepared to admit (and this is inherent in this point) that the possession of property and payment of rates entitle one to a vote in electing councillors for that district. The Government is also prepared to admit that, if one resides in a house in a district council area, one is entitled to vote. Therefore, in effect, this Bill disfranchises some people on one of these scores. I do not know how the Government can justify this.

I do not think that the Government can have it both ways. It is prepared to admit that if a person owns property in a certain area, he is entitled to vote. If he lives in a gutter somewhere, he is entitled to vote. However, the Government also admits that, if he lives in a house, he is entitled to vote. How does the Government justify the fact that this Bill disfranchises people under one or other of these terms? There is something basically wrong, I consider, in this argument. The Minister has said that the present system caused some people to be what he calls second-rate citizens, but I consider that this Bill will make second-rate citizens of those who are contributing financially to the operations of a council or people who, if they elect to vote for that area, will not be able to vote where they live.

The Government is making second-rate citizens of these people. It is disfranchising them, yet it is prepared to admit that, in some circumstances, they should be eligible to vote under either of these qualifications. We have heard much from the Government side of this Chamber about this business of wealth and privilege. This is the biggest lot of baloney that I have heard. Government members say that they are the backers of the underdog, but I think that, if they only knew, they do the underdog more damage than any other Government could do him. The Government says that big business runs local government, but this is absolute baloney. We have heard much about multiple voting. I suppose that, in the minds of many Government members, General Motors-Holden's would be the gem of big business, with all its profits going overseas. I think there has been a pertinent comment that if the trade union movement is not careful it will kill the goose that lays the golden egg. This big company has paid the Woodville council a six-figure sum of money in rates, yet in accordance with section 100 of the present Act it is entitled to only three votes in the election of a councillor.

Business enterprise within a council district is entitled to votes according to the ratable value of the property, on a sliding scale, and the maximum number of votes so available is three. I cannot for the life of me see that, in those circumstances, big business is running local government in this locality or anywhere else. In fact, I think it reasonable that, if a six-figure sum is contributed for the benefit of the majority of ratepayers in this district, it is not unreasonable that there should be some representation on the council. We have heard about people who are not ratepayers. The council provides amenities for many citizens. I have known local councils to build playgrounds for young children. Will the Government give them a vote, because they have amenities provided? We can carry this argument to absurdity.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You do.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have learnt a fair bit from the Minister since I have been in this Chamber. The Government is, for ideological reasons best known to itself, prepared to interfere with a system that has been highly successful and which compares more than favourably with local government as we know it in other places in this country, and indeed, in other places around the world.

Mr. Burdon: That's your opinion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, and it is shared by many other people, including many of this Government's supporters. The Government claims a mandate for these things. I pointed out in my earlier remarks that these proposals differ significantly from what the Government originally proposed.

Mr. Burdon: I ask you to read the Bill.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have done so, and the only conclusion I can come to from the interjections is that Government members have not grasped the importance of the Bill, because it varies significantly from what the Labor Party proposed in its policy speech.

Mr. Burdon: In what respect?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There is the basic change in the franchise proposal.

Mr. Burdon: That's the only point you can hang your hat on.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member does not have much to hang his hat on. I shall pursue the point that the Government claims it has a mandate for this measure. Well, it is not pursuing that mandate, if it did have it. As the member for Light has pointed out, many active supporters of the Labor Party, in consideration of this Bill in local councils, were prepared to oppose it. Despite this much vaunted 51 per cent that the Government has, if only two people in every 100 voted against the Government it would be defeated and would have lost this overwhelming mandate. I suggest that no supporters of my Party would be prepared to support this measure. In fact, I consider it an unpopular measure.

The Bill will have most undesirable effects on our rural industries. Some people living in my district earn their living solely from the grazing industry. One of the major charges imposed on these people is council rates: this is one of the most significant and, in many cases, the highest charge they have to meet, including those of water rates, land tax and other taxation, and it is a charge that is causing considerable difficulty at present. Some people hold parcels of land in different wards and in different council areas. I know some who pay council rates as high as \$1 a sheep a year. Anyone knowing anything about the rural industry will know what sort of taxation measure this would be at present to anybody wishing to remain in the grazing industry. Yet these are the wealthy people the Government is talking about and who are to be disfranchised! This action cannot be justified in any circumstances.

We hear much about the wealthy people of the State, but I am sure that many of the people to whom I have referred would be pleased to change places with some Government members of Parliament; in fact they would have been happy to change places with such members before they entered this place. Those to be included are the non-contributors of rates. Actually, people who occupy a house are entitled to vote, but the only major point of the member for Unley was that there seemed to be some difficulty about these people getting a vote. This is not only a fine point but one that is irrelevant. People who are going to pay rates are enfranchised because the information comes from the Lands Titles Office. People who are occupiers have the right to vote. It is not unreasonable to ask these people to apply to get a vote.

Mr. Brown: Why?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This amendment will involve the council in considerable expense. The member for Unley was not arguing whether the franchise was right or wrong, but he argued that certain people living in a house should be automatically enrolled, and so be able to vote. It seems that we are to embark on an expensive operation similar to the operation initiated by the Labor Party in getting people on the Legislative Council roll. This would be a charge on local government.

Mr. Clark: This won't be necessary.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Not if we accept the Government's premise, but we do not accept it, for the reasons I have stated.

Mr. Burdon: You don't want people to vote.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The present franchise is adequate, satisfactory, and, in the circumstances, completely fair.

Mr. Brown: Let us consider whether people are going to choose to vote.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I understand that the council at Moonta receives 60 per cent of its rates from people who own beach houses. These people have to choose to vote where they live, so they will be disfranchised at Moonta. If they pay 60 per cent of the rates they should have some say in electing their representatives in this area. This is not only my view but one that is widely held by people who form the majority of people in country areas who are ratepayers and entitled to vote at council elections. The suggestion that big business controls local government is absolute rubbish, particularly when one considers that the maximum number of votes that can be obtained for a council election is three. I



believe that these business enterprises make tremendous financial contributions to councils and do much in the district by way of trade and commerce. They bring many people into the district to become eligible to be elected to the council.

The Minister's proposals will make local government elections more cumbersome and more expensive. People are to be enrolled, and a poll is to be conducted, and those who contribute financially will have to contribute more so that non-contributors of rates can be enfranchised. There seems to be some confusion in the minds of Government members about the function of local government, and they seem to equate them with the functions of the Legislature, but they are much different. Some remarks of the solicitor for the Local Government Association are not inappropriate, and I should like to quote what I think are significant comments with regard to the proposals put to local government and for which the Minister said that broad agreement would be necessary before they could be implemented. Mr. Norman stated:

I have been informed that the Government does hope to make some change in the voting system for local government. I can only hope that if it proceeds with this matter it does have very careful regard to what the effects may be on the structure of local government. The fact that a voting change may be suitable for State purposes has no bearing at all on the question of voting for local government. I would be sorry to see any change come about merely because it is a matter of policy. If it is necessary to change the structure of the constitution of local government, then by all means change the voting and the finance system.

I think the answer is that if local government is to remain constitutionally as it is, then no change can be made and it must be left to organize its own affairs in the same way.

I do not believe that local government has organized its affairs unfairly in any way. Some of the proposals made in the Bill have considerable merit, particularly concerning the field of care for the aged, but if local government enters the field of housing (which I do not believe is its province) and this franchise becomes law there will be some changes. These have occurred overseas, but they will have undesirable effects on local government here. I cannot agree with the philosophical argument of the member for Mawson, who said that councils were spending ratepayers' money for political purposes. That was in reference to a pamphlet: I take it that it was not a general statement regarding the day-to-day operations of councils. I

believe that in this case it was an act of self-preservation, and I think it was fully justified in the circumstances, for a blow had been struck at the very foundation and the principle of local government. Anyway, I suggest that this action is not uncommon within the Party to which the honourable member belongs. I do not think that the Labor Party's motives behind trying to get people enrolled for the Legislative Council are particularly altruistic. This, again, is its form of encouragement about which we hear so much. The Government intends to encourage people to do things, at the expense—

Mr. Hoptgood: You are trying to discourage them.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is not so. Actually, the Government's attitude here is that if people do not accept encouragement they will be fined. I believe that certain provisions are quite unsatisfactory. I think that the provision requiring Ministerial approval before councils can propose a Bill to the Legislature is unwarranted and gives the Minister a power that he should not have. In fact, it gives the Minister complete power of veto over any approaches made to this place by local government. I have noticed the tendency in one or two other pieces of Government legislation, whereby the Minister can exercise this sort of power, and I believe that in this case, as in the previous cases, this power is completely unjustified. Councils have the right to advance a cause, which they think is worthy, without having to convince the Minister of the day on the matter. I believe that this provision represents an unnecessary intrusion of politics into this aspect of local government.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The member for Light gave what I consider to be an excellent exposition of the details of the Bill and, to my mind, showed a far greater grasp of its implications than was shown by any Government speaker. The honourable member dealt in some detail with the various provisions; indeed, I agree with some of the latter provisions in the Bill, which, having been promulgated by the Local Government Association, are desirable. The Government has been shrewd (to give it the most kindly interpretation)—

Mr. Venning: Cunning!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We can take our pick. I refer to the Government's including the desirable provisions with these completely unpalatable and unacceptable provisions. In

the main, we support certain provisions, and by way of amendment we will try to see that they are passed. However, if the Government persists with the other provisions that are completely unacceptable not only to me but also, I believe, to the majority of people (not only council electors in the district I represent), I will oppose this measure. As I say, unless the Government intends to accept amendments and delete certain provisions, the Bill will be opposed.

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I support the Bill and, in doing so, I congratulate the Minister on introducing it and compliment him on the clear and lucid explanation that he gave. Bearing in mind the good arguments advanced by my colleagues the members for Whyalla and Mawson, I consider that little is left for Government members to say in support of this Bill. I cannot say that I am particularly impressed by the arguments advanced by Opposition members in opposing the Bill. Government members have the greatest respect for people active in local government; and we appreciate the work which they do and for which they receive no monetary gain. As Parliamentarians we come into contact with people who have grave problems and who need the best type of assistance, but we at least are paid for what we are doing. However, people in local government, who come into contact with similar problems and difficult circumstances, are not paid.

I think it is unworthy of members opposite to suggest that, because the Act is being updated, it means that the Government considers that local government officers are acting inefficiently, for up-dating the Act does not imply that at all. It is unworthy of members opposite to suggest that people in local government, who are implementing regulations under the Act, are guilty of inefficiency. Great play has been made by members opposite of their respect for local government, and they have implied that we do not have a similar respect, but that is not so. As other members have said, there are areas of agreement between both Parties regarding certain clauses in the Bill, and I do not wish to comment on these clauses. As has been pointed out, the contentious provisions in the Bill are those relating to adult franchise and to the method of voting. In regard to adult franchise which, after all, has democratic implications, I refer to what the Minister said during his second reading explanation, namely:

Not only are many people denied the right to vote, but privileged people are given multiple voting rights based purely on the wealth or possessions that they have. People should be regarded for what they are, rather than for what they own. The very basis of democratic thinking revolves around the principle that people are the most important factor in society, and the poorest person in our society should have no less and no more say in the election of candidates for any form of government than the most affluent.

I do not think any further comment on that passage could make it more lucid or be of any help to members opposite who deny people the rights to which the Minister refers. The member for Mawson referred to the Leader's speech as being one displaying pyrotechnics. Indeed, this was obvious, and I take this opportunity to express my disappointment in the Leader. Coming into this Parliament as a new member, I thought that the Leader, when discussing a Bill, would critically analyse it, but that is not so. Surely, we can expect fireworks at times, particularly when the galleries are full and their reason for the fireworks becomes more obvious, but the Leader talks in generalities and does not deal with a Bill specifically; he leaves that to members of his Party. Indeed, he said during this debate that he would leave the details to members on his side. He said that for a good reason: he does not know anything about local government, so he leaves it to members on his side to be specific.

Mr. Clark: Not only local government.

Mr. KENEALLY: The comment from this side of the House was very accurate. Members opposite are very concerned about what they call the disfranchising of local government electors. They suggest that because a ratepayer is unable to have a vote for each ward and each local government electorate in which he owns a property he has been disfranchised.

Mr. Clark: He still has a vote.

Mr. KENEALLY: Ycs, the same as every other member of the community should have. Do they suggest that because a man owns property in South Australia and also in Victoria he should be entitled to a vote in the State elections of South Australia and of Victoria?

Mr. Becker: Two different subjects.

Mr. KENEALLY: They are not. Because oversea companies invest in Australia and contribute greatly to the taxation that the Commonwealth Government collects, do members

opposite suggest that they should be entitled to a vote in Commonwealth elections? To be consistent, this is the very thing they are saying. They cannot in all justice assert that a ratepayer who owns property in two local government districts should be entitled to vote in each of those districts and not accept the argument I have put forward regarding interstate and oversea investment. The Leader said:

The Minister said that the people will have the right to vote and will have only one vote. He said something about the poorest voter having as much say as the richest voter, but that is wrong, for the richest voter will not have as much say as the poorest voter. Some people will be disfranchised by this legislation.

It is beyond me to understand what the Leader was talking about. Of course, the richest voter will have as much say as the poorest voter; he will have equally as much of a say, and that is what he is entitled to. The right to vote should be judged on humanity. The debate continued:

Mr. HALL: My democratic friend says "No": that they should be disfranchised because they live somewhere else. He would give them an opportunity to vote in the area in which they live and deny them the opportunity to vote in the area in which they have their economic interest.

Mr. Hopgood: Yes.

Mr. HALL: That is democratic! Such a person is charged a tax, and laws made by local government could ruin his economic future. To deny him the right to vote is stupid. The member for Mawson has not been in Parliament long enough to understand this.

Mr. Clark: You will get that sort of comment thrown at you all the time.

Mr. KENEALLY: The Leader continued:

Even though the necessities of economic life and survival are involved, these people will be denied a vote, and other people will decide matters that will affect them.

I put to members opposite: where is the difference between that opinion and the one I have just stated regarding people who own investments or property in another State? The laws of this State could affect the livelihood of the person in another State as much as the laws introduced by local government. The Leader continued:

The meanest aspect of this measure is that it will take away from a man the right to vote on matters affecting his future.

The Leader is not the least bit concerned that this very position currently obtains. Certain people living in local government areas have no right to vote on matters affecting their

future, and this does not seem to concern the Leader or other members of the Opposition one iota. Does the Leader suggest that only people who contribute rates should be entitled to vote at the local government polls and that people who do not contribute taxation should be denied a vote in Commonwealth and State elections? This, again, would be his argument if he was to be consistent: pensioners, who do not pay taxes, would not be entitled according to the Leader's comments, to vote in State and Commonwealth elections; neither would a person not earning a taxable income. The position is untenable: of course they are entitled to a vote, because the laws made by the State and the Commonwealth concern everybody in the community, as the laws and regulations made at local government level concern every member in the community.

Mr. Crimes: More so.

Mr. KENEALLY: More so, because local government, as the member for Torrens said earlier by way of interjection, is that form of government that is closest to the people. I now refer to the people who are disfranchised under the current Local Government Act. There will be some groups of people unable to vote that I shall not mention, but I hope I shall cover the greatest percentage of those who have not the right to vote. I understand that the wives of tenants do not have a right to vote; neither do the children of ratepayers or tenants living at home if they do not own property elsewhere. Parents of ratepayers or tenants who live with them do not have the right to vote; neither do people who live in single men's quarters. There are others, of course, but those would probably be the greatest group.

Why should members opposite complain about wives of tenants having the right to vote? Why should they be afraid of their vote? Why do they complain about parents who live at home with their children having a vote, or the children of parents having a vote? I see no reason for this. I do not see how the vote of those people would materially change local government personnel. It is reasonable to suggest that, in the main, wives may vote along with their husbands, but what now is currently fact is that, if I live in Adelaide and own a property at Port Augusta that I buy merely speculatively, I am entitled to a vote at Port Augusta.

On the other hand, if I live in a rental house at Port Augusta, my wife is not entitled to vote; but my wife and the wives of many other men in different areas may be involved in committee work in connection with charities, hospitals, schools and the Red Cross. They may have a vital interest in local government but they are not entitled to vote, whereas a person living in Adelaide who will never be living in Port Augusta and who has no interest in that area, apart from the possibility of making a profit out of his speculation, is entitled to a vote there. I see no justice in this. That is the current position, a position that members opposite are supporting.

Another point is that members opposite in denying a certain group the right to vote in local government elections imply that those people are irresponsible. I submit that we should not say that because a person does not own land and does not pay rates he is irresponsible. Likewise, merely because a person owns land and pays rates, he is not automatically a responsible type of person. There is no reason why people who do not pay rates will vote irresponsibly, any more than ratepayers will vote responsibly. Although councils probably receive the bulk of their income from ratepayers, that is not the only source of their income. The State Government contributes to local government from funds that are collected from all people in the community.

Mr. Mathwin: The dogs pay a bit, too. Will you give them the vote?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart is speaking: there must not be interjections.

Mr. KENEALLY: The member for Kavel said that, according to our argument, if a council builds a playground the people who play in the playground are entitled to a vote. He is taking things to a ridiculous extreme. Councils provide swimming pools and civic centres. Swimming pools are enjoyed by all classes of the community; there is no sign outside a swimming pool saying that only ratepayers and their children may use it. It is possible that, though paying for their wives, children and themselves to use a swimming pool, non-ratepayers contribute nearly as much in that way over 12 months as a ratepayer pays in rates. I can pay 90c a day for my children to use a pool at Port Augusta, and the swimming season extends over about six months. Also, people pay to use civic centres.

In Adelaide, no sign is erected stating that only ratepayers may park their motor cars in front of parking meters.

These are other methods by which councils collect money, with contributions being made by all members of the community. While local government operates for the good of the community at large, it also collects its revenue from the community at large. Although it may not collect as much from non-ratepayers as it does from ratepayers, it collects a considerable sum from people who do not own property. The Leader made the following comment that bears on the point I was making about the responsibility or irresponsibility of non-ratepayers:

No council can afford to have voluntary voting and risk the direction of council affairs by non-ratepayers.

That is a complete indictment of the Leader: there can be no explanation other than that the Leader is saying that they are irresponsible. What rubbish! Non-ratepayers are responsible people and would cast a responsible vote.

Enrolment is another matter about which members have spoken. I believe that I have as much common sense as have members opposite. Perhaps I have more, for I am standing on this side of the House while they are in Opposition. However, until recently I was unaware that I could not vote at local government elections. I thought that this was a disgraceful situation. I had to go along and apply for the vote. Also, my wife was not eligible to vote. I must confess that there were times when I was among the 91 per cent who did not vote, and I suggest that many other members have been guilty of the same thing. I make no excuses: it should not have happened and I should have taken a greater interest. The fact remains that I was one of the group of people who did not know whether they were entitled to vote. The member for Mawson clarified this matter. There has been a great clamour about politics in local government. However, we must remember that our every activity is a result of a political decision made at some time or another, and politics is tied up with humanity. We simply cannot divorce politics from local government. Of course, Party politics should be kept out of local government; but what politics we find in local government is Liberal Party politics. There are a few areas, such as Port Augusta, Whyalla and Port Pirie, where there are sensible, sane people and where the politics are not Liberal

Party politics. In my own area council members have strenuously resisted any effort to bring politics into local government and they have refused Party endorsement.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! There are too many interjections.

Mr. KENEALLY: When the Leader and other Opposition members are not going too well they throw in the Socialist bit and have a crack at voluntary voting in unions. I suggest that members opposite should read the explanation of the member for Mawson regarding this matter. I wonder where the Leader stands. He says that, because we favour compulsory voting in local government elections, we should automatically favour compulsory voting in union elections. However, he prefers voluntary voting in local government elections, but not in union elections. There is no reason for him to do so. The Leader tries to force a standard on us that he is not prepared to accept himself.

Mr. Mathwin: He was correct, though, in what he said.

Mr. KENEALLY: The honourable member is on very touchy ground regarding unions. He has not answered a question on that matter that was asked of him this session, and I do not think he will answer it. He does not know very much about unions. The Opposition is not so much opposed to compulsory voting, despite what the member for Kavel has said, nor do I think it is so much opposed to adult franchise, but what members opposite are opposed to is abolition of the system of plural voting. I think that is the crux of the matter. I do not see why they should not accept adult franchise, because, as I have tried to show, this would not affect local government personnel greatly. The persons who would come within the franchise would be mainly parents and their children and they would tend to vote in accordance with what they considered to be the good of the rate-payers. The Opposition's suggestion that wealth and property have a greater right to be represented than has humanity is disgraceful. I could not accept that position, and my Party and this Government would not accept it. People are of prime importance in our society. We do not legislate for the good of a block of land, a house, or a corporation. All legislation should operate for the good of the people. The right of people to vote should not be based on the amount of property they own.

I wish to refer to the time at which some councils hold their meetings. This does not apply in my district but I understand that in other districts some councils hold meetings on an afternoon during the week. I suggest that this is not a good practice, because it can prevent a wage-earner from taking a position in local government. It also prevents most wage-earners from seeing what is going on at council meetings and from attending at question time. Councils may well consider holding their meetings in the evenings, as is done in my district.

In summing up, I wonder whether the comment made by the member for Whyalla earlier in the debate is correct, whether the people of South Australia oppose this legislation or whether the people who are in local government oppose it. I suggest it is the people in local government that oppose it because they think it is a threat to their existence. This may be a good reason to them to oppose it, but it is not a good reason for their denying a person the right to vote. The opposition from those participating in local government counts for nothing, because those persons see a threat to their existence. It would not be a threat if they were doing the job they were elected to do, as many are, because in those circumstances they would be re-elected.

The member for Kavel was concerned that persons in a council district would be given the right to decide whether voting would be compulsory or voluntary. Surely this is the basis of democracy: the people themselves are allowed to decide. Here again, a fictitious argument was used that one district would have a different system from another district and that confusion would be caused, but the honourable member does not seem to worry about the different systems of voting used by State Parliaments. People in a local government district will be given the right to decide for themselves which method of voting they will have, whether voluntary or compulsory, and I have not heard anyone argue with any validity against that proposition. I support the Bill: it is a good one and I commend it to members.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): I do not intend to deal with the whole Bill, because the member for Light covered fully all aspects of it. Few people in this House are more qualified than he is or know the Local Government Act better than he does. I suggest that he would know more about it than does the Minister.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's not saying much for your members.

Mr. CARNIE: I oppose the Bill, because it is a sugar-coated Bill, a palliative Bill. Many of its provisions are good and necessary and have been asked for by local government, but I dislike the sugar coating that covers the main purpose of the Bill, which will give to the people of this State another dose of Socialism by introducing adult franchise into local government. The people of South Australia do not want this. Who asked the Government for it?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The people of South Australia: 52 per cent of them.

Mr. CARNIE: The Local Government Association did not ask for it, and I have not heard any loud public outcry demanding that it be introduced. Why has the Labor Government rushed forward and introduced this measure? Could it be that the A.L.P. wants to extend its control into all levels of government in South Australia? The previous A.L.P. Government set up the Local Government Act Revision Committee, which did an extremely good job. I am sure that all members have read the exhaustive report it submitted in which it made many recommendations. On October 20 last year, in reply to a question from the member for Hanson, the Minister spoke about this report. The first part of his reply dealt with costs, but I shall read paragraph 6 of his reply, which stated:

Local government authorities will be given a period of six months to study the report following which the Government will proceed towards implementing its policy of completely revising and rewriting the present Act.

I have no doubt that the Local Government Act needs to be completely revised and rewritten. The member for Unley said this yesterday and I agree with him, because for many years anyone who has had to look at this Act would see that, with the many amendments that have been added, it had become what one could call a piecemeal Act. It seems that Parliament will have to consider the revision of this Act, and if it is done in more than two years' time no doubt it will be an L.C.L. Government that does it. This will be a big job for Parliament, so why are we adding now a piecemeal measure to what is already a piecemeal Act? Why the haste in introducing this Bill? The Minister and other Government speakers said that there were three levels of Government in Australia (Commonwealth, State and local) and that these levels were all the same, but I submit that they are not all the same. Only

a few people do not contribute in some way to Commonwealth and State finances. Even those fortunate people who do not pay income tax still contribute every time they buy anything carrying sales tax or, if they own a house, every time they pay land tax, and so on. However, many people do not contribute to local government. Should these people have a say in how money contributed by others is to be spent? If a person is not a member of a cricket club, should he be allowed to go along to club meetings and have a vote in the running of that club?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: This is not a club: it's local government.

Mr. CARNIE: If a person is not a financial member of a union, is he allowed to have a say in union affairs?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: This is not a union either: it's everyone's business.

Mr. CARNIE: In his policy speech, the Premier said he would introduce both adult franchise and compulsory voting for local government elections. We now see the introduction of adult franchise provisions, but the Government has backed down on compulsory voting, even though it was stated last May that compulsory voting would be introduced. There were no "ifs", "buts" or "possibles": compulsory voting would be introduced. However, the Government has backed down or, as my colleague the member for Heysen said last evening, it has chickened out. It has done this, first, because the public of South Australia showed overwhelmingly that it did not want compulsory voting.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: The public did not.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. The interjections, particularly from the Minister of Roads and Transport, are preventing me from hearing the member for Flinders. The Minister is giving an undignified and disgraceful display, and I ask you to call him to order.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): I can only say that interjections are out of order at any time. Every member has protection of the Chair and the right to be heard in silence.

Mr. CARNIE: Thank you, Mr. Acting Deputy Speaker. In the few months that I have been in this House, I have learnt that the more vociferous the Minister is the more he is being touched

on a sore spot. The Government followed the recommendation of the Local Government Act Revision Committee on compulsory voting, the committee recommending that those councils that desired compulsory voting should be allowed to have it, and those that did not want it should not be made to have it. If the Government followed that recommendation, why does it not follow the committee's recommendation on adult franchise? A chapter in the report deals with the voters' roll, and at the end of that chapter there is a summary of recommendations (summaries Nos. 1616 to 1649, making 34 recommendations), covering a wide range of aspects of who should be on the voters' roll. However, no reference to adult franchise whatever, either for or against, is made in these recommendations. In fact, I have not been able to find anything in the report about adult franchise. It is a large report and I may have missed a reference to it, but this matter is certainly not referred to in the report as a major issue. So once again I ask the Minister: who asked that this be introduced?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I cannot answer that. Your colleague would take a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

Mr. CARNIE: The Minister has the right to reply to this debate and I hope he answers that specific question. The member for Mawson in his speech last night when dealing with adult franchise said that several of the Eastern States had adult franchise. Is "several" more than one? To the best of my knowledge, Queensland is the only State in Australia that at present has full adult franchise at local government level. Therefore, I take exception to the word "several" as used by the member for Mawson.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It is the Liberal and Country Party Government in Queensland you are criticizing.

Mr. CARNIE: We come to the obviously strong differences of opinion between the two sides of the House on the matter of having a vote in different council areas. This has shown up strongly because, while this Bill is to enfranchise certain people in this State, it will also disfranchise many people throughout the State.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's untrue.

Mr. CARNIE: The Minister says it is untrue, but there are people who at present own property in various council areas of this State and can vote in each of those areas where they have an interest. They will now lose this right, so I say again there are many people in this State who will be disfranchised under this Bill.

The Leader of the Opposition, when speaking in this debate yesterday, gave an example of people who might own property in Adelaide, Mount Gambier, Victor Harbour, Renmark, and so on. They will now have to choose where to cast their vote, for they will be able to vote in only one of those places, although they have a financial interest in and are contributing to the local government of those areas by paying rates. The member for Mawson followed up that example by saying that, if a man had property in both Adelaide and Melbourne, he should have two votes in the Commonwealth elections, but that is not a valid comparison.

Mr. Clark: Why not?

Mr. CARNIE: Because the Commonwealth Government makes policies for the whole country whereas at local government level policies are made on a local basis and they may differ. Therefore, this man should have some say in how those policies are implemented.

Mr. Hopgood: I spoke of State elections—Victoria and South Australia.

Mr. CARNIE: I should not answer interjections but in that case I say he should have a vote in both places. However, that is beside the point. The member for Mawson had much to say in his academic exercise last night. I join issue with him when he says that corruption is common throughout local government in this State.

Mr. Hopgood: I said it was not unknown.

Mr. CARNIE: Not unknown, then. I challenge the honourable member to back this up. He also indulged in a character assassination of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Clark: The Leader does that himself every time he opens his mouth.

Mr. CARNIE: The Minister in his second reading explanation spoke strongly in favour of compulsory voting, although the Bill does not provide for it unless it is wanted in a specific district. Once again, we have this word being used that comes so often from the Government benches. The word "democracy" is used when what is meant

is "compulsion". When speaking to another Bill last year, I had occasion to criticize the Attorney-General for this. To my mind the words "democracy" and "compulsion" are a contradiction in terms and can never be used together. In his second reading explanation, the Minister of Local Government went further, quoting Abraham Lincoln as follows:

The purpose of this Bill to provide full adult franchise is completely in accordance with time-honoured principles of democracy, in that it provides for Government of the people for the people by the people.

Actually he has that quotation the wrong way around, but I will not go into that. The point is that he has used a quotation from a speech of the President of a country which has never had compulsory voting and which, to the best of my knowledge, has had no intention of introducing it. The Minister's use of the quotation is not valid. Government members often give the misleading impression (and the Minister is probably the worst offender) that compulsory voting is comparatively common throughout the world. At a public meeting at Port Lincoln last year, when he foreshadowed this Bill, the Minister gave that impression. When I challenged him, however, he admitted that compulsory voting was not as common as he had led people to believe. In fact, only 10 or 11 countries throughout the world have it.

I fear that clause 32 of the Bill could mean compulsory voting in most local government areas in the State. The Leader referred to this yesterday. Councils may opt for compulsory voting because they fear that they could be controlled by organized groups of non-ratepayers if adult franchise becomes the law in this State. Like me, they probably fear that the Labor Party machine, emanating from the Premier's office, would control local government. Although the Bill has many good clauses, I must oppose it as a whole because I oppose its main purpose, which is to introduce adult franchise at a local government level and to disfranchise many people throughout the State. This belief of mine is shared by every local government body in my district, as all of them have written to me expressing strong opposition to the Bill. In addition, many private citizens have opposed the Bill. Therefore, I share the belief of my electors in this matter. Again I ask why there is haste in introducing the Bill. Why does the Government not wait and rewrite the whole Act as it promised to do? I oppose the Bill.

Mr. BURDON secured the adjournment of the debate.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.44 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 9, at 2 p.m.