

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, March 18, 1971

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

### ASSENT TO BILLS

His Excellency the Governor, by message, intimated his assent to the following Bills:

Aircraft Offences,  
Electricity Trust of South Australia Act Amendment,  
River Murray Waters Act Amendment.

### FISHERIES 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.

### MEMBERS' INTERJECTIONS

The SPEAKER: Before calling on questions, I refer to the question directed to me yesterday by the honourable member for Fisher, asking why *Hansard* reporters are required to record interjections and replies to interjections when those interjections and replies are out of order. I point out that the *Hansard* staff is guided substantially by the definition of a *Hansard* report as enunciated by a House of Commons Select Committee on Parliamentary Debates in 1907, which states:

It is a full report, in the first person, of all speakers alike, a full report being defined as one "which, though not strictly verbatim, is substantially the verbatim report, with repetitions and redundancies omitted and with obvious mistakes corrected, but which on the other hand leaves out nothing that adds to the meaning of the speech or illustrates the argument".

A full report has been interpreted to include a record not only of what is in order to be said but also a record of what may be considered to be out of order, including interjections, irrelevancies, and inadmissible motions and amendments. If the inadmissible were not shown in the records of the House, be they the Votes and Proceedings or *Hansard*, there would be no recorded body of meaningful rulings and precedents, and, as the honourable member well knows, a House relies heavily on precedent for its rules of practice. I cannot agree with the honourable member that the recording of interjections encourages their use, but I do share his opinion that it places a burden on *Hansard* reporters. Hon-

ourable members on both sides could alleviate this problem by the practice of a little self-discipline. They would then contribute by individual restraint to enhance the corporate image of this honourable House.

### QUESTIONS

#### INDUSTRIAL POLICY

Mr. HALL: In view of the deterioration on the industrial scene in South Australia, will the Premier make a concise statement on the Government's industrial policy (a) indicating the Government's support for the arbitration system, (b) using every effort to prevent the imposition of black bans on South Australian industries (for example, the threat that is posed to Dunlop Australia Limited's South Australian operations), and (c), assuring the industrial community that the Government will not support action to obtain a 35-hour week at this time of Government financial crisis?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government's industrial policy is that the normal processes of law in conciliation and arbitration should be used in relation to industrial disputes and that nothing could be more disastrous than for the Government to try to intervene to by-pass that system. The Government supports the arbitration system, and it does not intend to intervene to prevent the arbitration system from determining claims in relation to a 35-hour week if such claims are made by anyone before that system.

Mr. Hall: Would you give evidence of the Government's position?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: So far as that matter affects the Government, certain matters can be expected to come before the arbitration tribunal in the normal manner. I find it strange that members opposite have made a practice of rising in their places and asking whether we would use our good offices with the trade union movement, when there was no evidence while they were in office that they would use their good offices with big business.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether he intends to see Messrs Gibbs and Hayward of General-Motors Holden's next week to discuss the wave of industrial unrest at that company's plant, as is reported in an article by Stewart Cockburn on page 2 of this morning's *Advertiser*? It is reported that these gentlemen are coming to Adelaide next week to discuss the serious industrial unrest in

their plants. All members know that the same is true throughout the motor car industry in South Australia. I have listened with attention to the Premier's answer, which rather suggests that he is not willing to discuss a matter of such vital urgency to the whole of South Australia. I remind the honourable gentleman that—

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

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I just want to make this last point in explanation, Sir. I remind the honourable gentleman that, when I asked the Minister of Labour and Industry yesterday whether he would use his good offices and take the initiative to try to reduce the unhappiness and unrest in South Australian industry, he avoided giving an answer.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: I did not. I said that my door was always open for anyone to see me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier meet these gentlemen next week, or does he refuse to discuss the matter with them?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member's suggestions are as ridiculous as those he normally makes.

Mr. Millhouse: Why don't you give an answer?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am giving an answer to the nonsense that the honourable member talks.

Mr. Millhouse: What nonsense have I talked?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The nonsense is the suggestion that my door or the door of members of this Government is not open to members of industry or anyone else involved. My door is always open to them. Indeed, at Mr. Gibbs's request, as is the case with any other request ever made to me either by General Motors-Holden's, Chrysler Australia Limited or any other industrialists in South Australia, my door is always open, and I am seeing these people on Monday.

Mr. Millhouse: I am glad to hear that, in view of your—

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It had already been announced publicly, and the honourable member knows it.

Mr. Millhouse: No, I don't.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In that case, the honourable member does not read the newspapers. All the honourable member can do is come here and make snide imputations

with the express purpose of trying to foster industrial unrest as much as he can.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That the Premier is not answering my question and is deliberately being abusive to me.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable member asked a question, which he sought leave to explain. He explained it, and the Premier has the right to reply to it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: And I am replying to the imputations that the honourable member has made without any basis whatsoever.

Mr. Millhouse: What are they?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That no answer was given to the honourable member yesterday. The answer given yesterday is the same answer as the honourable member will get today: that the Government's doors are always open to anyone that wants to talk to it about any problem relating to industry in this State. My door is open to Mr. Gibbs, who has asked to see me when he comes here. I was happy to arrange for him to do so. My door is always open to people representing the labour movement. Indeed, some of them will be here at the House this afternoon. If people wish to come to talk to the Government and we are able to facilitate the proper processes of conciliation and arbitration, we will do so. The suggestion that we will not talk to anyone is nonsense, and the honourable member knows it is.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry confirm that his door is always open to people who are involved in labour disputes and, if it is, and as he refused to take any part whatever in, or discuss with the unions concerned in any way with, the black ban that was placed late last year on wool produced by a settler on Kangaroo Island, will he say when this change of attitude took place?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Kangaroo Island dispute was a matter before arbitration at the time. I believe that I replied adequately to the question asked yesterday by the member for Mitcham, when I said that my door was always open.

Mr. Millhouse: I asked you whether you would take the initiative, and you said you wouldn't.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You're not asking the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! Members will assist considerably by refraining from interjecting. Each member, in turn, receives the call to ask a question, and that member is entitled to be heard. Ministers who are replying to questions are also entitled to be heard. I insist that members cease asking supplementary questions from their seats, when they are out of order. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I strongly resent the way the honourable member misrepresented what I said yesterday, namely:

As Minister of Labour and Industry, my policy is to keep my door open at all times to either party if they wish to see me.

The member for Mitcham then interjected and said, "Do you take the initiative?", and I replied:

Yes, I think we have taken the initiative by keeping in close touch with the industry and the trade union movement. As I have said, my door is open to either party.

The member for Mitcham certainly tried to misrepresent that reply.

Mr. Millhouse: Nonsense!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Of course he did, and I resent it strongly.

Mr. RODDA: Can the Minister of Labour and Industry assure the House that the explosive situation in industry in this State regarding inspectorial staff associated with Chrysler Australia Limited will be brought under control? Yesterday the public saw a photograph of the Minister of Roads and Transport and the member for Mawson having discussions with the people aggrieved but a solution of the problem does not appear to have been found.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: It appears evident that, while claiming to support conciliation and arbitration, Opposition members by sticking their noses into this matter obviously want to strike off this explosive and delicate situation.

*Members interjecting:*

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is replying to a question and, with so many interjections being made, it is just not possible for me to hear what is being said. I request members to stop interjecting, otherwise I will take appropriate action. It is imperative that I hear whether or not the Minister is in order. It is impossible to control the House unless there is decorum. The honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: We are fully informed on the situation from day to day. I can tell the honourable member now that a

Commonwealth conference is being convened for early next week.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier say whether the South Australian Government supports the current union blockade imposed by the Australian Council of Trade Unions against the Dunlop company? It has been reported that the President of the A.C.T.U. (Mr. Hawke) has, in effect, blockaded the Dunlop organization in Melbourne because of its refusal to supply goods to Bourkes, the store owned by the A.C.T.U., at prices dictated by Mr. Hawke or the A.C.T.U. (I am not sure which, but they are probably synonymous). It has been suggested that the blockade could extend from Melbourne throughout Australia. As the Premier knows, there are many subsidiary or associated Dunlop companies in this State. I understand that last week, in a speech he made at Geelong, the Premier called for the mobilization of the trade union movement at the investment level so that the unions could become the nation's greatest price-regulating force.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Hear, hear!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am pleased to hear that from the Minister, as it indicates his attitude; but I should like to know whether it is the Government's attitude. In view of the potential seriousness of the situation, I ask the Premier to say what is the Government's attitude.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member (perhaps not unusually) has misstated the facts of this matter in his explanation. The A.C.T.U. has not initiated a boycott of the Dunlop company because of that company's refusal to supply goods at the normal wholesale price. The true position is that Dunlop has refused to supply the A.C.T.U. store unless it charges a retail price exceeding what that body considers it could reasonably charge, given the wholesale price to them. In other words, the A.C.T.U. has objected to a process of resale price maintenance above the level that it finds commercially viable.

Mr. Millhouse: What about answering the question!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am answering it. The honourable member likes to come into this House, mis-state the position, and then not listen to the facts. The honourable member has for a long period said in this House that he does not believe in price control: he likes to see competition working in the market. However, when a retail organization seeks to

compete in the market according to the honourable member's precepts it is denied that supply, contrary to the very provisions of the law in South Australia under the Fair Prices Act, which has been on the Statute Book since 1924.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Do you support the ban?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I support a reasonable process of commercial organizations demanding that they be reasonably supplied without retail price maintenance agreements. In those circumstances, I believe the honourable member has received an adequate answer to his question.

### SWIMMING POOLS

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry a reply to my recent question regarding swimming pools?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I have considered the honourable member's question concerning safety provisions at private swimming pools and am of the opinion that there is no need for any additional legislative control to that contained in section 346a of the Local Government Act. Under this section, ample power has been given to councils to require the fencing or enclosure of swimming pools where, in the opinion of the council, the pool is considered dangerous to any person.

### RIVERLAND SPECIAL SCHOOL

Mr. CURREN: Has the Minister of Education a report, which I sought about two weeks ago, on additional accommodation to be provided at the Riverland Special School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The problems associated with the accommodation at the special school at Berri are recognized by the Education Department and consideration is being given to providing for a transportable unit for the school on the next building list. On the other hand, steps have already been taken to improve the existing accommodation. Improvements are to be made to the disused garage on the property to provide additional space for craft work. Although the work has not yet been done, a contract has been let and material is on site. In addition, following a feasibility investigation by the Public Buildings Department, it is intended to replace the wall separating the junior classroom and the assembly room by a folding door. Following the honourable member's question, I asked that an officer visit the school to make a proper investigation of its conditions, and that was done last week.

### DRUGS

Mr. CRIMES: In the absence of the Attorney-General, I ask the Premier whether he will take up with the Minister of Health the matter of restricting the sale of the drugs indocid and mevasine to persons presenting a doctor's prescription. My question arises from a report in this morning's *Advertiser* that these drugs can have alarming and dangerous side effects. The suppliers (Merck, Sharp and Dohme (Australia) Proprietary Limited) try to emphasize the side effects to doctors but, although no information to this effect is contained on the labels, according to the press report the drugs are sold across the counter in South Australia without a doctor's prescription. This seems to be a situation requiring public protection.

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

### INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Mr. COUMBE: I ask the Minister of Education whether, in view of the information he gave the House yesterday regarding the Institute of Technology, he intends to introduce legislation to give effect to the matters he raised. In particular, does he intend to introduce a Bill to amend the Institute of Technology Act, and, if he does, when will he do so and what form is the Bill likely to take?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I think I indicated yesterday that amending legislation would be necessary to the Institute of Technology Act, in particular regarding the powers of the institute to award degrees, which power is not contained in the present Act. Secondly, I intend to introduce amendments to the constitution of the Council of the Institute of Technology. Thirdly, legislation will be necessary in order to establish a board of advanced education and to provide for the autonomy of teachers colleges. The honourable member will appreciate the difficulties of gaining legislative time and any prediction of a legislative programme could easily go astray. At present, however, I hope that legislation on these matters will be submitted to Parliament towards the end of this year.

### SAVINGS BANK MORTGAGES

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Premier take up with the Savings Bank of South Australia the possibility of inserting in home mortgage agreements a protection clause on interest rates? I am told that prior to 1963 all home mortgage agreements had a 10-year protection

clause for interest rates and that this term was reduced to five years. In August, 1969 it was reduced to one year and since April, 1970, there have been no protection clauses in these agreements. I believe the young house owner faces a problem regarding the cost structure. There have been two recent increases in interest rates on such mortgages and people who have not had protection clauses have been affected greatly.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will ask for a report from the Savings Bank Board. The matter of interest rates has been examined previously and it is not a simple problem. At one time interest rates were fairly stable but, unfortunately, because of action by the Commonwealth Government such rates more recently have shown increased movement and this has brought about some change in policy so that the bank could protect itself and its depositors.

#### CAMPBELLTOWN INTERSECTION

Mr. SLATER: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport have examined the situation with regard to traffic control at the intersection of the Lower North-East Road and Darley Road, Campbelltown? At present, the only traffic control at this intersection is provided by two "give way" signs, which are located on the northern and southern sides of the intersection. As more traffic is using this intersection delays have occurred, particularly at peak periods. Therefore, I ask the Minister to see whether more effective traffic control is required at this intersection.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be pleased to have the matter investigated, and I will bring down a report for the honourable member.

#### APPILA ROAD

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works confer with the Minister of Roads and Transport with a view to honouring the promise that the Minister of Works made to my predecessor, Mr. Jim Heaslip? The last question Mr. Heaslip asked in the House was about the sealing of the Appila-Laura road. On November 2, 1967, Mr. Heaslip, who was about to retire, asked the following question:

I will not be back again, and this is the last question I shall ask the Minister of Lands. . . . Unless the Minister gives me the answer to this question today, I shall not be present in the House to hear it. Will he ask the Minister of Roads to ensure that Appila, although it did not get a silo, will have a sealed road by 1968?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran concluded his reply as follows:

I do not know whether to give him a satisfactory reply today, because he may try me out again before the end of Question Time. However, I shall use my good offices with my colleague to ensure that any assurance given to the honourable member will be honoured, and that, although Appila does not have a silo, it will have a sealed road by the end of 1968. It is now about 3½ years since that promise was made to my predecessor.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: There are a couple of points I should make here. The honourable member has accurately related the reply I gave to his predecessor in the House before Mr. Heaslip retired. The assurance I gave Mr. Heaslip on that occasion was that I would confer with the Minister of Roads, who was then the Hon. S. C. Bevan, to see whether or not we could do something about sealing the road, to which the honourable member has referred, as a parting gesture, if you like, to Mr. Heaslip. However, two things happened. First, we were not able to follow it up, for the Liberal Government took over. Obviously, on our record, had we remained in office at that time, something could have been done. Secondly, the new member for the district has obviously failed to follow up the matter, and this has resulted in the present situation. As the honourable member has asked me this question, I shall be happy to confer with the Minister of Roads and Transport. In fact, I do not think we need to confer, for no doubt my colleague is fully aware of the situation outlined by the honourable member. I am confident that, if anything can be done, the Minister will do it. No doubt he will examine what has happened in recent times and, in the light of that, I guess he will make his decision. I think that we can take what has happened now as being the conference between my colleague and me: the honourable member having drawn attention to the question and reply in 1967, I think I can leave the matter to my colleague.

#### HOUSING COMPANY

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Premier obtain for me a report on the position that now exists in respect of the affairs of Greenways and Betro Harrison Construction Proprietary Limited and associated companies, and find out what payments were made to the employees and to the secured and unsecured creditors and whether any further payments will be made to outstanding creditors? An interim committee of creditors to examine the affairs of this company and associated companies was formed on October 13, 1967; after these companies had got into financial difficulty. A

suggested scheme of arrangement was assented to by the court in November, 1966. As the Premier knows (he was Attorney-General at the time), this estate developer operated in the outer suburban areas that I represent.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I remember the matter very well. This was one of those instances where, if we had had builders licensing at the time, the trouble would not have occurred. However, I will obtain a report for the honourable member as to the situation with regard to this arrangement.

#### PINNAROO AREA SCHOOL

Mr. NANKIVELL: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the programme of work to be carried out at the Pinnaroo Area School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In addition to the changerooms, new toilet facilities for Pinnaroo are included in the design programme. No report has recently been received on the condition of the original solid-construction building which contains four classrooms. Generally speaking, it is in reasonable condition, though the eastern end is cracked and needs attention. No request for attention to the walls has been received, but the Headmaster will now submit a request for any work that is necessary. As well as a solid building, Pinnaroo Area School consists of boys and girls craft sections, plus four classrooms, library, office and staffroom and a science block all in timber, and shelter and toilet accommodation. The enrolment is 93 secondary and 182 primary students. It is not intended to provide a replacement school at Pinnaroo at this stage, nor are there plans for this soon as the need for replacement buildings at a number of other area schools is more urgent. However, necessary maintenance work will be carried out.

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education obtain for me a report on precisely what is meant by the designing of new toilet blocks and new changerooms for the Pinnaroo Area School? About 18 months ago, a visit to this school was arranged by me for members of the Minister's department, and it was suggested at the time that a toilet block of standard construction (one of the type approved for general erection) might be provided. Therefore, I should have thought that no designing was required, and I am wondering whether it is now intended to build a composite block, combining changerooms and a toilet block, and whether that is why the plans for the Pinnaroo school are still in the design stage.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member. Although I was a little puzzled, I certainly took it that the architects in the Public Buildings Department were not involved in designing toilets *per se*. If it were an ordinary toilet block, it would merely be a matter of how to locate it and of preparing the working plans to be effected within the school-grounds.

#### UNDERGROUND WATERS APPEAL

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say when the results will be available to members of the deliberations of the committee on the sociological aspect of the water supply for the Virginia and Two Wells area? Some time ago, I asked the Premier what grounds of appeal were available to persons who were not able to be considered under the provisions of the present legislation, and he said that a sociological survey was being conducted for the purpose of determining the difficulties that he knew existed. Can he now say whether this report is available or, if it is not, when it is likely to be available?

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

#### OAKBANK AREA SCHOOL

Mr. McANANEY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question about the Oakbank Area School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes, I have. I, like other members and, I am sure, you, Sir, am pleased to see the honourable member for Heysen back in the House.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Oakbank Area School has an enrolment of 215 primary and 450 secondary students. The school occupies a site which has a total area of 41 acres 3 roods 30 perches. Twenty-five acres of land on the western side of the school property was acquired recently with a view to the future extension, and this area is included in the total stated. Consideration is being given to acquiring a small area of land on the eastern side of the school property. Accommodation consists of 15 rooms in solid construction and 19 timber frame rooms. There is also an assembly hall and a group of buildings comprising those used for craft, agricultural science, shelter, canteen, toilets, etc. These have been sited from time to time in a hotch-potch fashion, so that the school has not developed in accordance with a master plan. On the other hand, the facilities and the breadth of

courses offered, cater very well for the secondary enrolment, and Oakbank enjoys a high reputation in the district. No planning has been undertaken for the replacement of the wooden buildings or other buildings. It has been necessary to include many area schools in the replacement programme in recent years. Such schools as Lameroo, Tumbly Bay, Streaky Bay, Brinkworth and, I think, Lucindale Area Schools have buildings that are far less adequate than those at Oakbank and the facilities are in many respects much inferior. Therefore, it is not likely that Oakbank Area School can be replaced for many years unless conditions change significantly.

#### BEACH EROSION

Mr. BECKER: In view of the recommendations contained in the Culver report on beach erosion, can the Minister for Conservation say whether the Government will accept the principle of protecting our beach foreshores to save them from further erosion? The Culver report implies that the sand dunes should be preserved and suggests that, as a matter of urgency, we stop further encroachment on to the beach or dune areas and that we declare and hold all known coastal reserves of sand for the future preservation of the beaches.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I think it goes without saying that the Government intends to do what is possible to preserve our beaches. The honourable member has referred to the Culver report, which the then Minister of Works (Hon. Cyril Hutchens) commissioned in 1967. Since that time the Government has provided finance for this research work to continue and, even before the Government received the final report, it had appointed the committee on foreshore and beach protection, which has been meeting for some time. Immediately I received the Culver report I referred it to the committee for examination and consideration of its recommendations and I asked the committee to make recommendations to the Government as a result of that consideration. This committee is working on the matter at present and has had discussions with me. I intend to visit the local beaches tomorrow to examine some of the aspects involved and I assure the honourable member that the Government will be considering this matter carefully.

#### CIGARETTES

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Works consider introducing an anti-smoking campaign in State schools? Last evening's

*News* contains a report headed "Schools act on smoking", which states:

Victoria is about to step up its anti-smoking campaign in State schools. A programme just developed by the Anti-Cancer Council of Victoria will be used. It includes films, posters, lecture material and a "smoking machine" kit. Director of the council, Dr. Nigel Gray, said: "The programme is as good as anything anywhere in the world."

I think we all accept that this matter is most important and, although I understand that social studies students receive some instruction on smoking, I think it would be better if they received further instruction.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member has raised an important question. As he has said, certain work is carried out on the matter in our schools. I certainly intend to obtain all the information I can about the Victorian arrangements and, if they are deemed to be valuable, we will consider implementing them here. If the honourable member could devise ways and means of instructing the Minister how to stop smoking, I should be even more pleased.

#### SWEETS

Dr. TONKIN: In the absence of the Attorney-General, will the Premier request the Minister of Health to ask officers of his department to report on the need for control of the sale of those sweets that are presented or packaged in a form resembling tablets and capsules in medical use? I think all members have seen recent reports (and there have been several) comparing the appearance of sweets commonly on sale with drugs that are in common medical use. There is not much difference between the two, and I have always been surprised that more tragedies have not occurred. One brand of sweets (Smarties) is an example that is widely advertised, including advertisements in children's television sessions. Whilst the responsibility for keeping drugs away from children rests largely with the parents, I cannot help thinking that this form of advertising must lead to potential tragedy sooner or later and I should be pleased if the Minister of Health would consider the matter.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will refer the matter to my colleague and get a report.

#### NORTH GAMBIER SCHOOL

Mr. BURDON: Will the Minister of Education say what progress has been made on the suggested purchase of additional land for the North Gambier Primary School? Following the Minister's visit to this school

last November, this matter has been the subject of much representation to and discussion with the Education Department and the Public Buildings Department. However, because of the siting of the school and the addition of an open-space building, the playing area at the school has been curtailed severely. The school committee is anxious to have the additional area of land, which is still available, acquired so as to assure that space will be adequate in future.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am aware of the area to which the honourable member refers and, as he says, there have been discussions about it, particularly consequent on the erection of an open-space unit at the school and also because the existing oval at the school is used considerably and the area near the goal posts will have had considerable wear and tear by the end of winter. I will investigate the matter further to find out what is the present position.

#### MAIN SOUTH ROAD

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on March 4 regarding traffic movements near the Victoria Hotel on the Main South Road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Investigations are being carried out into the improvement of traffic channelization at the Victoria Hotel on the Main South Road at O'Halloran Hill. The investigations will be completed shortly, following which detailed drawings will be prepared and the work implemented as early as practicable.

#### LAND TAX

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has the Treasurer a reply to the question I asked on March 2 regarding land tax assessments and the change in the rural situation since last June?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has suggested that the new unimproved values for Kangaroo Island could become obsolete quickly because of the unprecedented loss of confidence in the wool industry during the nine months since July 1, 1970, the date of assessment, and asks whether I will consider this matter. Under the terms of the Land Tax Act, unimproved value assessments are made quinquennially on July 1 in every fifth year. The Act further provides that, immediately after publication of the general notice of the making of the assessment, the assessment shall be and remain in force, except so far as it is at any time

altered, until a new assessment is made. General notice of the making of the latest assessment was published in the *Government Gazette* on December 17, 1970, so that the assessment is now in force and will remain so until July 1, 1975.

Alterations to the assessment are made in terms of sections 28 and 29 of the Land Tax Act. Section 28 provides:

The Commissioner may at any time alter or correct any assessment and assessment book in any manner he thinks fit; and, as soon as he conveniently can thereafter, the Commissioner shall give general notice that the assessment has been altered or corrected, as the case may be.

Section 29 provides:

The Commissioner may, whether notice of appeal has been given or not, alter or reduce any assessment, or class of assessment, and order a refund of any excess of tax that has been paid in respect thereof.

Pursuant to section 23 of the Land Tax Act the Commissioner shall, from time to time, assess, and add to the assessment all lands that become liable to land tax after the time for making of any quinquennial assessment, and before the making of the next such assessment. As I understand it, the legal position is that the general assessment made on July 1, 1970, is now in force and will remain so until a new general assessment is made on July 1, 1975. Amendments, corrections and alterations can be made to individual assessments as a result of objections and appeals, and in accord with sections 23, 28 and 29. The honourable member asked whether I would consider further reducing the Kangaroo Island assessments because of low wool prices.

Unimproved value assessments in accordance with the Act are based on sales of land, not on wool prices, although these may be a contributing factor. The present position on Kangaroo Island is that the new unimproved value assessments are supported by the latest sales evidence obtainable in 1970. Any departure from the land sales approach to the valuation of unimproved land would make assessments purely arbitrary. This could lead to discrimination between various groups of taxpayers and an unequitable distribution of the tax over the whole community. To check the effect of the new unimproved values on Kangaroo Island, the department has examined the rural assessments for the soldier settlers and, out of 171 assessments, 15 have unimproved values less than the statutory land tax exemption limit and would, therefore, have no land tax to pay. Of the remainder,



82 obtain a partial land tax exemption, and the rest have unimproved values of less than \$15,000, tax on which, after allowing 40 per cent rebate, is \$24. All these land owners will therefore pay land tax of less than \$24 annually.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: What about water rates?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member asked a question about land tax. I have a reply to a question asked by another member, so I shall have to reply to that separately.

Mr. EVANS: Has the Treasurer a reply to my recent question about land tax assessments?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The date of assessment was July 1, 1970. Preparatory valuations could have been made in the Adelaide Hills catchment area prior to April, 1970. If the owner of the property referred to by the honourable member (the area being given as 300 acres) is of the opinion that no account has been taken of the restrictions on subdivision of land into allotments of less than 20 acres, it is suggested that he refer the matter to the department, either by personally calling to see the valuer concerned or by written objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY FACILITIES

Mr. JENNINGS: I ask you, Sir, whether it is true that a member of this House recently approached you, requesting that you establish in Parliament House, or its environs, a gymnasium, squash court or a facility of that type? Before you accede to that request, Sir, will you consider the financial difficulties confronting this State and this House?

The SPEAKER: The provision of a gymnasium has been mentioned at random by some members, and it was accidentally discussed this morning. It happened to be coincidental this morning, when I was having a cup of tea, that I had a discussion with the member for Fisher, who suggested that possibly squash courts or some other facility would be suitable, particularly for the younger members who have come into the House, and that it would help them keep their weight at a level in accordance with the proper statistics. That is about the sum total of the situation.

Mr. EVANS: I ask leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr. EVANS: The explanation is the result of a question asked by the member for Ross

Smith and the reply that you gave, Mr. Speaker, in which you mentioned my name, as a result of a private conversation that we had while you were having a cup of tea with the Clerks this morning and I chose to join you in the discussion. The member for Ross Smith asked you whether it was true that a member of this House had made an approach to you, requesting you to establish, in Parliament House, a gymnasium, squash court, or something of that type.

I did not approach you, and I did not mention the squash court. You have said that it happened to be coincidental that this morning, when you were having a cup of tea with me, you had a discussion with me on this matter. It is also coincidental that this morning I gave evidence before the Public Works Committee on the intended improvements to this building and I know I possibly offended the line of thinking of the member for Ross Smith. I consider that it may be coincidental that this question has arisen now. I point out that at no time while giving evidence this morning did I recommend a gymnasium or squash court, although it would have been an ideal opportunity for me to recommend such a facility.

This morning it was you who initiated the discussion by saying that weight was a problem with some members and it would be desirable if we had a gymnasium here. I said that would be desirable: I believe it would be more desirable than, say, three lifts or some of the odd modern conveniences mentioned for the Chamber. I hope that, in discussing things in private with members opposite, we can still have trust. By giving the reply you gave today, you have killed whatever trust one could have in relation to a private conversation.

The SPEAKER: Order! I take exception to the remarks made by the honourable member for Fisher, because, if he examines my reply to the member for Ross Smith, he will see that I did not state that the member for Fisher had requested me. The reply to the member for Ross Smith made clear that it was in conversation with the member for Fisher. We were having the discussion and you made the suggestion. I take exception to the remark and ask the honourable member for Fisher to withdraw it.

Mr. EVANS: I am in a difficult position, because you are in charge of the House, and I did not make the suggestion. I cannot argue with you, but you can speak to three witnesses privately afterwards. You made the suggestion

and I followed it up and, on those grounds, I find it difficult to apologize, if you still argue.

The SPEAKER: I am not arguing. I say definitely that the honourable member will find, if he looks at *Hansard* that I did not say what he has said I said, and the other members of the House will agree. I said it was in a discussion, and a discussion is not a request. As such, the honourable member has definitely put an entirely different construction on the matter, and I ask him to withdraw his reference to trust.

Mr. EVANS: I withdraw the part in which I have suggested that. The question asked by the member for Ross Smith has led to the point that I made the approach to you, but you did say that I suggested a squash court. Squash courts were not mentioned in conversation this morning: it was only a gymnasium, or weight-lifting facilities. That is my explanation, and I still feel that the kind of trust that one should put in a private conversation has been killed here this afternoon.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Will you, Sir, say whether the question asked by the member for Ross Smith, in reply to which you referred to the member for Fisher, was discussed by you before the House met this afternoon? The member for Ross Smith, when asking about the possibility of a squash court or gymnasium being established here, implied that, because of the cost, it should not be built, and in your reply, Mr. Speaker, you said that the suggestion had been made by the member for Fisher. I was astounded when you referred to the member for Fisher in your reply.

Mr. Millhouse: Hear, hear!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As a member of the Joint House Committee, I personally have been approached by a member of the Government Party whom I will not name or refer to in my question. I was approached by that member regarding the same subject, namely, whether a squash court could be provided in Parliament House. Referring to the member for Fisher as having been involved in this matter suggests to me that you had a prior consultation with the member for Ross Smith, that you knew he would ask this question, and that you knew the reply you would give. I should like to know whether or not you did have that prior consultation.

The SPEAKER: The answer is "No".

#### COOBER PEDY WATER SUPPLY

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works consider reducing the cost of water to the

residents of Coober Pedy? Now that the reverse osmosis plant is operating there, I understand it is not necessary to cart water over a long distance and, therefore, the same carting cost is not involved. When I was in Coober Pedy earlier this week, I was asked whether the Minister would consider reducing this cost, which I understand at present is 30c for 60 gallons.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will examine the matter, although I do not hold out great hopes for the honourable member. I think he is aware of the vast costs involved to the department in supplying water in this difficult area. I think he is also aware, as are other members, that already we lose \$6,000,000 a year in respect of country water supplies, the cost of which, in fact, metropolitan people are subsidizing.

#### FREEWAY No. 1

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether a decision has been made to construct Freeway No. 1 on the north side or the south side of the township of Callington? About six weeks before Christmas, a conference was held near Callington between Highways Department engineers and landholders, and at that stage it was expected that a decision would be made within two or three weeks, this decision being vital to landholders in the area. If a decision has been made, will the Minister say what it is?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No decision has yet been made, and the reason for this is outside the control of the Highways Department. I understand that certain large company interests have been busy in the area of Callington (I am visualizing a fairly wide paddock here when I say "area"), and have been pegging mining leases left, right and centre, including a site right in the middle of where the freeway was proposed. Every time the Highways Department examines an alternative route, the first thing it finds is that yet another claim has been pegged. The department is still working on this matter, and some fairly high-level discussions may have to be held later in order to determine the route of the freeway.

#### TEACHER SHORTAGE

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Will the Minister of Education say what is the result of the recent drive to recruit mathematics and science teachers in order to relieve the shortage?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: If the honourable member cares to check the *Hansard* report of last Tuesday, he will find a reply that I gave the member for Torrens dealing with this matter. Speaking from memory, I think that, just prior to the beginning of the school year, there was a shortage of a little over 100 teachers, of whom, I think, 71 were mathematics/science teachers.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Full-time?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Yes. By the middle of February, the mathematics/science position was down to a shortage of about 32 teachers; and by the beginning of March, just prior to the campaign we instituted, we had 22 full-time and about 12 part-time vacancies. At present, I am informed that we have about five part-time vacancies. We propose that as people become available we will continue to appoint them in order to improve the position within the schools, because I am sure, as the honourable member will appreciate, that the problem in just about every school is that there is some erosion of staff because of resignations occurring during the year. However, as a result of the actions taken by the department, the position is now well under control.

#### PORT LINCOLN PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. CARNIE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I recently asked about water tanks at the Port Lincoln Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: It is not the policy to provide rainwater tanks at schools where a satisfactory reticulated water supply is available. The Engineering and Water Supply Department carried out an examination of the reticulated water available to the Port Lincoln Primary School on March 12, 1971. The tests indicated that there were no objectionable tastes whatsoever in the water and, further, that the bacteriological quality of the Port Lincoln water supply is consistently of the highest standard.

#### WILD DOG BOUNTY

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Lands to say how many dingo pup scalps there have been on which a bounty has been paid between June, 1970, and the present time? In addition, will the Minister consider increasing the bounty in respect of pup scalps from \$1 to \$2 as soon as the state of the Wild Dog Fund will permit? The general opinion in the area is that the number of dogs has decreased significantly

since last year, as a result of many dogs being destroyed in previous years and also as a result of the earlier drought. The people concerned consider that an increase in the price of scalps would encourage trappers to increase their activities in this regard. Following recent floods in the area, it is feared that many dogs will come inside the dog fence, once the floods wash away sections of the fence.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to confer with my colleague. However, I think the honourable member's attention should be drawn to the remarks made when the Wild Dogs Act was amended earlier this session and when it was stated that the fund had run into debt. It was feared at the time that some people were breeding pups for sale: in other words, making a feast out of it.

#### MODBURY FREEWAY

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport indicate what is to be the future of the Modbury Freeway? The report of the State Planning Authority published yesterday recommends modifications to the Modbury Freeway route, mainly in the northern extremity. Can the Minister indicate whether any change is contemplated for this route as it passes through the suburbs of Walkerville and North Adelaide, which are in my district. The Government has agreed that certain freeways are necessary and I understand from the Minister's previous comments that the Modbury Freeway is one of these. Does his department intend to continue purchasing land along the route, as Dr. Breuning recommended in his report to the Minister?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This matter was debated in this House earlier this session, but for the information of the honourable member I will quote from a statement I made as a result of a very exhaustive consideration of the Breuning report by the Government. The statement I made was printed in its entirety in the *Advertiser* of January 30 and the *News* of about that date. The pertinent part of the statement is as follows:

The Government said that the new systems of public transport will have greater capacities and will cause far less disturbance to the community and its established living patterns. However, they will require corridors through the urban area and although Dr. Breuning was not in the short time he was in Adelaide able or expected to consider the actual routes, he reported that routes similar to those in the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study Plan, if required at all, would best serve the city's needs as transportation

corridors. The Government said that accordingly steps have been taken to incorporate the following corridors in an amended 1962 Metropolitan Development Plan as recommended by Dr. Breuning in action recommendation No. 7:

To the south the Noarlunga Freeway alignment; to the north-west the Port Adelaide Freeway alignment; to the north the Salisbury Freeway alignment; to the north-east the Modbury Freeway alignment; and the necessary connections around the west and north of the city, that is, the alignment through Hindmarsh, across north of North Adelaide, and connecting to the north-east corner of Adelaide proper.

The Government said, that this plan will shortly be put on public display and be subject to public submissions.

The report appears in yesterday's *Advertiser* as a result of the considerations by the State Planning Authority, which for the information of the honourable member is not under my control: it has been transferred to the Minister for Conservation.

Mr. Millhouse: Taken away from you!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Yes, taken away from me. That is completely correct, so that the honourable Minister for Conservation may properly deal with the matters under his control. We do not like divided control within this Government.

Mr. Millhouse: Because of dissatisfaction with the way you handled it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will not answer any more of the honourable member's silly interjections. Such interjections are only equal to his intelligence, I am afraid. I should like to give the member for Torrens this information because I know he is interested, even though other members of the Opposition may not be. The report continues:

However, if any owner whose home is in one of these corridors chooses to sell his home and is unable to do so, the Highways Department will be a willing buyer, without asking for the proof of hardship that was required by the previous Government. The department will also continue to purchase vacant allotments along the routes.

I think those are the points in the Government's statements that relate to the question asked by the honourable member.

#### SMITHFIELD HOSTEL

Mr. CLARK: Has the Premier a reply to a question I asked recently about the retention of the Smithfield migrant hostel?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have checked with the South Australian Deputy Director of the Department of Labour and National Service and the South Australian Manager for Commonwealth Hostels Limited,

and both officers inform me that they have no knowledge of any proposal to close down the Smithfield hostel.

#### FIRE BANS

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture to be more lenient when announcing fire bans in the Western Division? Great concern has been expressed to me by farmers who wish to carry out burning-off operations but who, unfortunately, have been prevented from doing so by the many bans that have been imposed this year. There has been much rain in this area recently and a bushfire would be unlikely to cause much harm at present. Earlier in the year fire bans were imposed on many days that were unsuitable for burning anyway and it has caused considerable concern to the farmers because they believe that if any more fire bans are announced they may not be able to carry out their burning-off operations and they will have trouble cropping their paddocks.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take this matter up with my colleague and bring down a reply, although I do not know that it is a matter of being more lenient. I always thought that the announcements depended on the climatic conditions of the day. I am certain that the factors the honourable member has mentioned will be taken into account. We have a similar problem in the South-East, where one timber mill was out of timber because forest workers were not permitted to work in the forest on total fire ban days.

#### SPEECH THERAPY TEACHER

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Education a reply to a question I asked recently about the shortage of speech therapists?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: There is a shortage of speech therapists not only in the Education Department but throughout South Australia. The present establishment in the department is four, but the strength is only one full-time and one half-time. Mrs. Pierson, a speech therapist from the United States of America who was giving speech therapy to a few individuals at the Psychology Branch in 1970, returned to the U.S.A. on January 28, 1971. The Education Department was fortunate in being able to replace her with a part-time speech therapist from Victoria, who began work on March 15, 1971. The shortage of speech therapists is so acute that

only the most urgent cases can be given attention. It is not known whether the child mentioned by the honourable member falls into this category. We are concerned about this shortage and, in an attempt to overcome it, three speech therapy students are at present training at speech therapy colleges in other States at departmental expense. Our present intention is to provide two additional speech therapy studentships each year.

#### WEST LAKES

Mr. BECKER: Can the Minister for Conservation say whether, in declining the suggestion of the Woodville council that West Lakes Proprietary Limited should erect dwellings 25ft. from the forward sand dune rather than 8ft. from that dune, he consulted authorities such as the Beaches and Foreshore Protection Committee and the Seaside Councils Committee in the matter? The *Weekly Times* of March 10 contained an article which was headed "Woodville Council Gets Rap on Knuckles" and which stated that the Minister was asked to arbitrate on a proposal from the Woodville council, which suggested that dwellings in the West Lakes scheme at Semaphore Park be built 25ft. from the forward sand dune instead of 8ft. from it, as suggested by the company. Can the Minister say whether a precedent has been created in this case by the refusal to accept the principle contained in the Minister's statement this afternoon that the Government intends to do what is possible to protect our beaches? Can the Minister say why he did not rule in favour of the Woodville council's request, and consult the Beaches and Foreshore Protection Committee and the Seaside Councils Committee on this matter?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The council has raised this matter with me, having also discussed it with the member for the district, who has approached me and the Minister of Works about it. Arrangements that have been made in relation to the subdivision that has been undertaken by the West Lakes authority do not in any way bear on future development that will take place in the area. The problems raised by the council have been discussed only this morning with the Chairman of the foreshore and beaches authority, who has examined the matter. It is clear that, if the council has any complaints to make about the building project in the area, it has every avenue open to it to appeal against the decision. I suggest that the council is well aware of this.

#### EFFLUENT USE

Mr. BROWN: Has the Minister of Works obtained a reply to the question I asked on Tuesday about the possible use of effluent at Whyalla?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Laboratory tests to determine the salinity of the effluent from the Whyalla stabilization lagoon over the past three years have indicated a salinity level in excess of that which is considered satisfactory for the irrigation of ovals and park lands.

#### BOOK SERVICE

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Education see whether the book courier service can be extended to schools in the Central Hills area? I understand that the service operates as far as Willunga and throughout the Adelaide Plains, but so far it has been denied to those schools in the Hills that are close to Adelaide. It would be a great service to the area if it could be extended there.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to look into the extension of the courier service.

#### AIRCRAFT NOISE

Mr. CLARK: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about the noise made by aircraft used in training over the city of Elizabeth?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: An announcement made in the newspaper of March 5 states:

Qantas has agreed to vary flight paths, increasing operation heights and cancel all Sunday flights. The measures were adopted at talks between the Department of Civil Aviation, Qantas and the Royal Australian Air Force. The Regional Director of D.C.A. (Mr. K. M. Barclay) said the new schedule would operate immediately. The three parties were conscious of the noise problem and hoped that these new measures would be satisfactory to all concerned without affecting the training flights.

#### UNION MEMBERSHIP

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Minister of Labour and Industry any information about the hitherto unsuccessful attempt of one of my constituents to join a union? The Minister will recall that on February 23 I told him that my constituent had been unable to join. He said that, if relevant documents were made available to him, he would be pleased to take up the matter. No action has yet been taken, as far as I am aware; up to Monday of last week, this person had certainly not been given an opportunity to join a union. I only

hope that the Minister's activities in regard to the present industrial unrest have not been responsible for this delay.

The Hon. D. H. MCKEE: Only yesterday I made inquiries about the matter, and negotiations are still continuing.

#### COORONG

Mr. NANKIVELL: Can the Minister for Conservation say whether he is considering the situation in the Coorong and what plans, if any, his department has for its development? I wish once again to support this project. I hope that the Minister is aware of what has happened in the past with regard to investigations made and that he will not accept these on face value but will have his department analyse the matter again to see whether the proposals were costed on a reasonable basis. Otherwise, figures such as \$7,000,000 or \$8,000,000 stated to be necessary to cover the expense of diverting water from the western drainage division into the Coorong, together with estimated costs related to extending the drains known as Drain E and Baker Range Drain to Alf's Flat and Salt Creek, and those involved in cutting a channel from Lake Albert into the Coorong, may create a false picture of the actual cost of the restoration. All of these projects are related to the rehabilitation of the area. I imagine that the Minister is concerned about this problem from a tourism point of view.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am fully aware of the problems associated with the Coorong. When I visited the area recently I was disturbed to notice areas that were not in good condition. It appears that, owing to the efficient way in which the South-East was drained, waters that previously found their way to the Coorong no longer do so, with the result that stagnation is occurring, and it will possibly become worse in the future. I am aware of the tourist potential of the area and I know that, unless something is done, the bird life and other wild life in the area could suffer. In view of the concern I felt after visiting the area, I closely examined the position. As a result of looking through the dockets, I have seen the honourable member's interest in the matter and the representations he has made in the past. I regret that these representations were not available when the matter of draining the South-East was being considered, for then the effects on the Coorong could have been taken into account. The reports I have indicate that to correct the position at this

late stage will obviously be most costly. I am having the matter examined, taking into account the representations previously made, and we will also bear in mind what the honourable member has said today when we are examining this matter in future.

#### SAFETY RUN-OFFS

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say why the Waite Agricultural Research Institute property is not considered suitable as a site for an emergency safety run-off? I was induced to ask this question not only by the tragic accidents that have occurred because of runaway vehicles on Cross Road but also at the instigation of a constituent, Mrs. Wells, who was in a car at the intersection of Cross Road and Fullarton Road when one of the runaway vehicles went through that intersection. As Mrs. Wells has pointed out, it was purely a matter of luck or good fortune that she had taken the lane that she was in at that time. If she had taken the other lane, she could have been a victim in this accident. I appreciate the Minister's comments yesterday, in reply to a question, about long-term proposals to deal with runaway vehicles, but I think this statement will not do much to reassure my constituent or other people who use Cross Road in that area today, tomorrow, or in the weeks to come. I am not an expert but it seems that, if the drain on the side of Cross Road were covered and an area of collapsible fence were provided, this matter could be dealt with easily. I have also been asked to say that, in relation to the Waite Agricultural Research Institute, it is apparent from the reply given yesterday that the university authorities have not been consulted. I should like the Minister to consider the matter again urgently.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The matter has been considered. A full and comprehensive report was given to the honourable member yesterday and I would have thought that he, more than any other member of this House, would appreciate that prevention was far better than cure. The reply given to him yesterday showed that the department was actively concerned with legislation necessary to prevent runaway vehicles, rather than with trying to deal with them afterwards. I consider that, in the cases to which the honourable member has referred, the miracle is how the two runaway vehicles ever got around into Cross Road. No sooner would we have some

safety ramp constructed in the Waite agricultural institute property than the next runaway vehicle would go straight down Glen Osmond Road or into Portrush Road, and if that happened we would need to do more work there. I consider that it must be borne in mind (and obviously the honourable member ignores this completely) that both vehicles were operating in an illegal manner on the road.

Dr. Tonkin: It could have been otherwise.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Then I hope that we have the wholehearted support of the honourable member when next we introduce measures relating to the Motor Vehicles Act, instead of getting the hypocritical opposition that we received last evening in the debate on an amendment to that measure.

Dr. TONKIN: Does the Minister of Roads and Transport intend to introduce legislation to implement measures in this current session aimed at reducing the risk to the public from runaway vehicles on the Mount Barker Road and connecting roads at Glen Osmond; or must I inform my constituents that the Government intends to take no action at present?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is not my problem to tell the honourable member what to advise his constituents. No doubt he will do what he always does: say what is politically advantageous to him.

#### MURRAY RIVER FERRIES

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say whether the departmental committee that has recently issued a report on the operation of Murray River ferries (and I have received a copy of the report) considered that the amount being paid to ferry contractors was sufficient to reimburse all persons employed on them? I have been approached by two employees of contractors operating ferries, both of whom consider that present competition amongst contractors is very keen and that the profit margin is very small. As no public subscriptions or fees are paid to ferry contractors by the average motorist, the sum they receive from the council, which is agreed to by the department, is the total income they receive. Because these contracts are competitive, I understand there is not a high profit margin to enable contractors to pay all the people that must necessarily be employed, as most of these ferries operate 24 hours a day, seven days

a week. I find the committee's report interesting and informative, and I am delighted to see that many of the recommendations regarding ferries are to be implemented. I should like the committee to examine the amount being paid to these ferry contractors, and to investigate whether the amounts being paid to contractors are sufficient for them to pay their employees. I do not suggest that the contractors are being miserable in their payments to employees. However, many of the employees are middle-aged men who have their homes along the Murray River, and who cannot look for other work.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not certain that I can accede to the honourable member's request, as I am not sure that it would be within the committee's function to do as he asks. It seems to me that if there are any complaints, as the honourable member suggests there could be, some sentiments would have been expressed either to the councils or to the Highways Department. However, to the best of my knowledge there has been none. I assume that the honourable member is not suggesting that this committee, if it is to examine this matter, should go to the contractors and ask them whether they are getting enough for the contract. If they did, they would get the obvious reply, as no-one would say he was getting enough. I also assume (and I hope I am right) that the honourable member is not advocating that we revert to charging people who cross the Murray River. I will discuss this matter with the Chairman of the committee to determine whether it is practicable or, indeed, desirable to do anything about it, and I will inform the honourable member accordingly.

#### WOOL

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Works representing the Minister of Agriculture give the House details of correspondence that should have taken place between the Commonwealth Government and the Minister of Agriculture concerning the following part of the Labor Party's policy speech:

A Labor Government will press the Commonwealth Government to again initiate talks with the United States on the abolition of the 25½ per cent tariff on Australian greasy wool. As it is now 10 months since the Labor Party delivered its policy speech, I would expect that some correspondence would have passed between the parties and that some progress would have been made.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Yes.

**MARINO TRAIN SERVICE**

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider changing the present rail service on the Marino line? The train that leaves Marino station at 8 a.m. is full by the time it leaves the Oaklands station. Despite this, it still stops at every station on the way to the city. An express train from Oaklands to the city, with a follow-up single carriage train to pick up passengers after Oaklands, would speed up the service and cut 10 minutes off each journey, and it would also encourage people to use the service.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As a similar question has already been asked by the member for Mawson, I hope to have a reply to this question either next week or the week after.

Mr. MATHWIN: I should like to clarify my question because I do not think the Minister understood it. He said that a similar question had previously been asked by the member for Mawson, but I have since spoken to the honourable member and it is obvious that the questions are different.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was clear in my mind when I answered the questions, but the honourable member has now thoroughly confused me.

Mr. Gunn: That's easy enough.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Maybe, because it is very easy for the member for Glenelg to confuse anyone.

**ROAD SAFETY**

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport say what action, if any, the Government intends to take on the recommendations of the South Australian Committee of Inquiry into Road Safety? Some weeks ago I asked a series of Questions on Notice about this matter, and I received a reply on March 2 to the effect that the Government expected a report to be submitted to it within the next few weeks. It is now between two and three weeks since I received that reply and, as the session is drawing to a close, I rather expected to hear the Minister give notice today of his intention to introduce the legislation. If we are to have any legislative action on this matter, it is about time a Bill was introduced. Legislation of this nature has been introduced by the Victorian Government in its Parliament. Will the Minister say whether legislation is to be introduced on this vitally important topic and, if it is, will it be introduced soon so that members may have the time to give it the attention

it warrants? The report deals not just with the matter of legislation: it contains many other recommendations. However, we do not know yet what the Government intends to do, if anything.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I presume that you, Sir, would rule that I must answer the question first asked by the honourable member and not any of the other four he subsequently asked in his explanation. If that is so, I will answer the honourable member's first question. The honourable member asked whether the Government intended to take action on the report. However, he answered that question in his explanation. The matter has been referred to a committee (as the honourable member was informed on March 2) and, as soon as the Government receives the report and has studied it, the honourable member, other members and the public will be informed of the Government's intentions.

**METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY**

Mr. COUNBE: Can the Minister of Works say what is the Government's plan regarding the clarification and purification of the metropolitan water supply? When I had the privilege of being Minister of Works, I examined this matter and spent some time at the pilot plant at which, as the Minister knows, much of the work undertaken in this regard is being carried out. Subsequently, my Party prior to the last election announced a policy of purifying the Adelaide water supply, and at the time we were chided by members of the present Government for making that statement. I understand that the Minister or another member of the Government subsequently stated that a modified scheme would be introduced and that it would extend over a period of years, as the previous Government intended. Can the Minister say whether this is still the position and what investigations are proceeding into the possibility of purifying the metropolitan water supply?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I said on one occasion that I believed that the filtration of the Adelaide water supply was inevitable, but never did I say that the Government planned to filter the water, such work to be spread over a period of years. Although this was suggested, it was never said by me. I think that, if the honourable member reads the press reports closely, he will see that it was speculation on the part of the press rather than a statement made by me. I said at the time that I believed (and it was a personal belief) that it was inevitable that a filtration system would



have to be provided in connection with the Adelaide water supply. Where possible, the purchase of property, as previously planned (and this has been the plan for some time), is taking place, and the pilot plant is still functioning. I have asked for a detailed report (in fact, I think it is available to me) so that the Government can study the problem, although we are placing no urgency on this work at present. The honourable member would be fully aware, of course, of the tremendous costs involved. I am certain that before the Government accepted any recommendation it would wish to know exactly what costs were involved and to inform people in the metropolitan area who would be affected what would be the likely cost if such a scheme were introduced. However, we have not reached that stage yet.

#### METROPOLITAN HOUSING

Dr. EASTICK: Has the Premier a reply to my recent question about metropolitan housing, particularly in relation to displaced stock salesmen from the country?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Housing Trust has had no special information recently about families now being displaced from rural communities, although it has been the trust's experience over many years that many families from rural areas do apply for accommodation in Adelaide. It is true that the demand for housing in the metropolitan area is the heaviest that the Housing Trust has known. The trust reported in its annual report for 1969-1970 that it had received a record number of 10,037 applications for rental accommodation. This application rate has even increased, and, in the past 10 weeks alone, 2,210 applications for rental accommodation were received. In addition, 817 other applications, mainly for rental purchase housing, were also received, making the total number of applications lodged with the trust since last Christmas 3,027. In the same period, the trust has been able to assist 1,226 families, and of this number 1,021 were allocated rental houses. From the figures quoted, it can be seen that the trust is receiving an average of about 300 applications each week and is only able to offer housing to 120 families. Because of this heavy demand, the trust is not able to assist any applicant without a considerable delay, and this also applies in the Elizabeth-Salisbury area. The trust deals with all applications as sympathetically as possible but date of application must be the main factor in deciding the order in which people are offered accommodation. It is con-

sidered that this is the only fair way to handle the problem, as most families applying appear to have some urgency in their need. Unfortunately then, should the families referred to by the honourable member apply to the trust, they must expect to wait some time before being assisted.

#### BREATHALYSER

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider increasing the penalty in connection with offences under the Road Traffic Act involving the breathalyser test and a blood alcohol content of .08 per cent? On January 27, a gentleman by the name of Greenwood was tried in court, and the magistrate said that it was "about time motorists took bloody notice of the law". Even though it was this person's second offence within a year, he was only fined a minimum of \$100. If we are to have road safety—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

Mr. McANANEY: I am giving what I thought to be an explanation of the question. I am asking this question because I consider this person was let off far too lightly by the magistrate, although he was highly critical of the driver's conduct.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will obtain a report for the honourable member.

#### ANDAMOOKA WATER SUPPLY

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Works say what is his Government's policy regarding the water subsidy at Andamooka? When I was at Andamooka earlier this week, the Chairman of the local progress association asked me whether I could get the Minister to clarify the position. At present, because of the recent rains very little water is being carted to Andamooka. He wonders whether, if within a month or so the need to have water carted again arises, the Government will again subsidize such an operation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I take it the honourable member is asking, if water has to be carted in the near future, what will be the policy of the Government. I suggest to him that this is a hypothetical question but the Government has always been sympathetic to people in this area regarding water, and I see no reason why there should be any change of attitude.

## PRESS REPORTS

Mr. HOPGOOD: I ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether you will issue a statement with a view to correcting a false impression that people may have gained from reading today's *Advertiser* report of an incident that occurred in this House last night? I have no desire to refer to the incident or to the people involved, but a person who had read page 1 of today's *Advertiser* would have seen the following: in the subheadline of the report reference is made to a "rowdy clash in the Assembly"; in the third column reference is made to the "uproar"; and in the fourth column reference is made to the "din" in the Chamber. As I move around the community people talk about politicians squabbling in the House; but I normally find that these people have never seen members at work, nor do they read *Hansard*, so their only guide is the newspaper reports. I feel that this report has been misleading. My dictionary defines "uproar" as "tumult, violent disturbance and clamour". I was in the Chamber last night but, after reading this report, I wonder whether I was asleep.

The SPEAKER: I will consider the honourable member's question.

*At 4 o'clock, the bells having been rung:*

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

CIVIL AVIATION (CARRIERS' LIABILITY)  
ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

LOCAL AND DISTRICT CRIMINAL  
COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

RIVER MURRAY WATERS (DARTMOUTH  
RESERVOIR) BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

AGENT-GENERAL ACT AMENDMENT  
BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Agent-General Act, 1901-1970. Read a first time.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move:

*That this Bill be now read a second time.* As honourable members are no doubt aware, Mr. R. C. Taylor has been appointed Agent-General for South Australia in the United

Kingdom, to take the place of Mr. K. L. Milne, whose term of office expires on March 20, 1971. Mr. Taylor's term of office commences on April 1, 1971, within a short time of which he will take up duty in London. The Bill increases the salary and expenses allowance payable to the Agent-General and renders him responsible to the Premier instead of to the Treasurer.

As the Act now stands, the salary has been £4,460 sterling a year since 1967 and the expenses allowance has been £3,375 sterling a year since 1970. It was a condition of Mr. Taylor's acceptance of the appointment that his salary would not suffer and, as the Public Service Board was to consider the Agent-General's salary and allowance when senior salaries are reviewed later this year, the Government believes that the increases proposed by the Bill should operate from the commencement of Mr. Taylor's term of office. It is proposed that his salary will be £5,000 sterling (\$10,746 Australian) and his expenses allowance £4,200 sterling (\$9,027 Australian).

The Bill also removes the control over the office of Agent-General from the Treasurer's Department and places it in the hands of the Premier's Department, where it now more properly belongs. The supervision and appointment of the Agent-General have in fact been largely carried out through the Premier's Department for some years, and it is felt that this situation ought to be regularized. Mr. Taylor has been led to understand that he will be answerable direct to the Premier. As the matters contained in the Bill must be in effect by April 1, I recommend that this Bill be passed with as little delay as possible.

I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 fixes the commencement of this amending Act on April 1, so that the existing provisions regarding salary and allowance are preserved until that date. Clause 3 amends section 4 of the principal Act which deals with the office of Agent-General, by substituting the word "Premier" for "Treasurer" wherever it occurs. Clause 4 amends section 5 of the principal Act, which deals with salary and allowances, by deleting the two existing paragraphs which specify the rates of payment. New paragraph (a) provides for an annual salary of £5,000 sterling, payable from April 1, 1971, and new paragraph (b) provides for an annual expenses allowance of £4,200 sterling, payable from the same date.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

### LOTTERY AND GAMING ACT AMENDMENT BILL (TAX)

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from March 17. Page 4123.)

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): Of the seven measures that the Government is introducing to raise revenue, this is possibly the most acceptable in that it is a tax that people can avoid paying if they wish to do so. What is involved is not an essential part of living. By saying that the money is needed for social services (especially health and hospitals), the Government invites debate on these subjects, but as the sum involved is only \$90,000 in a full year I will not endeavour to extend the debate to those issues. No-one enjoys paying taxes of any kind, but this is possibly one of the least objectionable taxes.

The action of the Government in permitting the retention of the 1.8 per cent turnover tax at country courses is to be commended. Some country racing clubs have difficulty in surviving, although the Strathalbyn, Balaklava and Murray Bridge clubs conduct fairly thriving meetings, providing good service to people who attend. As the increase in turnover tax from 1.8 per cent to 2 per cent only brings the level in this State up to the level that exists in the other States, I do not think anyone can object to this increase. This is still a small levy on the turnover of bookmakers, especially when compared with the 5.22 per cent tax collected in respect of bets made with the Totalizator Agency Board or the on-course totalizator. If any adjustment should be made to the taxes paid by the racing industry, some consideration should be given to lowering the rate that applies to T.A.B. and the on-course totalizator and to increasing the levy on bookmakers' turnover.

As I have said before in this House, I do not object to there being bookmakers on race-courses, provided that they do not have an unfair advantage over the on-course totalizator and the T.A.B., to the detriment of people who invest their money in those latter forms of betting. I notice that the T.A.B. report states that, if someone had invested a dollar on T.A.B. on the winner of each race, he would have collected \$40,000, whereas the same investment would have returned only \$31,000 based on starting prices. I admit that the starting price is not necessarily the best price offering before a race. Nevertheless, this

indicates to me that the only reason people bet with the bookmakers is that it is perhaps a little more glamorous and the odds can be seen. If more money were invested by the on-course totalizator, it would be able to provide better facilities for betting. If the facilities were improved, I am sure this type of betting would go ahead.

A newspaper report states that the Australian Labor Party will investigate off-course starting-price bookmaking and see whether it can be stopped. I do not think this should be the responsibility of the A.L.P.: the Government should have the responsibility of seeing that the laws are policed and not evaded. The Government should set up an inquiry into illegal starting-price bookmaking, every effort being made to prevent the loss of revenue to the Government that results from these operations. No-one likes to support a measure that increases taxation, but I can find little objection to this Bill. This measure is not inflationary in any way. If people do not wish to pay this tax they do not have to do so, as betting is not a necessity of life. I support the Bill, with the slight objection I have made in relation to the way forms of betting other than bookmaking are discriminated against.

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): This is another of the seven taxation measures that the Treasurer foreshadowed in the statement he made to the House some time ago. The Government is searching for further funds in the extremities of the taxation field, and this illustrates that the public must pay for what the Government spends. People have to pay in some way or another, whether by means of an entertainment tax or as a result of taxes imposed on business activities that are conducted in an effort to improve production in the community. One cannot oppose the increase of a tax when that increase does not have a crippling effect on the transactions involved. If the Government has got itself into a fix and needs additional revenue, this is perhaps one legitimate avenue in which it can raise money.

This will involve the racing fraternity in paying an extra \$90,000 each year. This is not nearly as great a tax as is the foreshadowed entertainment tax on all forms of entertainment for which the admission price is \$1 or more. This will affect hundreds of thousands of South Australians who enjoy entertainment. We can be thankful that this tax is not as great as that tax. No doubt we will deal with other iniquitous propositions

when the legislation relating to them is introduced. When my Government came into office, we had to fulfil a promise to the racing fraternity to remove the winning bets tax. The Minister of Education has always referred to this fraternity as the racing industry, and I think we received some tardy recognition from him for the action we then took. Having lightened the burden of bookmakers considerably in that way, we left open this avenue whereby turnover tax could be increased, and we increased this tax to 1.8 per cent. After drawing comparisons with the tax in other States, the Government is increasing the tax to 2 per cent.

No responsible member of the House can oppose this move, in the light of the fact that the Government has got itself into financial difficulty through its administration of the State. With a backward-looking glance at the taxation measures the Government has already introduced and with some trepidation as I look forward to the taxation measures it still has to bring in, I support the Bill with about the same amount of enthusiasm as the Minister of Education showed in praising us for taking off the winning bets tax.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): This Bill could be described as thump No. 3 of the new taxation measures announced recently by the Treasurer. In announcing them, the Treasurer stated:

From July 1, 1969, when the winning bets tax was lifted, the tax on bookmakers' turnover was increased from 1½ per cent to 1.8 per cent to offset partially the loss of revenue. It is now intended to increase the tax, from April 1, to 2 per cent, the most common rate applicable in the other States. This will yield additional revenues of about \$110,000 in a full year, and about \$35,000 this financial year. In introducing this Bill, the Treasurer stated that the tax was expected to yield \$90,000 in a full year. Therefore, somewhere we have lost \$20,000, and I should be interested to know how he could say, on the one hand, that the tax would benefit the State by \$110,000 a year and, on the other, that it would benefit the State by \$90,000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There's a simple answer.

Mr. BECKER: Is this the sort of economics we are to get from the State Government? No wonder the Government is in the red to the extent of \$12,000,000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: There's a simple answer. The Bill does not relate to country areas. That explains the \$20,000 difference.

Mr. BECKER: The amount was completely different when the new tax was announced

from what has been stated in the explanation of this Bill. That is typical of the Government's airy-fairy attitude and the roundabout way that this measure has been brought in. The Government will not fool the people all the time, and it is about time someone protested. This measure will thump the people who support the racing industry, including the bookmakers. True, the amount of tax involved is not large, but how can the bookmakers absorb all the increase? It must be passed on. We cannot expect the bookmakers to absorb this. They have had increased costs of wages, printing, stationery, and everything else, yet the Government expects them to absorb this increase.

If Government members think that bookmakers are a most affluent section of the community, they should work in a bank to find out whether that is so. Bookmakers are rich one day and poor the next. In the last few years, much capital has been spent in this State to build up the blood-horse industry and to keep racing going so that we can compete with other States, yet the Government is thumping the industry again and thumping the supporter, the average working man who likes to go to the races on a Saturday afternoon.

As the Leader of the Opposition has said, this tax is not as severe as the entertainment tax. However, we all know that racing clubs are considering increasing admission charges, so the person who supports racing will be thumped again.

Mr. Coumbe: The little man.

Mr. BECKER: Not only the little man is affected: this affects all sections of the racing industry. I warn the House that we cannot expect to impose levies continuously to balance the State Budget because of the Government's poor financial handling. It is all very well for the Treasurer to state in his explanation that, by increasing the turnover tax on bookmakers, this State will be brought into line with New South Wales and Victoria and that when he goes to the Commonwealth Grants Commission he will be able to say, "Gentlemen, in South Australia we have introduced certain tax measures and have also brought the impost on bookmakers into line with charges in other States. Therefore, we expect a big handout to balance our Budget, because we are not capable of balancing the Budget." For the reasons I have given, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): It has been fashionable to speak to this type of measure

this week. The Treasurer and his colleagues need finance to run the State, but here the Government is looking at a taxation field that is supported by people from all walks of life. This Bill increases the tax on bookmakers' turnover from 1.8 per cent to 2 per cent. Whilst the Bill is short, it will have far-reaching effect: I understand that it will raise about \$90,000 a year.

I wish to refer to the racing industry in the South-East of this State and the rationalization of this industry that has taken place in recent years. If we take something from anything, it is always advisable to put something back. An important industry has grown around the sport of racing. This afternoon, during Question Time, we discussed some of the side effects of depressed rural areas. I represent a rural area and have expressed concern about the Bordertown area being denied a race meeting that it has fostered over the years.

I am referring to a matter that I think is relevant to this Bill. The Bordertown Racing Club provides the venue for racing in the Upper South-East, its course being about 100 miles from Murray Bridge and about 50 miles north of Naracoorte. In that area, a thriving racing industry is growing up, involving blood stock and their training. About 40 owners and trainers are making full and proper use of a facility at Bordertown that will make its contribution to the coffers of this State.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That's not affected by this Bill, of course.

Mr. RODDA: Yes, it is. It will make its contribution in a mild way.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: In what way and by how much?

Mr. RODDA: I do not think the interjections are relevant.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr. Ryan): Interjections are out of order.

Mr. RODDA: An integral part of my district will be denied the opportunity to hold a race meeting, and the race day has been given to Mount Gambier.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: You cannot amend this Bill to do anything about that, though.

Mr. RODDA: I am raising this issue on behalf of the people I represent, and I am entirely in your hands, Sir. I raise this matter, notwithstanding what the distinguished Ministers opposite think about it. The people I represent who are interested in racing do not quibble about making a contribution to the Treasury along the lines proposed in the Bill, which I am sure will pass.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Why don't you speak to the Bill?

Mr. RODDA: I do not know what the Minister is getting hot under the collar about.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We are trying to speak to the Bill?

Mr. RODDA: I do not know why the Minister is so damn stupid that he cannot contain himself.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In view of the member's remarks, Sir, I take a point of order. There is nothing in the Bill about racing dates; it deals with turnover taxes. Therefore, his remarks are out of order.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Bill relates to a tax on bookmakers' turnover. If the honourable member can link his remarks to the Bill, he may continue. However, if he cannot do so he will be out of order.

Mr. RODDA: I am making the point that a *bona fide* club, which holds race meetings in this State and which will pay its contribution in accordance with the provisions of the Bill, is being denied a most important racing date. I raise this issue on behalf of the people I represent, and I only hope that this club can have a successful meeting to enable it to contribute money to the Government to enable it to build schools, about which the Minister of Education is so concerned. I hope I am not being irksome, but there are some flourishing bookmakers in the area of which I speak; much interstate money is brought into the district; and I am sure the Minister would not mind having some of Sir Henry Bolte's money appropriated to the Education Department.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's reference to education is out of order.

Mr. RODDA: I am sorry, Sir. The Bordertown Racing Club has made its contribution not only to the racing industry but also to this part of South Australia generally, and I am using this platform to bring to the notice of the authorities the great concern of the club. Despite the fact that the South-Eastern District Racing Association (the body that controls racing in the area) ruled by 17 votes to four that the Bordertown Racing Club should have the Melbourne Cup meeting, it has not been able to obtain it. I will deal further with the Bill in Committee.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): Here we have a further stampede measure by the Government: a Bill which was introduced yesterday and which has to be debated and decided today. This gives members little or no opportunity

to discuss the full implications of the Bill with their constituents, who are so vitally affected by it. It is unreasonable for the Government to expect any member to be able to obtain in such a short time all the information he requires from the people he represents. This Bill not only erodes the advantages that have accrued to racing clubs in the past but it is also an example of another erosion of members' rights.

The expectations of the racing clubs regarding the provisions of the Bill discussed in this place earlier in the session (which Bill amended the principal Act, particularly in relation to betting and betting facilities) were fairly short-lived. The Treasurer said then that he wanted to ensure that the people conducting racecourses had every opportunity to provide better facilities for their patrons and for the sport of racing, be it horse-racing, trotting or coursing. It was stated then that the true issue was a means of increasing this State's revenue by increasing the ability of people to bet and, therefore, increase the ability of the betting public to pay taxes to the State.

Once more, by this Bill bookmakers are being made to make a larger contribution. Not a large amount is involved: it will amount to \$90,000 in 12 months. This lines up with Government expenditure, much of which has been unnecessary. Of course, not just the little man in the street but all sectors of the racing community will eventually be forced to pay. The member for Florey has said before that he enjoys making a bet, albeit only a small bet. If one analyses clause 3 and its application to section 41 (b) of the Act, one will find that the racing clubs will receive a lesser return.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: That is not true.

Dr. EASTICK: The Treasurer, when introducing the Bill, gave a copy of the second reading explanation to the Leader of the Opposition, part of which is as follows:

Clause 3 amends section 41 of the principal Act which deals with the application of the commission raised under section 40. The existing provisions are altered so that the proportions of commission passing to the racing clubs (that is, twenty-five/thirty-sixths of bets made on races held within South Australia and on all coursing events, and five/thirty-sixths of bets made on interstate races) are retained until April 1, and then after that day the proportions are reduced—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you cared to work out twenty-five/thirty-sixths of 1.8 per cent you would find it was exactly the same as—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Light.

Dr. EASTICK: There will be a further erosion of moneys being made available to racing. The necessity for the bookmaker to meet increasing costs in all directions will affect his ability to make funds available to the clubs or to meet the increases in bookmakers' fees that the clubs will be seeking. I cannot tolerate or accept this continuous erosion of moneys. It may be said that the sum is small, but one only has to go out into a rainstorm of small raindrops, and it is not long before one is wet. These small sums that are constantly being taken from the public will greatly affect people's ability to enjoy the pleasures that the Government so unjustly claims it wishes to provide.

Once again, we see a new definition of the metropolitan area. In the short time I have been in this House, I think I would be correct in saying that we have considered not fewer than six definitions of the metropolitan area, and this Bill introduces yet another definition. According to the Bill, the metropolitan area is defined as that part of the State that lies within a radius of 20 miles from the General Post Office at Adelaide. In another Bill introduced yesterday—

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: The honourable member would be out of order if he referred to another debate in this Chamber.

Dr. EASTICK: I suppose that, as the Minister has explained the Industries Development Act Amendment Bill, the debate on that Bill has been commenced. However, we find in that Bill also a completely new definition of the metropolitan area. After the arrival in the House a few moments ago of the Treasurer, the Minister of Education does not seem to be so sure whether his arithmetic is correct.

Mr. Clark: He'll tell you in a minute.

Dr. EASTICK: I can hardly wait to hear his contribution. I cannot support this Bill, which represents a further erosion of people's finances.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON (Minister of Education): First, the member for Hanson has failed to appreciate that the Bill raises the turnover tax only on bookmakers in the metropolitan area; it does not affect any country race meeting outside a 20-mile radius of the G.P.O., and that explains why the revenue expected is less than that stated when the Treasurer first announced the revenue measures to be introduced. Secondly, for the benefit of the member for Light, I point

out that the definition in this Bill of the metropolitan area is a special definition, because race meetings at Gawler are classed as being equivalent to country meetings. As the honourable member knows, they are relatively smaller meetings, now held on a Wednesday afternoon. Of course, the member for Light may prefer a broader definition of the metropolitan area to bring the Gawler Racing Club inside the metropolitan area and, therefore, to provide a higher rate of turnover tax for that club. If he thought about it for a moment, the honourable member would not be able to hold up his head in his district if he did not support this provision. Finally, also for the benefit of the member for Light, I point out that the fractions that appear in the Bill relate to various percentages.

Before this Bill is passed, regarding all races that take place in South Australia the fraction of 1.8 per cent which goes to the clubs is a fraction of twenty-five/thirty-sixths. If the honourable member cares to think for a moment, he will find that twenty-five/thirty-sixths of 1.8 per cent is  $1\frac{1}{4}$  per cent; and  $1\frac{1}{4}$  per cent of the turnover tax goes to the clubs. After the day when the change to 2 per cent comes about, five-eighths of the new 2 per cent turnover tax goes to the clubs, and if the honourable member gets out his slide rule he will find that five-eighths of 2 per cent is  $1\frac{1}{4}$  per cent, and that is the fraction going to the clubs, the same as applies at present;  $1\frac{1}{4}$  per cent of the bookmakers' turnover on races within South Australia goes to the clubs. Previously, five/thirty-sixths of 1.8 per cent of moneys held in respect of interstate races has gone to the clubs; five/thirty-sixths of 1.8 per cent is a quarter of 1 per cent and, after the changeover, one-eighth of 2 per cent goes to the clubs in respect of interstate races; that is also  $\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. Therefore, there is absolutely no change in the sum going to the clubs; there is no reduction whatsoever. As the honourable member will need to support the provisions regarding the metropolitan area, and as he was wrong about the percentage going to the clubs, the member for Light will now be able to support the Bill with a clear conscience.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I congratulate the Minister of Education on making a speech in this House that was even shorter than his average replies to questions. I support the protest made by the member for Gawler regarding the time that members are given to examine legislation.

The ACTING DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must refer to members by their correct names. It is the member for Light.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The member for Light made a cogent point when he said that, although this Bill was introduced only yesterday, we are expected to debate it today. This is a taxation measure, which it is estimated will raise an additional revenue to the Government of \$90,000, this sum to be taken from bookmakers' turnover. This is not a minor matter, although the sum involved is not as big as that involved in other taxation measures we are considering, but, when it is recalled that Standing Orders provide for notice to be given for a Bill on one day and for the Bill to be introduced not before the next sitting day and then read a first time and that the second reading must be set down for another day, it can be seen that Standing Orders provide for proper consideration to be allowed for every measure coming before this Parliament. During recent years there has been a tendency, to which the House has agreed, to suspend Standing Orders in order to enable the second reading explanation to be given on the day on which the Bill is introduced. Sometimes Standing Orders are suspended to dispense with even the notice of the introduction, so that people who may be interested in the subject have not even that time to take interest in what is going on in Parliament.

To my mind this has been overdone. I have protested in this House on a number of occasions about the haste with which measures are introduced. A much more widely discussed Bill than this referred last year to a shopping hours referendum and I protested then. I warn the Government, whether it is worth it or not, that I will object to the suspension of Standing Orders to enable second readings to be proceeded with on the day of introduction, if I think the Bill will be brought on for discussion on the following day. Certainly I can be overruled: there is no question about that. The Government can suspend Standing Orders; it can introduce a Bill without notice and have it debated and passed all in the one day if it wishes, for it has the numbers.

I point out that suspension of Standing Orders is normal in the sense that until recently it has been done after consultation with the Opposition. I sat on the Government benches for many years and I think that I have never had Standing Orders suspended without getting

consent from a member opposite who was interested in the Bill. I would make some approach to the member on the other side to see if he was happy about it. One of the secrets of Sir Thomas Playford's success in this Parliament, and he had remarkable success—

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is digressing somewhat from the Bill. We are not discussing Standing Orders. I ask him to return to the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am protesting that we should be asked to discuss a Bill less than 24 hours after it has been introduced, and that can be done only by the suspension of Standing Orders. I am on the Standing Orders Committee of this House, and as you well know—

The SPEAKER: The honourable member cannot discuss a decision of the House. I ask him to speak to the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: This is a decision of Government I am discussing, and I am allowed to do that. The Government asked this House to agree to the suspension of Standing Orders to enable the second reading explanation to be given yesterday. No-one objected, and that was fair enough; yet we are now asked to discuss the matter only 24 hours later.

Mr. Langley: It has been agreed between the Whips; you didn't want to discuss the other matter, so we transferred it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I am pointing out that, in future when the Government asks for the suspension of Standing Orders, I will question its future plans for the legislation because, as a member of Parliament, I want to have a chance to discuss the legislation with interested people throughout the community. All members have someone in the community to whom they go for an opinion on legislation. I have never pretended to be an authority on the Lottery and Gaming Act. I do not go to the races often these days, although years ago I used to attend fairly regularly. I have experienced the various forms of betting and enjoyed the general excitement of race meetings: I have enjoyed placing bets and studying the horses and their form. I know I am right when I say that largely the racing public supports bookmakers ahead of the totalizator. When I go to the races, I bet with the bookmakers. A great many people bet with the bookmakers because they like to know the odds at the time they lay their bets. Although I do not oppose the Bill, I wish that the Gov-

ernment would outline its plans when it introduces yet another measure to increase taxation. In connection with the State's finances, all we have had up to the present is a circular sent out to Government departments.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has not spoken to the Bill at all. Standing Orders must be observed. I think I have been more than lenient with the honourable member. If the honourable member wishes to speak in the manner in which he is speaking, ways and means are open to him to do so. However, he must confine his present remarks to the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I take it that I am not allowed to refer to the Government's economies.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member can refer to the economies in the Bill.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I cannot refer to other financial measures?

The SPEAKER: Not at this point.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: As I am allowed to discuss this method of raising revenue but no other aspect of the Government's revenue raising, I can only say that, although I do not oppose the Bill, I look on it with distaste. I believe better justification could have been given for this move. One justification given (and this is given almost invariably) is that we will be increasing this tax to the level that applies in the Eastern States, meaning Victoria and New South Wales.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: At the moment, until they bring in their Budgets.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: How often have we heard that we must bring the State into parity with the other States? How often have we tried to remind the Government that this State should not come up to the level of the other States? In this case, we should keep our costs lower, because the racing industry here is not on the scale of the racing industries in Victoria and New South Wales. The Minister, who is trying to interject, knows that enormous strides have been made in the last few years in breeding thoroughbreds in this State. When a thoroughbred is produced, if he is good enough his trainers and owners immediately look for races in the Eastern States in which to enter the horse. The horse may not be lost entirely to South Australia, but he is likely to race in the Eastern States.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: This might not have happened if your Government had introduced T.A.B.



The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Minister has many opportunities to speak, but he is not a good speaker: I think he is an interjector by profession. Racing in this State is not on as big a scale as is racing in the Eastern States and, despite what the Minister may interject, it will not be on such a scale. Proportionately, I should say that South Australia has improved the quality of its thoroughbreds—

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing in the Bill about breeding.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The Bill deals with turnover tax, so the racing industry is concerned.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must link up his remarks with the content of the Bill as it relates to turnover tax. In this connection he cannot talk about the breeding of race horses. In doing so, he contravenes Standing Orders.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: I will not press the matter, but I say my remarks are relevant. We must look after the State's racing industry. We must be careful in increasing turnover tax and taking revenue from the racing industry. It is not a good argument to say that we are only increasing the tax to the rate that applies in the other States. Although I do not oppose the Bill, I do not greet it with enthusiasm.

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

#### ELECTORAL ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ENROLMENT)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 23. Page 3512.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): In a rather brief second reading explanation, the Attorney-General's first point was that the implementation of this Bill was Government policy, as announced before the last State election. In his explanation he stated:

One of its main objects is to provide a simple method of enrolling House of Assembly electors as Legislative Council electors under the Electoral Act. This is consequential on the policy of the Government that a person entitled to vote at an Assembly election should be qualified to have his name placed on the appropriate Council roll.

In the Government's policy speech further light is thrown on the Bill by a short but significant phrase. It states:

As a first step to reform the Upper House the Labor Party proposes adult franchise and compulsory voting for Upper House elections. We now see the Bill in its true perspective. The Labor Party's policy, which has been

quoted openly, is to abolish the Legislative Council as a second Chamber, so we see clearly how the Bill is a first step towards that. Even if we do not consider the ramifications of the Bill, this statement in the policy speech is a ground for opposing the measure, because most people in the State consider that the Legislative Council performs a useful function.

The Bill is threefold and there are grounds for rejecting it on those three bases. The Labor Party is persisting with this legislation, saying that it has a mandate for it. However, whilst we must concede that the Labor Party's overall policy commended itself to many citizens. I do not consider that the people examine every line and detail in a policy speech. Because of that, it is not valid for the Government to say that it has a mandate for every item in the speech. I am convinced that a referendum on the abolition of the Legislative Council would be defeated.

Basically, the Bill contains three proposals: the first is compulsory enrolment on the basis of the House of Assembly roll; the second is that voting shall then become compulsory; and the third is that an amendment to the principal Act is necessary to enrol 18-year-old voters. Apart from the broad subject of abolition of the Legislative Council, each of those matters is a ground for rejecting the Bill. I consider that a House of Review has a role to play and, if we accept this, it must be elected on a franchise that is different from that for the House of Assembly. If one accepts the Labor Party's premise that the Legislative Council is superfluous, one can accept the Labor Party's argument about franchise. In those circumstances, it would not have any useful function and we might just as well enlarge this House. However, as most people consider that a second House is a safeguard, the Bill must be rejected. The Attorney, in dealing with compulsion, stated:

The philosophy underlying the Bill is that the law ought to encourage citizens to exercise their voting rights.

We cannot quarrel with this basic point but then he follows with legal argument that I consider to be devious argument, to put the most charitable interpretation on it. In that argument the encouragement turns first to a right and obligation, then to a privilege, then to a democratic right and, finally, to a duty. This is the progression from encouragement to compulsion, and in the process there are various contradictions and shades of meaning. The law will step in finally and, if the people

do not accept encouragement, they will be fined.

This legal jargon looks well but, when one boils it down, one finds that it is what we call the process of rationalization. In that process, one starts with a hypothesis and, by using enough big words in the process, arrives at the desired end. I do not admit that the Attorney's argument has weight. I have always considered that the democratic idea allowed citizens, where possible, to have a choice. Obviously, the Labor Party does not apply any connotation of choice. I thought that freedom was inherent in the idea of democracy and that, where citizens could exercise a choice, freedom could be given them. I cannot accept the hypothesis that, because the Attorney-General suggested we should encourage people to vote, we should therefore compel them to do so and that, if they do not vote, we should fine them. However, I do not want to argue about the rights and wrongs of compulsory voting now. The compelling argument in this matter is that, if the Upper House is to have any real significance, its franchise must be different from that of this House.

Mr. Slater: Why?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Because, if the franchise for the Upper House is the same as it is for this House, we may just as well enlarge the House of Assembly; otherwise, any benefits to be derived from having the Upper House as a House of Review would be negated. The member for Playford has persisted in his insulting references to members of the Upper House. His remarks in this respect were irrelevant and nonsensical. However, the honourable member cannot help being insulting. He said that there seemed to him to be a relationship between compulsory voting and the quality of the Legislature elected. I suppose he refers those remarks to the members of Parliament in Britain and other places where compulsory voting is not in force. He also said during his speech:

For example, it seems to me to follow that, because such a minority elects the Upper House in this State, that in itself is a good explanation for the appalling quality of that place.

That sort of derogatory remark merely reflects the bitterness that some people opposite feel towards a House which has, over the years, more than proved its worth. Indeed, the value of the Upper House has been illustrated many times during the sitting of this Parliament, when amendments returned to this

place from the Upper House have been accepted happily by the Government.

The House of Review can reconsider legislation passed in this House, and a different viewpoint on many matters can be advanced. People are also given more time to make their representations. I will return to this aspect later. The insulting remarks made by Government members regarding another place harm them more than they harm members of the Upper House. The member for Florey said there was such a furore (I think that is the word he used) in the minds of the public about the Upper House that something should be done about it. However, the furore is so large that the Labor Party has to engage in a most extensive campaign to get people enrolled on the Legislative Council roll. I should have thought that, if the furore was as great as the honourable member suggested, people would be clamouring to get enrolled. The people of South Australia are perfectly happy with the two-House system of Parliament, and would like to see it continue. The overwhelming argument in this matter is that there should be a difference in the franchise. Members could argue about the exact details of that difference but, if the Upper House is to have a separate identity, there must be some difference in the way its members are elected.

The Government wants to reduce the age of majority to 18 years and, although I have clarified my position in this respect, I am happy to restate it. I am not convinced by the arguments that have been advanced in this respect. I know that there are members on both sides who believe that the franchise should be extended to 18-year-olds. However, I am not convinced that persons of this age are more mature than 18-year-olds were years ago. True, they have come under much more pressure and they are subject to much more influence than we were. Conversely, they are staying at school longer and they depend on their parents longer. I do not believe that in many of the areas in which maturity of judgment is required they are any more mature. In saying that, I am not criticizing young people: that is an obtuse misinterpretation that Government members choose to place on my remarks. People mature when they take on responsibilities and when they go out to work and have to make their own living.

Another important point to be borne in mind, which is to the younger people's credit, is that they are not asking for these measures.

Members know perfectly well that I have had dealings as a high school teacher with many 17-year-olds that are soon to turn 18. None of these young people is clamouring to vote at 18. I was involved this year in a quest dealing with 18 to 20-year-old persons. Many questions were asked of these young people, none of whom was interested in voting at 18. This is merely an attempt by the Labor Party, not just here but in many places around the world, to enfranchise young people when those young people do not really want this right.

Mr. Harrison: What about the Liberal Party?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am giving my own personal views. Members not only on this side but also on the other side think that at 18 years young people should have all the rights of an adult. However, from my experience with many young people of this age, I do not agree. The Bill should be rejected on the three scores to which I have referred. As the Labor Party has said that this is a first step towards the abolition of the Legislative Council, the Bill should be opposed. Much has been said by Government members regarding the virtues of the one-House system. The member for Mawson was extolling the virtues of Queensland, a State in which this system has operated, but opinions are divided on the success of the Queensland Legislature with its one-House system. I refer to comments by A. A. Morrison, formerly a senior lecturer at the Queensland University, in the book *The Government of the Australian States*. He is far from convinced that the one-House system, to which this Bill is a stepping-stone, has the virtues that this Government would try to convince us that it does have. He states:

The long dominance of a single organized political Party further contributed to the decline of the Assembly by transferring public interest from Parliament to the Party. Hence what the Parliamentary Labor Party decided in Caucus inevitably became the law of the State. However closely fought the proposal may have been in Caucus, the Party voted solidly in the House. Once introduced into the Assembly, the Bill marched irresistibly through all stages, and no Government Bill was ever defeated and very few were even laid aside.

This is the overwhelming argument that would lead me to oppose vehemently this Bill, which is one of the stepping-stones enunciated by the Labor Party in its policy speech towards abolishing the Legislative Council. In these circumstances I totally oppose the Bill, and reject the three proposals it contains.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Gunn: This'll be good!

Mr. PAYNE: It will be better than anything the honourable member has done, anyway. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill. Before saying why this Bill should be supported by both sides, I should like to refer to what was said by the member for Kavel.

Mr. Venning: And you may learn something, too.

Mr. PAYNE: I listened to the honourable member in order to be able to comment on the points that he raised and to show him where he was wrong. All he did was knock our youth, as he has done before. He said that he did not think they were ready to vote.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Rubbish!

Mr. Venning: Do you?

Mr. PAYNE: I do, and I know they are, because in Western Australia not long ago they proved that they were ready to vote and 62 per cent voted for the Labor Party.

Mr. Rodda: How do you know that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PAYNE: Another point I noticed about the member for Kavel in his speech was that he showed a strong attachment to the Labor Party policy as enunciated before the last election. This is an extremely strong attraction. I know that I cannot refer to other debates, except in passing, but it would be fair to say (and I am sure members would agree with me) that the honourable member has never been on his feet in this House, except at Question Time, without saying that he is concerned with the Labor Party policy speech. I do not blame him for being fascinated by it: the people of this State are, too.

Mr. Venning: Why not speak to the Bill?

Mr. PAYNE: I have listened to, and I have read, what other speakers have said on this matter and I have observed that they have covered a wide range. I am sure that what I intend to say will be within the confines of this debate, but I shall abide by your ruling, Mr. Speaker, at all times. This debate has continued for some time with members putting forward their points of view. Initially, I shall comment on the speeches of Opposition members who have spoken before the member for Kavel. They seemed to me to be taking part in a forlorn attempt to stem the tide of democracy which is slowly but surely engulfing them and their fellows in the other place. They seem to find it frightening that the other place will be engulfed by democracy. The Leader commenced his effort with his usual flamboyant, fallacious farrago—

Mr. Mathwin: What does that mean?

Mr. PAYNE: It means what the honourable member often says when he is on his feet in this House.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PAYNE: After the Leader's initial farrago he changed his pace. I think I am being charitable, because what followed slipped out when he said:

Basically, the widening of the franchise of the Council must be completed so that every citizen in the State who is qualified to vote for the House of Assembly will also be qualified to vote for the Legislative Council.

We agree with that, and this Bill will secure that condition. Why does he not support the Bill? I leave the people of this State to make up their minds on that point. The Leader realized what he had said, drew back from what was to him the dread precipice of Liberals in this country advocating democracy, and rambled on about "We must have a difference in the franchise for each House." We have heard that line all the time. The member for Kavel was constrained to point out that we must have this difference. The Leader, in bolstering that line, cited the five multiple districts with four members each with six-year terms and said that elections were held every three years.

Not content with that, he then spoke about having different days. He wants a different difference from what we have now. I considered his arguments carefully after hearing them, but the logical extension of his phoney argument would be to go for an even greater difference: why not have the States swap Upper Houses and have someone who has nothing to do with it as a House of Review? What rubbish! It is the responsibility of members to take care of the Government of this State. The Leader was putting a smoke-screen around what we have to decide. We already have sufficient difference in the areas I have quoted, and the Leader well knows it. We have different human beings in each place, and no member would disagree with me when I remind him of the complexity of the human character. If that does not provide enough difference for the Leader, I do not know what else he wants. The Leader also said:

All members who have been here for any great length of time must admit that a second House brings a different view to matters.

If the Leader adopts that argument, why does he want to add other qualifications? It is clear that he considers that the mere fact of having a second House (if we must have a second House) must be sufficient, without fur-

ther qualification. The member for Flinders followed, and we can guess what he said. It is a sort of litany on the other side that is in evidence daily, and it is to this effect: "We believe in full adult franchise, but we don't believe in using it." Members opposite say one thing and mean another.

The member for Flinders sees getting to the polling booth as a kind of obstacle race, and he is not merely satisfied with the differences to which I have referred: he wants separate rolls, as well as polls on different days. He would want voters to bring their own pencils! Requiring them to walk into the booth backwards is about the only additional thing I can think of. The people of this State are not fooled by that sort of argument; they have heard it before and know what members opposite are up to. Opposition members are fighting tooth and nail to retain the *status quo*. I am sure that the member for Flinders was unconscious when he paid the Attorney-General the great compliment by saying that the word "democracy" ran like a thread through the Attorney's second reading explanation. I should be proud to have someone say that of my speeches.

This Bill is all about democracy; it seeks to bring about the true democratic expression of the will of the people of this State who will then have in the Upper House (if we must have that place) their desired elected representatives, not the wealthy, property-owning legislators who now occupy many of the seats in that place. The member for Flinders then glided off into semantics and talked about rights and privileges in relation to voting, although I believe his references turned out to be erroneous. For his benefit, I point out that the definition in the Parliamentary Library dictionary of "right" is "that which is consonant with equity; that which is morally just or due".

Mr. Crimes: They regard that as subversive.

Mr. PAYNE: Yes, but I regard it as a fundamental truth. The definition in the same dictionary of "privilege" is "a special advantage enjoyed by persons or a class of person beyond the common advantage of others". The member for Flinders further said:

I do not believe that we have the right to say to anyone, "You are not allowed to vote."

Mr. Venning: Aren't you quoting out of context?

Mr. PAYNE: I do not take things out of context. Within the rules of discussion and

argument, I am prepared (I listen to all speeches in this Chamber) to have my own speeches subjected to the same kind of scrutiny. The member for Flinders then said:

Nor do I believe we have the right to say to anyone, "You must vote."

I offer that statement for consideration. Which of those two statements is the truth is clear to me. I do not believe we have the right to say to anyone, "You are not allowed to vote." In other words, there is no real loss of freedom in compelling an opinion but

there is a definite loss of freedom in preventing an opinion. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

#### BUILDING BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council with amendments.

#### ADJOURNMENT

At 5.38 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 23, at 2 p.m.