HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, September 15, 1971

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

PETITION: LIQUOR TRADING

Mr. HARRISON presented a petition signed by 23 members and supporters of the Queenstown Church of Christ stating that, because Sunday drinking would add to the road toll, spell increasing disaster to family life and increase Sunday crime and desecration, it was undesirable to extend liquor trading to Sundays without first submitting the question to a referendum of the people. The petitioners prayed that the House of Assembly would not pass any legislation to effect an extension of liquor trading to Sundays unless a majority of the electors was in favour of such an extension.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

MORGAN DOCKYARD

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Roads and Transport say when a decision will be made regarding the proposed removal of the dockyard at Morgan to a point farther down the river? Members may recall that I have repeatedly asked the Minister questions about this matter, which is worrying Morgan residents. Members of the dockyard staff, who own about 12 houses in the town, consider that the removal of this dockyard would be detrimental to the town itself.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This matter has been the subject of much consideration over a long period. The Commissioner of Highways has discussed the matter thoroughly with me as Minister, and the matter has been considered by Cabinet. I have received several deputations on this subject and have also visited Morgan to see the situation at first hand. The Assistant Commissioner (Construction) met representatives of the district council at Morgan yesterday to ascertain whether the council wished to submit to the Government any other matters that had not already been raised. I have been informed by the Assistant Commissioner that all the matters raised by the council yesterday have been fully considered. The Government and the Highways Department are fully conscious of the social and economic repercussions that could result from the shifting of the Morgan dockyard to another location. It was necessary to weigh these matters against the desirability of continuing the dockyard virtually in isolation to the rest of the departmental activities in that general area.

About three years ago, the Highways Department decided that it was desirable to establish a substantial district office at Murray Bridge. This district office is now an accomplished fact, and the department's activities in that area should logically be brought together. Accordingly, the Government has decided that the recommendation of the Highways Department that the Morgan dockyard be progressively shifted to a site at Murray Bridge is the only proper and adequate solution to this matter. I can also say that a great amount of consideration has been given to the matter of the transfer of any employees who wish to move from Morgan to Murray Bridge. The Commissioner of Highways will provide appropriate housing, and every facility will be given to these employees in order to minimize the effect that this decision may have on them. I point out that none of the employees will be retrenched as a result of the move.

Mr. HALL: In view of the Minister's shock announcement that the Highways Department facilities are to be shifted from Morgan, I ask him whether he will take up with Cabinet the proposal that compensation be paid to those employees of the dockyard who have invested their life savings in purchasing a house and who will consequently lose on that purchase when they shift their employment to Murray Bridge.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In my statement, I said that all aspects of this question had been fully considered. Obviously the point about those employees who had homes in Morgan was one that was given serious and lengthy consideration. The Government's decision was made only after all these factors had been considered. The answer to the Leader's question whether I will ask Cabinet to consider this matter is that the point has already been fully considered by Cabinet; the various aspects were weighed when considering the overall point.

Mr. Hall: Was it agreed to?

Mr. Venning: What happened?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Despite the rude interruption by the member for Rocky River, who has no interest in Morgan anyhow, let me stress that the die was cast for the eventual transfer of the Morgan dockyard facilities to Murray Bridge when, three years ago, under the Leader's Government, a decision was made to establish a substantial district office at Murray Bridge. I believe that was the start

of events which left virtually no other final answer than the one I have given today. The Government is not happy to see these employees embarrassed socially, financially or in any other way, but it agrees that it has a responsibility to all the people of South Australia to run this State's business organizations in a proper way, and the decision has been made in that light.

Mr. Hall: Will compensation be paid?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Compensation for what?

Mr. Hall: The loss by these employees of investment in houses caused by the transfer.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We are not taking away houses from the people in Morgan.

Mr. Hall: I want an answer, not prevarication.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the Leader would like me to get specific details, I should be only too pleased to do so. However, I think from memory about half of those employees have either houses or, I understand, fruit blocks. It is not a question of our buying these properties from them. We are not engaged in an acquisition matter: we are concerned with either the upgrading of the Morgan dockyard facilities or the transfer of those facilities. It was considered desirable to transfer them.

Mr. Hall: And no compensation will be paid to these people?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I think I have made abundantly clear that it would be quite improper to make a compensation payment for something that we were not buying. These people who own either houses in the town or small properties out in the irrigation areas will either retain them or sell them, as they choose. All that has happened is that over a period of years their place of employment will be moved progressively.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister say what consideration was given by Cabinet to the effect that the potential sale of 12 houses at Morgan would have on the overall value of real estate in that community, having regard to the fact that the total population of the town is 270? If an average of four persons to a house is used, it will be readily realized that about 70 house units would be necessary to accommodate this population. Twelve houses are involved in respect of the 21 employees who are associated with the Morgan dockyard and, if these persons wish to move to the place of their new employment, it is conceivable that 12 houses would be on the market at the same time. I suggest that 12 out of a total of about 70 would create a difficult situation. It has been stated that the value of these 12 houses (and these are current figures) is about $70,000. In a community which, because of diminishing industrial opportunities, cannot attract persons to live in it, this situation becomes important.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I doubt whether the situation that the honourable member suggests as possible will occur because, as I have said in reply to the member for Frome, the Highways Department over a period will progressively transfer its activities from Morgan to Murray Bridge. No definite schedule of operation has yet been determined to the best of my knowledge (it would be unreasonable to think that it would have been operating, as we have spent much time in the last few months seriously considering whether the move should be made), and it is reasonable to assume that there has been no forward planning to determine how the move will become effective. I said that the transfer would occur gradually as facilities were erected at Murray Bridge. With that thought in mind I would not expect all the 12 houses to which the honourable member has referred to be put on the market at the same time. I am not even certain that the number of 12 is correct, although the honourable member says it is. I thought it was slightly less: say, nine or 10. I do not expect the transfer of the dockyard to occur in the way the honourable member has implied; hence I do not think this hypothetical situation of the effect on real estate in the town will become a factor requiring consideration.

Mr. WRIGHT: In the event of any Highways Department employee at Morgan objecting to the proposed transfer of his employment to Murray Bridge, will alternative employment be found for him at Morgan? I think this would overcome the difficulties that have been expressed today, because the hardship would be taken out of the proposed transfer if alternative employment could be found, thus allowing the employee to remain in his own accommodation at Morgan.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The answer is "Yes". In the discussions I have had with the District Council of Morgan and the various deputations from the council, the Riverland Local Government Association and the Amalgamated Engineering Union, I have consistently stated that, in the event of its being decided to transfer these facilities to Murray Bridge, any employee resident in Morgan who did not wish to be transferred would be found work

at the Morgan depot of the Highways Department, to the extent that this could be done. I doubt whether all the employees could be absorbed, but I would not expect all of them to decide not to transfer. If any employee does not wish to transfer, alternative employment will be found for him in the Highways Department at Morgan. This would overcome many of the problems that are being dreamt up.

Mr. WARDLE: As a result of today's announcement, can the Minister give the exact location of the new dockyard?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot describe the exact location, but I will obtain a description of the location from the land surveyors and give it to the honourable member who, I am sure, is at least one person who will be happy that additional industry is to go to Murray Bridge.

SUNDAY HOTEL TRADING

Mr. HARRISON: Will the Attorney-General say whether the Government intends to amend the Licensing Act to permit Sunday trading in hotels? The current widespread interest in this matter, as evidenced by the petition I have presented and the many letters being received by honourable members, may have emanated from a newspaper report to the effect that the Government may amend the Act.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Some time ago I saw a newspaper report speculating about this matter. Although I do not know what was the origin of that report, I can say categorically that the Government does not intend to amend the Licensing Act to provide for Sunday hotel trading.

FRUIT JUICE DELIVERY

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Premier investigate the circumstances in which two of my constituents and a third person who, I understand, is a constituent of the member for Fisher allege that they were improperly induced to purchase a franchise for the delivery of fruit juice? The following advertisement appeared in the *Advertiser* of February 6 this year:

Delivery rounds. Opportunities are available for men or women to join an Australia-wide company as owner-drivers. Selected applicants will benefit from a five-year written contract with options and sales outlets supplied. Minimum earnings $120 weekly with potential earnings related entirely to effort. Straight deliveries, no selling, finance available on very small deposit. Act now.

Then there was a telephone number that could be telephoned, and the name of a person and an address. These gentlemen, on responding to this advertisement, found that it had been inserted in the press by the Grove Fruit Juices company and, as a result of assurances they obtained from the gentleman in charge of this operation, two of them paid $1,750 in cash for the franchise for a round. The person who has given me this letter states that, in order to raise this money, it was necessary for him to mortgage his house, with consequential high rates of interest. In fact, during the period in which these men operated the round, this person received an average of only about $45 gross a week, and this figure reduced to as little as $30 a week gross, which barely covered, if it did cover, his expenses. There was in the advertisement a reference to a written contract. One of the three gentlemen has supplied me with a contract, but it is not signed. He claims that the contract that was signed by both him and the company was left in the hands of the company, which has claimed that it has subsequently mislaid it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I shall have the matter investigated and give a report to the honourable member.

CAPITAL TAXATION

Mr. COUMBE: Has the Premier read the report of the Legislative Council Select Committee on the effect of capital taxation upon business and industry in South Australia? If he has seen it, does he intend to give effect either by legislation or by other means to the recommendations of that committee, or, if he has not studied it, will he do so and tell the House of his possible intentions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The reply to the first question is "No", and to the second question "Yes".

OVERLAND EXPRESS

Mr. RYAN: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to my recent question about the departure times of the Overland?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: There were no alterations to the normal schedule of the second division, which departed from Adelaide on August 31, 1971, at the usual time of 8 p.m. However, because of delays in receiving air-conditioned cars from Victoria, the first division, which normally departs at 7 p.m. was delayed until 11.13 p.m. on this day. There were no other time table alterations affecting the Overland.

WIGS

Mrs. BYRNE: Mr. Speaker, is there anything in Standing Orders to prevent a lady member from wearing a wig in the House? I understand that the House of Commons practice in regard to ladies' headgear is followed in this Chamber, namely, that a lady member may or may not wear a hat, as she chooses. As I am not aware whether this rule would enable a lady member to wear a wig, I should appreciate your advice on this matter.

The SPEAKER: The member for Tea Tree Gully is aware that inquiries have been made into House of Commons practice. Dress, which I interpret broadly to include wigs, is a matter of discretion for each individual member, male or female. In my opinion, the wearing of a wig by any member does not involve any infraction of the rules of the House. I point out, however, that in the case of the member for Tea Tree Gully the wearing of a wig would, in my judgment, be akin to gilding the lily.

TOURIST BUREAU OFFICERS

Mr. LANGLEY: Has the Premier, as Minister in charge of tourism, a reply to my recent question about training staff of the South Australian Government Tourist Bureau to speak foreign languages?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In addition to English, officers of the department can speak French, Italian, Spanish, Arabic, Portuguese, German and Yugoslav. Another officer is learning Japanese. English/Japanese speaking guides are available to the department. Adelaide is also fortunate in having available the organization called Interpreters International Australia. These people are skilled and experienced in providing interpreting and translating services in the fields of science, commerce and industry. They are able to cover the following languages: French, German, Arabic, Bulgarian, Czech, Estonian, Greek, Italian, Latvian, Polish, Russian and Swedish.

Mr. Mathwin: What about Welsh?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I believe we could run to that, and even to Fijian as well.

WAIKERIE COURTHOUSE

Mr. CURREN: Can the Minister of Works say what is the Government's intention regarding the construction of a new courthouse and police station complex at Waikerie? I have discussed this project with the Minister on several occasions, the project having first been mooted some years ago. Unfortunately, the project has been deferred slightly, and I now ask what is the current programme.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It is expected that the proposal to build a new courthouse and police station at Waikerie will be referred to the Public Works Committee in October this year. If that is done, I think it can be expected that the contract documents will be drawn in about March, 1972, tenders called in about September, 1972, and the work completed in about December, 1973.

BREWING KIT

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to examine the possibility that purchasers of a currently popular line of home brew beer and lager kit may become poisoned and, if this danger exists, will he issue public advice in order to avoid this possibility? I understand that, last evening on a television programme, a brewery official said that this was a distinct possibility.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will refer the question to my colleague.

SOUTH ROAD MEDIAN STRIP

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Roads and Transport a reply to the question I asked on September 2 about the South Road median strip?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The median of South Road in Morphett Vale near Jordan Drive is maintained by the District Council of Noarlunga on behalf of the Highways Department. The median is grassed and planted, and the council will soon provide a firm pathway across the median opposite the bus stop in question.

JUVENILE COURT REPORT

The SPEAKER: I have received the following letter, dated September 15, 1971:

Dear Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform you that it is my intention to move this day that this House at its rising this day adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock p.m. for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency: namely, that this House disapproves of the Government's failure to make information available to members upon request, and in particular the refusal yesterday of the Attorney-General to make public the Annual Report of the Juvenile Court for the year ended June 30, 1971.

Yours faithfully,
(Signed) Robin Millhouse,
Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Is the motion seconded?

Several members having risen:

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I move:

That this House at its rising this day adjourn until tomorrow at 1 o'clock,

for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgency, namely, that this House disapproves of the Government's failure to make information available to members upon request, and in particular the refusal yesterday of the Attorney-General to make public the Annual Report of the Juvenile Court for the year ended June 30, 1971. It is a fundamental principle that in a democracy people are entitled to know what is going on in the community, unless there is some reason, such as the interests of national security, why that principle should be overridden. In the instance that has prompted me to move this motion, there is no such reason why people should not know the full facts set out in the Juvenile Court magistrate's report and that magistrate's opinions.

What is the position regarding this matter? Members, if they look at the Notice Paper, or if they remember the business that has been introduced into the House, will know that item No. 8 of Government business is the Juvenile Courts Bill, which is awaiting our debate. We will have to decide on certain proposals that the Government is putting to this House to alter the law on the treatment of juvenile offenders, and to do that, if we are to make reasoned decisions on these matters, we should, amongst other things, know the opinions of the man who for the last 18 months has been most immediately concerned with the treatment and punishment in the Adelaide Juvenile Court of those offenders.

Yet the Attorney-General has refused to make that report public, and I understand he is now persisting in his refusal. Since I raised this matter yesterday when we were going into Committee, I have had inquiries made in the Parliamentary Library, and I find that the library has a copy of every report from the magistrate at the Juvenile Court back to the year 1947, with one exception: the report for 1968 is missing. It may be said by members opposite that the 1968 report was made to me. I checked on this and found that the report of the Juvenile Court magistrate was released by me, and extracts from it can be found on page 1 of the *Advertiser* of August 16 of that year. Likewise, in 1969 (on July 12), a report appeared on page 3. When my successor, the present Attorney-General, released the report last year, it appeared on page 1 on August 7. I have referred to the pages particularly to emphasize the fact that the contents of this report have always been regarded as of a special public interest, and certainly not more so than now when these very matters are to be discussed in this House. Yesterday the Attorney-General said that it was wrong for a judicial officer to descend into the field of controversy. He said:

This is a report by a judicial officer who is a public servant, but my emphasis for the purpose of this debate is rather on the fact that he is a judicial officer. It has been a long-standing tradition, and one that I subscribe to, that a judicial officer does not take part in public controversy on the issues of the day.

I say deliberately that in my opinion that is a weak excuse. It is absolute nonsense, as the actions of the present Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition show. His actions show that some members opposite could not possibly agree with the contentions of the Attorney-General. I referred to this briefly in the debate yesterday, but since then I have had the opportunity of looking at *Hansard* of November 12, 1969, at a time when the House was debating the intermediate courts legislation, which was being opposed by the then Opposition. On that occasion, the then Leader (the present Premier) did not scruple openly to use a report which he, as Leader, had received from the magistrates at the Adelaide Magistrates Court. At page 2963 of *Hansard*, he is reported as saying:

I intend to give to the House the effect of the submission that has been made to me by magistrates, because it shows just the sort of difficulty that I outlined when this measure was debated previously. The submission states:

And he goes on with about four pages of submission that he had received on a matter of public controversy from the magistrates of the Adelaide Magistrates Court.

Mr. Coumbe: Judicial officers.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, as the Attorney-General calls them, and rightly so. I wonder whether the Premier agrees with the weak excuse put up by the Attorney-General, who went on yesterday to say:

In these circumstances I believe that to make the report public would lead inevitably to involving a member of the Judiciary in a current public controversy, and I think that would be entirely wrong, because of the time-honoured judicial tradition of remaining aloof on matters of public controversy.

Well, the honourable gentleman sitting at the other end of the front bench opposite did not believe that in 1969 or, if he did, he ignored it for his own purposes. The Government today cannot have it both ways: it cannot support what was done by the Premier when

he was Leader of the Opposition and also support the attitude now taken by the Attorney-General. We know that the real reason why this report is not to be made public is to save the Government from embarrassment. What is the Government afraid of? We can guess the line that has been taken by Mr. Beerworth in his report, which is to be kept secret, because last year in the report which the Attorney-General did make public (and incidentally at that time Mr. Beerworth had been in that position for only two months, yet there was no let or hindrance to the publication of his report, and rightly so) Mr. Beerworth states:

I am not particularly happy about a number of matters which have been recommended in the report.

He is referring to the Social Welfare Advisory Council's report which I requested as Minister of Social Welfare and on which I understand the present legislation is founded, although it does not follow the report exactly. Mr. Beerworth also said in his 1970 report:

I am opposed to a pre-court clinic in all cases, even for first offenders.

The report goes on to enlarge on the reasons for his opposition. If that is the line he has taken in his present report (and one must presume that it is) I think that probably I would not agree with the points he makes, because, after all, the idea of juvenile aid panels (and that is what he refers to when he mentions clinics) was an idea which I brought back with me from the United States of America in 1969 and of which I approved, but that does not matter.

The fact is that members in this place, when they are discussing these questions, should have every shade of opinion available to them whether it is in favour of or against the policy and proposals of the Government, because only if we have every shade of opinion available to us can we do the job that we should be doing. Is the Government so uncertain of its position and of the legislation it has introduced that it cannot stand up to any criticism from the Juvenile Court magistrate or from anyone else? Is that the reason why this report is to be suppressed? The persistence of the Attorney-General in refusing to make the report public, after the request made to him by the member for Torrens and other members when the House was going into Committee yesterday on the Budget, makes the situation worse. The Attorney-General has hinted at what is in the report, saying that he cannot say what is in it without revealing all of it, but we are left wondering what on earth the Juvenile Court magistrate has said. We know the line that he has probably taken, but how far has he gone? Has he made such telling points in the report as to invalidate the Government's proposals? We are entitled to know this, and the general community is entitled to know it.

I entirely disagree with the excuse the Attorney has given. I have said that it is certainly contrary to the actions of his Leader and his Party only a few months before the Attorney came into this place, when Labor was in Opposition. If one accepts his excuse, he has made the position 10 times worse by his persistence in refusing to make the report available, because it is now left to us to imagine the sort of thing that must be in the report. This is just the latest, and in my view the worst, example of the Government's acting in an authoritarian manner and letting us know what it regards as good for us. This is the hallmark of Socialists. In spite of their protestations of personal freedom and so on, they believe in telling people what is good for them and doing for people what is good for them whether the people want it or not; this is a good example of their actions speaking louder than their words.

I do not intend to enlarge on any other matters expressed in this motion, but I refer to several other occasions on which we have had refusals from Ministers to make available information to us. I think of the occasions when the Minister of Works, in answer to questions by me and others, has arrogantly refused to make available information on matters, saying that he will make these things known in his own good time, and so on. I think of the refusal of the Minister of Roads and Transport on many occasions to make information available to us and to answer questions. I have been reminded of an occasion last month when the Minister of Environment and Conservation took a similar attitude in regard to a reply to a question from the member for Glenelg, who had asked him to make available the final report of the beach and foreshore protection committee. The Minister said:

This report has been made available to the Government, which is considering the recommendations made in the report before introducing legislation. When that consideration has been completed, I will decide whether I can make the report available to honourable members.

Mr. Mathwin: That's a Big Brother job.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As the member for Glenelg has said, it is a Big Brother job. That

is only one other example. In conclusion, I come back to the matter of principle. Ours is a system of Parliamentary democracy that works on the making of decisions in Parliament after a full, frank and free discussion. However, if the discussion in this place is to be full, frank and free, we must have all the information available on any topic. If the Government is not going to be frank and open, if it is going to tell the public and this House what it thinks is good for us to know, if it is going to suppress information as it is doing here, and if it is going to suppress information that could be embarrassing to the Government, Parliament might just as well not meet and we might just as well pack up and go home.

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support the Deputy Leader in his comments. I speak on this as a matter of principle and also to express my disgust at the Government's action in repressing and suppressing several reports. Yesterday, I said that this matter arose because of two questions that I had asked the Attorney-General regarding the report of the Juvenile Court magistrate. In his reply, the Attorney said that he would give me statistics but would not publish the magistrate's comments.

Without canvassing the material that I spoke of yesterday and to put the matter in a nutshell, I remind the House that for at least 20 years Attorneys-General from both Parties in this House have without exception presented to Parliament and to the people of South Australia the report *in toto;* that is, the report of the magistrate and the statistical tables. This year is the first time that this custom has been departed from. We all know that this is a Ministerial report from the magistrate. It is valuable to the people of South Australia, and more particularly to members of this House, who are concerned with various aspects of the subjects that come before the Juvenile Court, as they should be.

This subject is concerning the people more and more each day, because we are all concerned about the welfare of young offenders and the attempts being made either to rehabilitate them or to prevent them from committing offences that will bring them into the court. When I raised this matter yesterday at Question Time and on the motion to go into Committee of Supply, the Attorney advanced what I thought was a very weak defence. Indeed, his only defence was put on the grounds that the Judiciary should not enter into public controversy. That was fair enough. The Deputy Leader has now cited examples where this has occurred, and I repeat that the Attorneys-General of both Parties have always presented these reports.

Yesterday the Attorney-General, in his comments in reply to the debate, admitted freely that the report submitted to him by the Juvenile Court magistrate contained matters dealing with legislation that has yet to be debated by this House. He obviously had to admit that. I have not seen the report, and it is proper that I should not have seen it: only the Attorney or his colleagues should have seen it. However, we can only surmise (and the Attorney's actions during his speech yesterday and since must confirm our fears) that the magistrate's comments could be in conflict with the legislation that is before the House. That would be a very intelligent guess. This seems to me to be the only valid reason why the Government is now taking this radical course of suppressing this report and not making it available to the House.

I do not go along wth the specious argument that the Attorney used, when the only reason that he gave for not releasing the report was that the Judiciary should not enter into public controversy. We are not talking about judges of the Supreme Court or magistrates in other courts. We are talking about the Juvenile Court in South Australia, where the custom and practice for over 20 years has been for this report to be made available freely without let or hindrance. Not only is this report of value to this House and the public, but I should imagine that magistrates and other persons concerned with child welfare and delinquency and juvenile offences in other States or other parts of the world would possibly be on the mailing list. I do not know that, but I imagine that there would be an exchange of views on this type of subject between our court and other institutions vitally interested in this important subject.

I consider that the information should be available freely on this basis. Yesterday I asked whether the report would be available to members before the Juvenile Courts Bill was debated. If it was available, it would give members a valuable opportunity to consider a reasoned opinion by an officer with first-hand experience who is probably better versed than any other officer in the State in one aspect of the Bill. I cannot say whether I would agree with the magistrate's comments, because I have not seen the report, but, even if I did not agree with them, I would defend the principle that the report should be made available to this House and to the people.

I reserve my right to agree or disagree, as the case may be, but members are being denied the opportunity to consider the magistrate's views. This is a form of censorship. Members of the Australian Labor Party are keen to talk about abolition of censorship at every opportunity, yet here we have a first-rate example from the Government front bench of the laying down of censorship in this House, which is a place of privilege that should at least see reports. If I put the matter in milder terms, I would say that the Attorney-General was muzzling the House, the public and the press.

Mr. Mathwin: Do you think he's applying the gag?

Mr. COUMBE: It could be a form of gag. He is denying the Parliament of South Australia the opportunity to see the report, yet we should have all available information readily accessible when we debate the Bill on this subject. Members who are to speak on various Bills go to much trouble to research on subjects coming before this House. In asking a question of the Attorney-General before the show recess, my object was to have information available before the Bill was debated so that we could read what the magistrate had said. The Minister's answer was that we could not have it: we were not allowed to have it because it was a privileged document. I realize that it is a report to the Minister and that he can please himself, but I remind him that he is doing a disservice to members and to the public.

A former Attorney-General, now the Premier, released the magistrate's report: in fact, the present Attorney released this report last year. This is the first time that the report has not been available. The motion covers more than the Juvenile Court magistrate's report, because it deals with other subjects. I remind members that there have been times when other reports of great interest to members (and I believe we are entitled to have them) have been denied to members, although we have asked for them time after time or have asked for the information contained in them. I cite two cases in which I was involved as Minister of Works. The first was the Bennett report on water resources in South Australia, and the second was the Sangster report on water rating in South Australia. Both reports were initiated during the previous Government's term of office, but particularly by me, with Cabinet approval, when I was Minister of Works.

These reports would have been of great value to members and the public. I do not know what is in these reports, although from my experience I could make an intelligent guess about their contents. When I and other members asked the Minister of Works whether these reports would be available to us, he was arrogant and rude and said that we could not have them. The Bennett report on water resources in South Australia resulted from a committee set up with Mr. Bennett, Professor Rudd and Mr. Kinnaird as members, all experts in their fields. The committee was charged with the duty of considering the total future water resources available in this State. This matter was initiated when we were negotiating for the Dartmouth dam, when we were investigating the water supply in the South-East, and when we were concerned about the availability of water in the future for development not only in the metropolitan area but also in country areas.

The committee travelled extensively throughout the State investigating the various aspects of water supply and water requirements and demand for many years ahead. The previous Director and Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. Julian Dridan), who is well respected by members, presented several interim reports on this subject before he retired. Surely the Bennett report would have been of immeasurable interest to the people of this State and to members, as it concerned the future development of this State. Why has this report not been made available? We have asked for it to be made available many times. What is there to hide? It makes one wonder how this Government operates, because when it hides things it gives a rather sinister appearance to all its operations. I remind members that taxpayers have paid for that report.

The other report was the Sangster report on water rating. This committee was set up under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Sangster, as he is now. It was charged with the duty of inquiring into the water rating system in the State and of investigating the possibility of a more equitable method of charging for water. From my knowledge of the bases of water rating and valuations, I know that this could be a difficult problem and that the committee would have to make a thorough investigation. When I was Minister I emphasized the point that the committee should consider alternative methods: whether we should continue with the traditional method of rating or whether we should have a system combining rating valuations and a charge for the use of water, or have any other means. I also insisted that

members of the public should have the chance to give evidence before that committee.

I was aware that the report might or might not be acceptable to the Government and that the recommendations might or might not be implemented. However, this report should have been made available to this House. It was asked for many times. I contrast the present action of the Minister in suppressing the magistrate's report with the action taken concerning the former committee's report on rating in South Australia, commonly called the Ligertwood report, which has been freely available as a Parliamentary Paper and which has been used as a basis for debate many times. I based a private member's motion on that report when dealing with rating on church properties. The question is why these more recent reports have not been released. Before the former Government went out of office, Mr. Mander-Jones (a former Director-General of Education) presented me as Minister of Education with a report on the libraries system in South Australia. He had been commissioned by my predecessor, the member for Davenport, to compile such a report.

I sent the report to each member of this House (although I was not obliged to) and it was circulated throughout council areas and to many people who were interested in this subject. The information was freely available. Now, I have already cited three reports only (and there are others) that have not been presented to Parliament: two reports concerning the Minister of Works and the report from the Juvenile Court magistrate concerning the Attorney-General.

Is it too late for the Attorney-General to change his mind? I make this plea realizing that I may not agree with the magistrate's report, but it is surely for me and for other members of the House to decide. That is why we sit here to sift the information we can glean and to make up our own minds. I make this plea even at this late stage: will the Attorney now release the report? If he does not release it, I am afraid that this will be just another retrograde step the Government is taking, and the stigma already beginning to stick to the Government will become more firmly adhered to it than ever. It is well known that the Government is releasing information when it wants to and not releasing it when it does not want to.

We have seen Government press secretaries and others putting out extensive and expensive screeds of material that boost Government action time and time again. We saw it in the Budget debate, when certain points were highlighted and other points were not even mentioned. Here we have the opposite side where information that should be made available is being suppressed from the House. What the Attorney-General is doing is brushing this matter under the carpet, and that is not good enough.

I speak now on a matter of principle: members of this House should be given all information to which they are entitled so that they can prepare themselves for debate on a Bill now before the House. In addition, the long-established custom of the report of the Juvenile Court magistrate (who, I suggest and submit to the Attorney-General, is in a completely different position from the rest of the Judiciary) should be made public. This officer has been permitted to submit his report to the Minister, who has freely made the report available to all comers year after year until 1971, so that we have D day now, when no further reports are to be issued. It makes me wonder, when the court is reconstituted, as provided for by the enabling Bill, what will happen: will we get reports in the future? I do not know. How else will we find out what is going on in the Juvenile Court? What access has a private member? What means does he have of knowing what is going on in the Juvenile Court unless he goes down and sits in the court or reads the press reports that deal only with a fraction of the cases that come before it? The Attorney-General receives this information, but what information is given to members? We have on our desks (and by the end of the session it will be a very tall volume) the reports of statutory and other bodies in South Australia that are obliged by Statute or command to report to the House. Some of these reports are very valuable.

What is more important than the future welfare of the young people of South Australia? Surely we are entitled to have a report on this, together with comments. The Social Welfare Committee, other welfare committees in the State (and I am associated with some of them, as no doubt are most members) and every parent in the State should be interested in this subject. We have heard pungent comments at times from the present Juvenile Court magistrate on young offenders. The press is the only way by which I can find out what is going on in the court. How else can I find out? There is no other way. We have always relied on the Juvenile Court magistrate's report,

but the Government is now denying us even this very last and least step of obtaining this information. I say to the Government that once again it is imposing censorship, muzzling the House and denying information that members should have. I suggest that the Government stands condemned for its action in withholding information not only on this report but on other reports, and I have pleasure in seconding the motion.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Clark: Here's another of them.

Dr. TONKIN: If the member for Elizabeth takes such a light-hearted view of what I believe to be a most serious matter, he shows far less responsibility than I gave him credit for. I believe that the Attorney-General's refusal to release the report of the Juvenile Court magistrate is a violation of a fundamental principle and a misguided action. Perhaps I can understand his motives, because there is legislation before the House and I believe that the Attorney-General thinks that the release of the report might prejudice the acceptance of the legislation. We have ample evidence to suppose that the latest report is much the same as the last report. It is no secret that Mr. Beerworth in his 1970 report disagreed with aspects of the Social Welfare Advisory Council's report, on which most aspects of the pending legislation are based. I believe that Mr. Beerworth complained that neither he nor his predecessor (Mr. McLean Wright) had been consulted by the council; but we did (and I speak as a member of the council at the time) receive reports from the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate that included the Juvenile Court magistrate's comments and opinions.

It is natural that the Juvenile Court magistrate should be uncertain and that he should like things to remain as they are, but his own report for last year indicates the need for change. The report states:

> It is very disturbing for the Juvenile Court magistrate to find so many girls and boys, who have been committed to institutions on a number of occasions, repeatedly coming before the court on the same type of offence which caused the original order of committal.

The magistrate has put his own interpretation and explanation on it, and he is entitled to do that. However, I would put a different construction on it, and so might other members. The general principle is the thing at stake. Magistrates' reports in the past have concerned themselves with the number of offences committed, the number of offenders, and the areas where most offences have been committed. There has been a tendency to release the names of schools, to say where young people come from, and to say they are at risk because they attend a certain school. I do not agree with this, and I do not think any member would agree with it.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think that that sort of statement would have been better not released?

Dr. TONKIN: I maintain that, if it is an honest opinion that the magistrate holds, he should be allowed to express his opinion and to have it subjected to debate and discussion. It might help him; it certainly would help the community. I do not agree with many of the aspects that have been raised in the reports of previous magistrates, and that is no secret. However, I want the legislation involving those aspects that I believe will help young offenders passed through this House, and I want it passed not under a cloud but because all members believe that it is a good thing. I want that legislation passed because members of the community think it is a good thing.

When we learnt in this House yesterday that the report would not be released, the reaction of some members was obvious; it was a reaction of suspicion, and that is the last thing we want. We want all these things brought into the open, and I think it is doing a great disservice to the people that we do not have these opinions, whether or not we agree with them. These opinions should be expressed, discussed and debated, and the present situation is doing a great disservice to the magistrate, the officers of the Juvenile Court and the community at large. This Government, as the member for Torrens has pointed out, is developing a reputation for not releasing things that it does not think are good for the people, and this is the worst and most pernicious form of censorship. It represents a Big Brother attitude. I need only refer, I think, to the hospital communications inquiry report.

In that case, we are told that we must not hear the evidence, because that might incriminate some people. I can see that that point of view must be considered, but to have sweeping recommendations made without any explanation about why they have been made and to say that the Government will implement them without giving anyone a chance to debate, discuss or suggest improvements brings me back to my old theme: that this Government thinks it is perfect. That is a juvenile attitude, inasmuch as the Government thinks it is never wrong. Be

that as it may, the prime consideration of the Juvenile Court is the welfare of the child. That is why a juvenile court is different from any other court; it is the child that matters, not the offence. A juvenile court has as its first consideration the welfare of the child, but it also has another function, namely, a responsibility to protect the public. I believe that the welfare of a child takes precedence, but the responsibility to protect the public must not be lost sight of. I believe that all I have seen overseas in juvenile courts in many centres, all I have read and all the evidence I have heard as a member of the council supports the need for revision. But if the measure is accepted (as I believe it should be, because it is a good thing; it is good for our young people) it has to be ventilated, and every point of view must be heard and debated and, if necessary, rebutted and countered.

I do not want to see this legislation apparently foisted on the people of South Australia. I repeat the plea that the member for Torrens has made: it is not too late to release this report. Some considerations may make it difficult for the Attorney-General to release this report; I do not know. However, I do not believe that any of these considerations are as important as is the welfare of our young people. I believe that this legislation is good, and I do not think that the magistrate's report could hamper its passage. The Government has the numbers, even if it were to have no support for the measure from this side. I believe these are thoroughly worthwhile objectives, but let us get every point of view; let us bring out all the fears and worries; and let us reassure the populace. I do not know what the magistrate's report reveals. We have all been assuming that it contains things that are against the proposals in the legislation. Perhaps it goes the other way; does it perhaps contain a recommendation that corporal punishment should be reintroduced? The Attorney-General may well smile, but I think members of this House and the public are entitled to know.

I repeat that it is not too late to release this report. In my opinion, it will not in any way impede the passage of the legislation through Parliament. There is nothing to be afraid of. A fundamental principle is being violated here, perhaps with the best intentions (perhaps with inexperienced intentions; I do not know). However, as I say, a fundamental principle is being violated, and I believe that if this report is not tabled and released the public of South Australia will regard the proposed legislation for the reform of the treatment of juvenile offenders with much suspicion, instead of accepting it with the whole-hearted agreement that might otherwise exist. I support the motion.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): There has been much posturing in the course of this debate by members of the Opposition. All of them know that Governments and Ministers frequently obtain reports that form the basis of Government decisions, and often the basis of legislation that is ultimately introduced into the House. In all of those cases, Governments or the appropriate Ministers are called on to decide whether it is appropriate to release the report in question. Sometimes the report is released; sometimes it is not. That has been the situation with Governments of all political complexions as long as there have been Parliaments and Ministries responsible to those Parliaments. It is absurd to suggest that some practice has been adopted by the present Government by refusing to disclose information in reports that were disclosed by other Governments. I do not intend to go through the individual reports referred to by the member for Torrens and others. It is sufficient to say that in every case the report was obtained as a basis for a Government decision or for legislation to be prepared, and in each case the Government or the Minister must decide whether the report is to be released. There is nothing new or novel about that.

Turning to the report that has occasioned this motion, namely, the annual report of the Juvenile Court magistrate, I think the position is pretty clear. It is a long-standing tradition of the Judiciary in English-speaking countries that it does not involve itself in controversies with the Executive Government over the issues that are before the public at any time. I know that there have been occasions (one could cite a few) over the years in this country where judges or others holding judicial positions have departed from that tradition, but the occasions have been few. The principle is an important one, because if the Judiciary becomes involved in controversy, especially controversy involving the Executive Government, a situation quickly arises in which persons holding judicial offices are found to be partisans in the issues that divide the community. That being the case, the respect that is felt for the Judiciary by all sections of the community, whatever their views or philosophies, and no matter how sharply they differ,

and the confidence that the Judiciary is detached from the passions of controversy would quickly be lost.

This would be a disaster in a free community, because it is of the utmost importance, no matter how we differ from one another and no matter how strongly we feel about issues or how much we may privately disagree with the opinions of judges, that we feel confident that the Judiciary will not become involved in controversy and that the detachment of the judicial mind will not be clouded by becoming involved with the passions of political and other public controversy. This is a fundamental principle, and I think it is one which we should try to preserve.

The situation here is that the Juvenile Court magistrate has furnished a report to the Attorney-General, a report, as I have said, consisting in part of statistics and in part of comment. As I have pointed out, the comment is on matters of Government policy involving the Juvenile Court and involving the subject matter of the Bill which is currently before the House and which will shortly be a matter of debate and doubtless a matter of controversy, as the member for Bragg has said.

Therefore, this is a report to the Attorney-General. In it the Juvenile Court magistrate has made the observations which seem proper to him. They are controversial observations, and are therefore observations which it would not be proper for him, holding the judicial office that he holds, to make publicly. The making of these observations publicly would inevitably involve him, and therefore a part of the Judiciary, in a public controversy and, if that is wrong, it is equally as wrong (indeed, more wrong) for the Minister to make himself an instrument for making public comments and statements which it would not be proper for the magistrate himself to make, because then the Minister would be dragging the Judiciary into the heat and dust of public controversy, and that I am not prepared to do.

Mr. Coumbe: Isn't this a special case?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No, it is not a special case with regard to that principle. It is a special case in the way I will now outline. The member for Light has interjected, saying that reports of Juvenile Court magistrates have been released in the past, and indeed they have been. The last one was released by me, as Minister on that occasion. In ordinary circumstances, I see nothing wrong with the release of reports of Juvenile Court magistrates. Like every other report which comes to a Minister, this calls for a decision or judgment by the Minister whether in the existing circumstances the public interest is served by the release of the report. The present circumstances are that there is before the House a Bill which is currently the subject matter of controversy and which will shortly be a subject matter of debate in this and another place. In these circumstances, the release of a report containing comment on the matter of Government policy and the subject matter of the Bill would inevitably have the effect of dragging the Judiciary into the heat and dust of public controversy. In that sense it is a special case, but only in that sense.

I do not agree with the suggestion of the member for Torrens that in some way Juvenile Court magistrates stand in a different position from other members of the Judiciary with regard to public controversy. I think that it is as important (perhaps more important) for the judicial officer exercising judicial functions in the Juvenile Court to remain detached from public controversy and from the sort of passions that frequently arise when questions of juvenile behaviour arise. I do not believe any judge or magistrate can properly discharge his duty in that court, any more than can be done in any other court, if he finds himself personally involved in public controversy over the matters which fall within his jurisdiction. I believe that I would be doing a grave disservice to the performance of the judicial function in this State if I released a report which would or might have the effect of involving the Judiciary in controversy of that sort. It has been suggested that the reason for refusing to release the report is that the Government wishes to avoid some sort of embarrassment. That is an odd suggestion, coming as it does from members who say that they know the line which the magistrate has taken in this report. They say that they know this from previous comments that he made in an earlier report.

Dr. Tonkin: They are guesses.

The Hon. L. J. KING: That is what the honourable member says, and the member for Torrens said that he put it as an intelligent guess, but he seemed to think that he was guessing with some confidence. If members opposite know the attitude of the Juvenile Court magistrate on the topics dealt with in the report, and therefore if other people know the attitude of the magistrate, how can it be said that the release of the report would be an embarrassment to the Government? The release of the report would not be an embarrassment to the Government, but it would be an

embarrassment to the administration of justice in this State, because it would have the effect of releasing—

Mr. Coumbe: You are now reflecting on the Judiciary.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Of course I am not.

Mr. Millhouse: You're reflecting on the magistrate.

The Hon. L. J. KING: This afternoon the Opposition is pursuing a determined effort to get the Judiciary involved in controversy. Members opposite are doing this deliberately. If there was any doubt about that, it was removed by the concerted interjections just made as an attempt to impute to me some reflection on the magistrate because I said that to release this report would have the effect of dragging the Judiciary into a controversy. Why does that reflect on anyone—the magistrate or anyone else? Members opposite who made that interjection made it only because they were determined, for reasons which only they would know, to attempt to drag the Judiciary into matters of controversy.

Reference has been made to an earlier episode on another occasion and in another debate when opinions expressed by magistrates were referred to in this House. The relevance of that escaped me when it was first referred to by the member for Mitcham, and it still escapes me. The issue that we are discussing this afternoon is the propriety of a Minister's releasing to the public a report made to the Minister. On the occasion to which the member for Mitcham has referred (and I rely on his account of the incident, as I have not checked it)—

Mr. Millhouse: Check it in *Hansard*.

The Hon. L. J. KING: —there was no report to a Minister; no Minister was ever charged with the responsibility of making the decision made on that occasion, and the circumstances were about as different from the present circumstances as it would be possible to imagine.

Mr. Millhouse: There was a report to the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I think that the situation here is tolerably clear. We have a report to a Minister. A Minister has to form a judgment whether it would be in the public interest to release that report. That is not an unusual circumstance: it is a very common thing. True, in the past, circumstances have not arisen in the case of the Juvenile Court magistrate's report which have led any Minister to decline to publish the report, or so it appears from what the member for Mitcham says (I have no knowledge of any occasion on which the report has not been published, but I would not know about that). What is important about the present occasion is that we have a Bill before the House which is likely to become a matter of controversy. I believe that it is important that the Judiciary should not be involved in public debate on controversial matters at this time. This is the practice that is observed by the judges themselves. If they have comments to make on matters which are currently before the public, they communicate those comments to the appropriate Minister. They do not expect to become involved in public controversy themselves; they do not engage (and never will) in public comment on political or controversial issues. I believe that that is the correct attitude. If it is the correct attitude, I believe that it would be entirely wrong for the Minister, having received a report of this kind, to make himself the instrument of publicizing and making public something that it would be wrong for the judicial officer himself to make public. I think the principle is perfectly clear.

The member for Torrens has suggested to me that I should change my decision and make the report public. I think it would be wrong to do that, for the reasons that I have given. I think that the grounds on which the original decision was made by me, as Minister, and approved by Cabinet were correct, and I believe that they are as valid now as they were when the decision was first made. I adhere to that view and see no reason to change the decision.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN (Alexandra): I think this debate is a disgraceful episode in the life of this Government and I am surprised that the Attorney-General has so far departed from the ideals that he seemed to have when he came into this House as to now want to suppress a report that evidently contains some criticism of Government policy. This situation is ridiculous. The Attorney-General has not been in political life for long and he is normally able to speak with the ideals that he has acquired during his experience at the bar. However, today he spoke in the political terms as we know them at their very worst. It is common for Governments sometimes to identify the welfare and the interests of the nation or State with their own political welfare, and it is obvious now that that has happened here. Neither I nor any other member on this side

knows what is in the report that we are not allowed to see. I did get the impression that the Attorney-General suggested at one stage that members on this side knew what was in it. However, we only know what he told us yesterday, namely, that it contained some discussion of policy, and this is evidently critical.

The Attorney-General also asked how, if members did not know what was in the report, it could be said that it would help to bring the report to the House as a public document. I think I have quoted correctly the effect of what the Attorney-General said. There is on the Notice Paper a Bill dealing with the very subject of this report and, as members know, anyone who wants to study a Bill dealing with a certain subject immediately looks in the Parliamentary Library for annual reports on that subject. If we are dealing with the Juvenile Court, we look up the annual report of the magistrate, which, as has been pointed out, has been submitted continuously since about 1947. However, now we have a Bill before the House and the latest information on the subject is not available, for the sole reason that the Government does not like what is in that latest information. How thin and childish can this argument become? The Government cannot expect to have a dark room in Victoria Square in which it stacks up all the reports it does not like.

Mr. Hall: It has, though.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes, it has a stack of reports. The committee appointed by the previous Government to inquire into water rating systems reported, I think late last year, and that report has not been released, although the information in the report has been used by the Minister of Works, both in his planning and in matters of controversy. I have a letter from the Minister dated September 7 in reply to a letter that I wrote him regarding the water supply project for American River. In my letter I also asked him, in passing, about another matter, because some people were interested in the controversy between the Government and the landholders in the Upper South-East through whose properties the main would pass. There had been court action and, when these people asked me for information, I wrote to the Minister, who replied:

With regard to the further question posed in your letter of August 3, 1971, regarding the position of landholders who objected to paying rates in the Coonalpyn-Tintinara area, I wish to advise that the present position is that the two Supreme Court writs taken out against the Minister of Works have not been withdrawn. It is understood that the parties are not proceeding with court action, pending the outcome of the report of the Sangster committee on water rating systems.

Incidentally, I remind members that that report has been available to the Government for about eight months. In his letter the Minister also stated:

The report is at present being evaluated by the Engineering and Water Supply Department and, following completion of this evaluation, the Government will decide whether any change to the present rating system will be made.

Again, I do not know what is in the report and cannot say whether I approve of the recommendations, but no-one in this House, other than the Government, has had access to the report. On August 17, I asked the Minister of Works about this report, and he said that it was being evaluated. I interjected and asked what was the secret about it. You, Mr. Speaker, called me to order, stating that there could be only one question at a time. The Minister said that the report was being evaluated, and the *Hansard* report continues:

When that evaluation has been completed, recommendations will be made to the Government on the report, and when the Government has considered those recommendations, and only then, will I decide whether the report will be released.

Mr. Millhouse: But why?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Because the department is at present making an evaluation and the report is for my use and the Government's use, not for the use of anyone else.

Mr. Millhouse: There you are, the arrogance!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Has there ever been a weaker reply to a question? There was really not a reply: the Minister simply said, "I will not," and kept on saying that. Just before the last Government left office, the report of the committee of inquiry on transport to Kangaroo Island was presented to it. That was a day or two before the election. Naturally, the Government could not evaluate the report and make a decision then, and it did not consider that it should do so. The report became the property of the incoming Government in about June last year, 15 months ago. That report has not been released. I asked the Minister of Roads and Transport about the release of that report and said I understood that there were difficulties. I asked that question in July last year, 14 months ago, when I said:

I well understand the Minister's position, and I do not dispute that there may be good reasons why he may not wish to release the report at present. However, on the other hand, I

suggest that the report be made available as soon as possible.

The Minister said, amongst other things:

I am somewhat at a loss to understand the clamour for the release of the report.

That was 14 months ago and the report has not yet been released: it is in the dark room in Victoria Square where Mr. Beerworth's report will go, too, if it is not already there. I have the feeling that the Government considers that anything that is likely to embarrass it should be suppressed in the interests of the public. If the Government really thinks that I should be surprised. I believe that it thinks that, because it will embarrass the Government, it should be suppressed whether or not there is a good reason for doing that. Why do the Labor back-benchers not do something about this? They are members of Parliament, but as back-benchers I think they are a phoney back bench. They are doing nothing about it and they are not standing up for their rights. They lie down. The Government tells them to do something and they do it. Do you know, Mr. Deputy Speaker, that the Government finds it expedient to cut into private members' time on Wednesdays by giving replies to questions?

Mr. Payne: Oh, no!

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Yes. The Government finds it expedient to cut into private members' time—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will have to confine his remarks to the motion.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: The motion to which I am speaking is hampered by the lack of action of Labor back-benchers who, on private members' day, ask twice as many questions as do Opposition members, although on other days Opposition members ask four or five times as many questions as are asked by Labor back-benchers.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Then you're eating into Government time on other days.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: At the behest of the Government, Labor back-benchers are filling up private members' time, which they as private members should cherish.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have warned the honourable member that he must confine his remarks to the motion being considered.

The Hon. D. N. BROOKMAN: Mr. Deputy Speaker, I think it is time that Labor back-benchers stood up and demanded that this report be released, and that the Attorney-General stopped playing a silly kind of politics and became a politician in the proper sense of the word. It is time that he got out of the habit (a habit that he has just developed) of saying that a report that criticizes his Government must be suppressed. It is in the interests of the people that members on both sides should understand what is in that report. It may or may not be relevant to the Bill that is on the Notice Paper, but it is obviously likely to be relevant, so that it is ridiculous to say that members should not be allowed to see it. I support the motion.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I suggest to Opposition members that the attack that has been made on the Attorney-General this afternoon should be directed against the Government, because the Attorney-General has the entire support of the Government in his action. It is a proper action, and the emotional speeches and posturing from the Opposition is another form of a Bombay blue duck.

Mr. Mathwin: Is that a line from *Oh! Calcutta!?*

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No, it is a quote from the member for Alexandra.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Well, you've got it wrong.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is not surprising, but no doubt the honourable member will correct me and give me the classical reference, which was the basis for his original remark.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: I will try to get it in the next debate.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: What members opposite have suggested is that any report that is obtained by the Government—a departmental report, or a report of any committee set up to advise the Minister within a department—

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: No.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Oh, yes, that is what Opposition members are speaking about: any situation in which a report is made to a Minister calls for the report to be released publicly.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: No, we didn't say that at all.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has not been in the House all the time during this debate, and I suggest that he go back to the things that his colleagues have seen fit to say. That is what has been said here this afternoon: that where reports are obtained (not made to Parliament and not made by an independent inquiry, but reports made to Ministers) they must necessarily be

made public. That has never happened under any Government, and it has not happened under this Government. Reports are obtained and made to the Government, and they are released and made public. Indeed, several times during the course of this Government's term of office that has happened, but it is the duty of a Minister, when a report is made to him, to decide whether it is proper that he should publish the material in that report, and that is a Ministerial duty he must exercise. It is a Ministerial duty that is required of the Attorney-General concerning the Juvenile Court magistrate's report. It has not been the case in the past that every Attorney-General has been merely a pipeline to the public for a report made by the Juvenile Court magistrate. I certainly was not when I was Attorney-General. I assure you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, there was a time when a report came in from the Juvenile Court magistrate and, after consulting his senior, I asked the magistrate to reconsider the contents of the report, because I would not be willing to publish it if it came to me in that form.

Mr. Millhouse: You had it altered, did you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I suggested that he had gone beyond the bounds of what he should have said, and that he must re-examine it.

Mr. Millhouse: It goes back to the mid-1960's?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I was exercising my Ministerial responsibility, and the matter was drawn to my attention by a senior magistrate in that department.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Are you saying the same suggestion has been made now?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have no idea. In that matter there was only a small part of the report to which objection could have been taken, but it was something that went beyond what the Juvenile Court magistrate was required to do in his report. It was a signal criticism of other senior public servants.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: Now that you have got that far, wouldn't it be wiser if you let us have the report and we would know instead of knowing only half of it?

Mr. Hall: We might get an awkward report.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member knows that he is not making a sensible suggestion, and we will not do this.

Mr. Mathwin: Let's see it when you've altered it.

Mr. Millhouse: I have never heard anything like this.

Dr. Tonkin: This is astounding.

Mr. Millhouse: Well, go on.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Goldsworthy: A pause for reflection!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Coumbe: I think the Premier has finished: he is not continuing with the debate.

The Hon. D. N. Brookman: He is playing out time.

Dr. Tonkin: He is thinking.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Why not take his photograph!

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Coumbe: It will be a still.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The position is that the Government will not take the attitude that, where it is a Minister's responsibility to examine a report, he will simply be a pipeline to the public for that report. If there is a statutory requirement that the report be made to Parliament or to the public, that will take place. I was in this House, as were many Opposition members, when the Juvenile Courts Act was re-enacted, and I was the Minister responsible for introducing the legislation. No member of this House suggested that the report of the Juvenile Court magistrate should be tabled in Parliament.

Mr. Coumbe: Because it has always been made public.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It has been the custom to make it public where it contained only the kind of material which was—

Mr. Millhouse: Acceptable to the Minister!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No—which was supposed to be in the report.

Mr. Hall: According to the Minister's judgment.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes; or, if not in accordance with the Minister's judgment, the report to the Minister would not be acceptable to him and he would not make it public, because the report is to the Minister: it is not a report to members opposite. This Government will not proceed to get rid of its Ministerial responsibility regarding the material that comes forward to it in accordance with Statute. Ministerial responsibility is required to be exercised and, if the report does not accord with the provisions of the proper exercise of that Ministerial responsibility, the

Government will not publish it. That is the Government's policy, and the Government stands by it. If members believe that reports should be made to them and not to the Government, they have a duty to see that that is provided by the legislation. If the report is to be made to the Minister and not to Parliament, what is it for? It is so that the Minister may exercise his responsibility in relation to it.

Dr. Tonkin: Big Brother!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is being his usual stupid self. If the Minister has no responsibility at all, then what is the purpose of making the report to him? If he has a responsibility he must exercise it. How does he exercise a Ministerial responsibility—by being Big Brother! The honourable member has obviously not read George Orwell; he does not know what it is about. The Minister has acted with entire propriety and has the complete support of the Government. Members opposite are obviously only embarking on a political exercise because not one of them is prepared to say that he would agree with a criticism of the present legislation or of the published statements of the Juvenile Court magistrate last year. What members opposite are saying is, "We want you to publish a report that will drag the magistrate into the sphere of public controversy." That is exactly what they are saying, but we decline to do that.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: They are only stirring!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. They have had a difficult time with another matter that is taking the time of the House, and they are trying to stir on this. There was one other matter the honourable member saw fit to mention, namely, my raising in this House in another debate a complaint that had been made to me by magistrates in the Adelaide Magistrates Court concerning legislation which had been brought before the House and which affected their status, position and activity in the Public Service.

Mr. Millhouse: Doesn't the legislation affect this magistrate's status and position within the Public Service?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not necessarily.

Mr. Millhouse: Doesn't it provide for the appointment of a judge?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, but that will be a matter for later decision.

Mr. Millhouse: It doesn't necessarily affect him?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitcham has spoken in this debate.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That will have to be determined at a later stage of the proceedings.

At 4 o'clock the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

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

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable the Deputy Leader of the Opposition to reply to this debate.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Not on your life!

Mr. HALL: I so move. The Premier may have finished his speech, but we should hear the Deputy Leader reply.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: I have finished.

The House divided on Mr. Hall's motion:

Ayes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Becker, Brookman, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall (teller), Mathwin, Millhouse, Rodda, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (26)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 9 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

SPECIAL EDUCATION

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Goldsworthy:

(For wording of motion, see page 889.)

(Continued from September 1. Page 1288.)

Mr. KENEALLY (Stuart): I oppose the motion, not because I believe that there is much argument against the suggestion made by the member for Kavel to appoint a committee but because, as the Minister has pointed out, certain factors militate against the effective performance of such a committee. However, the member for Kavel is to be commended for showing a real interest in the welfare and education of children who have special handicaps, and I ask him on this occasion to accept the fact that the Minister is equally concerned and will always act in the best interests of these children, so far as it is within the department's financial capacity to do so. The Minister appreciates the situation regarding the education of retarded children, and this was amply demonstrated by his contribution to the debate. However, his reasoned and sensible remarks did not deserve the sarcastic comment of the member for Bragg, who said:

Although the Minister has demonstrated a tremendous (almost impressive) grasp of the subject, I think he would be the last to say that he knew everything about all the problems and all the voluntary organizations in the field. I am sure that the Minister does not come into the arrogant category of the person who says that he knows it all and who refuses advice when it is offered by experts.

One can be suspicious of advice given by experts because, as the member for Peake has pointed out to me previously, the definition of an expert is as follows: "ex" ("X") is an unknown quantity and "spert" ("spurt") is a drip under pressure. By what standard does the member for Bragg set himself up as being qualified to make such a statement? Does it surprise him that the Minister has an impressive grasp of the subject? If it does, I point out that he would be the only member in the House who would be surprised to know that the Minister has such a sound knowledge and competence in any area of his Ministerial responsibility. I think that that comment by the member for Bragg was unworthy. I abhor the situation in which there is a necessity within an advanced society, as we supposedly have in Australia, to require voluntary groups to step into the breach and provide essential services in regard to not only educating mentally retarded children but also helping the aged, destitute and physically sick.

In my opinion, the responsibility for ensuring that rehabilitation and welfare service is available to all those in need lies fairly and squarely with Governments. However, it is unreasonable to expect that the State Governments, with their limited resources, can provide all the services required by the less fortunate in our society, when many of these services are required as a direct result of Commonwealth Government policy. I agree with the member for Kavel that it is necessary for the State Government to place its priorities in the correct order, but why does he not join the Government of this State in its appeals to the Commonwealth Government to do likewise? The State Government is anxious to do many things for the needy, not the least of these things being to provide free and adequate education for the physically and mentally retarded, but it cannot do so, because of the niggardly attitude of the Commonwealth Government (not only to this State but to other States as well).

Does he not agree that, in this lucky country of great mineral wealth, with a tremendous capacity for providing for its people a living standard envied by all, it is disgraceful that we should need to debate such an issue? I repeat that priorities must be put in their right order in Australia. I am not suggesting that community voluntary welfare groups should be disbanded. As members know, the best results are often achieved through voluntary help. For instance, in the case of the Meals on Wheels organization, for which the finance should be provided by the Government, the actual delivery of meals can be adequately handled by members of the community. But it is no longer good enough to let voluntary organizations do what rightly the Governments should do. By all means, let the voluntary groups continue with their work, not as the basic group but as people with special interests who can do something extra for the organizations they support.

Governments are not elected solely to represent the physically well, mentally alert, and competent people who are well able to cope; they are also elected (and this is more important) to represent people who cannot look after themselves. I do not think any member would argue about that. We accept that Governments have a tremendous responsibility to look after those who cannot look after themselves.

The intention of the motion was to create a committee representative of voluntary organizations that could advise the Minister of Education on aspects of special education. However, it can be seen from the speech of the member for Bragg that he expects that the committee will be one through which the Minister can advise the voluntary organizations. I submit that that proposal completely negates the original intent of the motion. This clearly identifies one problem that could arise if such a committee were appointed, because there could be an attempt to use it for other than its original purpose. I believe that if a committee is created to advise the Minister of Education on policy it must be able to provide professional advice. Within his own department, the Minister already has available to him professional advice. In this connection, a problem arises. As I understand it, there is a dearth of such qualified departmental officers. Should they be expected to spend much time doing committee work, their expert knowledge would not be available at such times to deal with children with special problems. As members who have already spoken have said, organizations such as Speld are operating most successfully. I appreciate that Speld has been operating only since early August.

Mr. Mathwin: In South Australia.

Mr. KENEALLY: Yes. The distinction which must be made here is that the committee as contemplated by the member for Kavel would advise the Minister on policy, whereas Speld does not do this but is a group effort by the department and the voluntary organization to ascertain what are the best methods of educating children with special learning difficulties. Thus there is that distinction between what Speld is doing and what the committee is expected to do. In speaking to the motion, the Minister of Education said that there was a proliferation of voluntary organizations working in the field of special education. As I understand it, as medical research progresses new types of mental retardation are always being found. Each time a type of retardation is isolated, a committee is formed to represent that type of person. This immediately creates a problem in trying to appoint a committee that will represent all of these organizations. As these organizations proliferate, each one will expect to be represented on the committee that advises the Minister. As I think that eventually the committee would be unwieldy, I believe the Minister's point is valid.

Another good reason given by the Minister for not supporting the motion is simply that such a committee cannot be guaranteed to give sound professional advice to the Minister. We must remember that the advice is to be on policy matters. The point has been made (and the member for Bragg supported this) that the people who are mainly represented on these organizations are parents who have children with special problems. Although they are motivated to work in the best interests of the children who suffer these handicaps, that does not always mean that they will give the best advice. It is reasonable to assume that people who have children suffering from these handicaps will probably have an emotional interest in the matter. I believe that the sort of advice needed can best be provided by professionals, and they are available within the department, although certainly not in the numbers that we would like to see. However, action has been taken by the Minister and the department to try to improve the position. I believe such action meets with the approval of members generally.

The Commonwealth Handicapped Children (Assistance) Act is most discriminatory. I suggest to the member for Kavel, who wants the State Government to provide assistance for children who have such pressing problems, that he use his influence with his Commonwealth colleagues to do something about this Act. Previous speakers have already canvassed this subject. The Act discourages the participation of State Governments in this type of education and, in supporting voluntary organizations to the detriment of State Governments, it may well be acting against the best interests of the children. I do not wish to criticize the member for Kavel, who has shown a real interest in the matter. I do not know whether he takes much notice of what I say, but I ask him to suggest to his Commonwealth colleagues that the Commonwealth Government do something in this field. In his speech on this motion, I detected for the first time since he has been in the House a slight criticism of his Commonwealth colleagues.

Mr. Goldsworthy: No; read what I said again.

Mr. KENEALLY: This criticism surprised me; it may mean that in other debates the honourable member has been speaking from a purely Party-political point of view. However, I agree with the Minister of Education that this subject is so important that Party politics should not intrude. The honourable member raised another point on which he is more competent than I to speak. I was interested to hear what he, the member for Bragg and the Minister had to say about the advantages that would accrue to these children if they were educated in the normal school environment. As one who has had a little to do with this matter, I believe that the points made are valid. I suggest that this debate has brought these matters to the attention of members like me; we can well learn from people who are expert (and this even takes into account the definition of "expert" given earlier) in these fields.

The member for Bragg rightly told the House about the various causes of mental retardation. In this field he displayed what one could almost call an impressive knowledge (to use his term) of the subject. Here again, the competence of the honourable member is not in question. His speech can well be read and absorbed by other members. I have read it, and I appreciate what he said.

As I have said, there is only a fine distinction between accepting the motion and not accepting it. I am willing to go along with the Minister because of my belief in his sincere regard for education in South Australia, including education of these children. The Minister is always motivated by the best interests of these children. If members opposite

consider that the Government is not doing what it has said it will do in this field, they can move a similar motion in the House later and, if they moved a motion on that basis, it would be well founded. I am not saying that the motion is not well founded now, and I do not want to be misunderstood on that. There is a need for work in this field. However, I support the Minister, because I believe that he, as much as anyone else in this House, is concerned with the education of these children, and I oppose the motion.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion and congratulate the member for Kavel on moving it. This matter is important to those concerned with it in this State. The Minister of Education certainly disappointed me by rejecting the motion. When he spoke in the House, he said:

Although I do not want to reflect in any way on the intention of the member for Kavel in moving this motion, as I am confident his aim was entirely worthy and worth while, I believe I must oppose the motion for several reasons. First, as the number of these voluntary organizations is getting large indeed, the question of getting a workable committee from representatives of them is likely to become more and more difficult.

That is a poor excuse from someone who ought to know much better. Later the Minister referred to 10 points in giving his reasons for not supporting the motion and in explaining the ways in which the Government was dealing with matters of this type. To me, these points did not ring true as an excuse for not helping in the matter. Finally, the Minister said:

I repeat that, while it may be appropriate at some future date to establish the kind of committee that the honourable member is seeking to establish, it is clear that at present we are not properly placed to provide an overall advisory committee to cover all the areas of special handicap.

One would think from this reply that the member for Kavel was anticipating the expenditure of a large sum or perhaps the formation of a board. However, he was not doing that. This would be a voluntary committee comprising people who would discuss the problems and, if possible, give a priority to the wide and varied aspects dealing with handicapped children. The Karmel committee was convinced without doubt of the urgent need to educate these handicapped children. It is most difficult to establish a proper system of priorities, as I think members on both sides would agree, and most people agree that, especially in the matter of handicapped children, the problem is great.

The Karmel report states, in chapter 13, that between 10 per cent and 15 per cent of schoolchildren have some sort of handicap, whether physical or mental. Many schools need remedial teachers, and I understand that a further 18 teachers are being trained in this field this year. Nevertheless, there is still a big shortage and I think that this shortage will continue for many years. With the medical field expanding as it is, more and more children will be kept alive and will therefore need the services of teachers, schools and organizations. Many schools have these teachers. At the Morphettville Park school, in my district, there was such a teacher last year, but this year, unfortunately, the teacher has been placed elsewhere and the children needing these services are still at the school. This is a serious problem for this school and is causing strain, stress and worry to the teachers, parents and children concerned.

The Government is not responsible by law to look after these children. I think it ought to be, and I would support any move to make it so responsible. I consider that it would be in the best interests of all concerned to integrate these children into the normal school life. The Karmel report also stresses this, and it is morally wrong to compel the parents of a normal child to see that that child attends school, while the parents of the handicapped child, because of the cost involved, have the responsibility of educating the child. When a parent of a normal child keeps that child away from school, or when the child does not go to school, an Education Department officer calls on the parent and, if there is cause, the department summons the parent and takes him to court, where he may be punished. However, it is left to the parents of handicapped children to have their children educated.

We know that the parents must pay one-third of the cost of transporting these children to school, whilst the Government pays the remainder. This is another matter, but it causes much hardship and some children miss out on school because of it. It is most important that these children be integrated into the normal school life. The Government should be responsible to ensure that these children can attend the normal school. I think that most members realize that many different committees work hard for these children. One such committee is the Association for Children Requiring Special Education, and its report states:

In the main, as you know, our interest is centred on slow-learning children, there being

about 1,200 of them in school at this time with possibly 800 or 900 outside special or opportunity classes who might well profit through entry into these classes if there was room.

The objects of this association are set out in its constitution as follows:

The objectives of the association will be the improvement of the care and education generally of all children who have learning difficulties, and for whom the teaching provided by the normal school class is proving inadequate, and in particular: (1) to co-operate with the Education Department, and especially the Psychology Branch of the department, in widening the scope of special education classes in South Australia; (2) to provide guidance to parents in overcoming the problems connected with the care of children with learning and/or behaviour problems; (3) to assist where possible teachers of opportunity and special classes; and (4) to promote the provision of opportunities for handicapped adolescents to enter employment and become assimilated into society.

Another organization is the Specific Learning Difficulties Association of South Australia (Speld), which has been operating in other States for some time and which has recently moved into South Australia. As the member for Stuart spoke about this organization, he may be interested in the contents of a letter that I have received from it. Apparently, representatives of this organization have already visited the Minister of Education but without much response. The letter states:

Specifically, we would suggest that the following action be taken:

(*a*) A detailed survey of the problem should be undertaken at governmental level to find out how widespread is the condition in the State, what facilities are presently available to deal with it, and what further facilities should be made available.

(*b*) A cohesive plan to tackle the problem by way of training teachers to recognize and deal with the various conditions should be developed. At present, there is no establishment for teaching and developing diagnostic staff, and the provision of the appropriate facilities appears to be beyond the resources of the Education Department at present, though it is in that department and in its teachers that, with the aid of the medical profession, the work must be done.

I am proud of the work done at the Crippled Childrens Association home at Somerton which is situated in my district. That organization has excellent auxiliaries and committees, and receives support from local organizations. A letter from the Parents and Friends Association of that home states:

There should be an immediate wide-scale survey into the future needs and numbers of handicapped children in South Australia.

This is a good argument to set up the committee that has been requested by the member for Kavel.

Mr. Keneally: It did not say it should be a professional committee.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member does not listen. He may be an authority on collective farming, but he will not listen to other people without interjecting. The letter continues:

Pre-school education centres for physically handicapped children should be established with special emphasis on advice and guidance for parents.

This is a wide field, and I entirely agree with this line of thinking. The letter continues:

Specialized training for teachers of physically and/or mentally handicapped children: ideally we envisage a general teaching course followed by a specialist course along similar lines to those courses available to the teachers of the deaf and blind. The South Australian Education Department should be responsible for the education of all handicapped children.

I agree with that comment, and that was recommended by the Karmel report at page 351. The letter continues:

Also, the Education Department of South Australia should assess all children for placement in special schools. This would ensure the most suitable placement for physically handicapped children. Also we consider that, although education is important, it is not enough for these children. We consider that each child's future occupation when he leaves the home should have been carefully planned, selected, and supervised so that he is placed in a worthy position in society. We consider that, where possible, handicapped children should be taught in normal schools where they can mix freely with other children and can feel that they are part of the community and enhance their recreational and social education. Vocational guidance, assessment and training of physically handicapped children ready to leave school is inadequate and fragmented. Organizations overlap each other, and this causes delay and unnecessary costs. There is a need for more simplified and unified methods for placing school leavers. We suggest that a centralized group or agency should be established to assess the capabilities, etc., of these children for employment, and we consider that the major function of this agency should be the finding of suitable avenues of employment for these children when they leave school. This agency would have to work in close co-operation with the voluntary organizations.

These children, who are normal mentally, are able to do these tasks. They could be trained to do computer work, for example. However, even when trained and having attended school, the big problem is that, when they leave

school, they have nowhere to go, and they find difficulty in obtaining employment. Employment must be found for them, and employers must be encouraged to employ them. A scheme should be devised whereby either a Commonwealth Government or a State Government subsidy could be given to employers to employ these young people. I, together with the Minister of Education, who used to represent the district that contains the Somerton Crippled Children's Home, know of the great job done by the committees and auxiliaries. Some of the members of the auxiliaries are not parents of handicapped children, but they work hard in making money for the organization. I have seen the Minister of Education present at fetes for the home that I have attended. Organizations such as the Red Cross and Apex work hard to raise money for this fine organization. I speak more of the Somerton home, with which I am familiar because it is in my area.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Its site is not big enough.

Mr. MATHWIN: No, perhaps it should be relocated in, say, the O'Halloran Hill area. There is a troop of girl guides and boy scouts at the home. Recently, scouts from the home attended a jamboree in Melbourne. One of the young crippled scouts, Rex Thompson, was taken, together with other scouts, to a fun fair and, without the scoutmaster's knowledge, he was given a ride in a bumper car and, unfortunately, he broke a leg.

These children are normal mentally. The boy I have referred to is a fine, bright young fellow. During my frequent visits to the Somerton Crippled Children's Home I am always greatly impressed with the work done there. One parent who lives at Elizabeth has a child who now lives in the home, because it would be very difficult to transport the child each day from Elizabeth to the home. Any parent with a child in this situation is involved in great expense, because all the gear and equipment must be paid for. The parent I have referred to has to pay hundreds of dollars for the gear for his child, which he is doing on a weekly basis, causing great hardship. The committee should study all these aspects.

The Minda Home is on the boundary of my electoral district, and all members are aware of the fine work being done in that home. The Minister of Education and I frequently attend fetes there. I am sure the Minister would agree with me that the home does a marvellous job. Townsend House, which is within half a mile of my electoral district, does a marvellous job, too. It has now been completely revitalized, and the children now live in family units. I cannot agree with the member for Stuart, who does not believe that the voluntary organizations should have the responsibility in connection with this type of committee. I did not think the honourable member would bring in the old bogy of the Commonwealth Government so early in his speech. Both he and the Minister of Education said that professional people should be on such a committee. The Minister, more than anyone else, would know, particularly with reference to the Somerton Crippled Children's Home, that committees have professional people on them. Monthly meetings are held of the professional staff in the home, at which the staff discusses all these problems.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: When the school is reformed, the professionals will have a great say in it.

Mr. MATHWIN: Because of the nature of these committees and the people concerned, we have professional people on the committees.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Sometimes we do and sometimes we don't.

Mr. MATHWIN: If we formed a committee to advise the Minister and I, as a member of the committee, was asked to nominate someone to represent an organization, I would recommend the person most likely to know a great deal about the matter. So, the people on the committee should be those who know most about the matter—the professional people whom the Minister has said he wants on it. The Minister's reason for opposing the motion was that he thought it would be better to have a professional body. I support the motion, because there is a great need for this type of committee. Nothing but good can come from it. The Minister said that there were so many organizations that the committee would be too big and unwieldy, but we would be deciding how many members should be on the committee.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Which organizations would you leave out?

Mr. MATHWIN: That would be the Minister's prerogative.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Would you leave out the Muscular Dystrophy Association?

Mr. MATHWIN: If the Minister wanted representatives from all organizations, they could form an executive, which could contact the Minister. They could sift out what information should be passed on to the Minister.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think I get bad professional advice at present?

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister certainly got bad professional advice in regard to smoking.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think I get bad professional advice in regard to the problems of special education?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I will give the Minister some advice: he is out of order.

Mr. MATHWIN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Speaker, I was not making an interjection: I was only seeking information.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order is not upheld. The Minister was out of order in the remarks he made.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am sure that all members know that there is a great need for a committee of this type. The Minister knows it, and I ask him to reconsider his opposition to the motion.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I support the motion.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Have you had Party instructions on this matter?

Mr. RODDA: The Minister is obviously expert on Party instructions, judging by the way he has Government members under his thumb. I was disappointed to hear the Minister say that he opposed the motion. However, most of his speech was largely an endorsement of the motion. The member for Stuart began by eulogizing the Minister on what he described as a factual rendition connected with this field of education. The member for Stuart spelt out his belief in Socialism and said that the responsibility for this sort of thing should lie with the Government and that we should not have any outside assistance.

Mr. Keneally: I didn't say that.

Mr. RODDA: I think that in the first instance the honourable member did say that, and he was expressing himself as only a good Socialist could do, but he then got down to some sober thinking; he said that he was not against voluntary assistance, and he cited Meals on Wheels. The member for Stuart was merely paying lip service to the opinions expressed by the Minister. I have no quarrel with what the honourable member was saying; he was supporting his Minister. But the member for Kavel, himself a qualified teacher, knows what he is talking about. The Minister and I came into the House on the same day, and for the past six or seven years I have heard him talking about the inadequacies in education. We have heard him as a backbencher, a middle-bencher, and now as a prominent front-bencher. As Minister, he has a job to do, and he is apparently getting the best professional advice that a Minister can get.

However, I hope the Minister reads the speech made by the member for Bragg, who has had specialist training, and who had some things to say that would undoubtedly interest the Minister. Although the member for Glenelg and I can perhaps express only a lay opinion, we have some special appreciation of the practical needs in this area, and we have had some experience of parents whose backward children need education. We know of the great interest those parents show in this matter. I think the member for Kavel, in moving the motion, had in mind this great untapped wealth of assistance and advice that can be used in this regard. The assistance obtained would only help, not hinder, the Minister. The remarks made by the member for Stuart about the Commonwealth Government and about a shortage of funds do not hold water, especially when we bear in mind the Budget document now being considered by members. There seemed to be an echo of ingratitude in the honourable member's references to the Commonwealth Government, when at the same time he was defending his Minister. Having read what the Minister had to say, I thought that in the body of his speech he was hand in glove with the member for Kavel; it was only at the beginning and end of his speech that he differed. Of course, that is where his commissioned authority lies, and that is also where Caucus puts on the crunch. I know that in my own district and in the district of the member for Mallee people are interested in having special assistance provided for these children. The Minister said that 90 per cent of the backward children—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Not necessarily backward: children involved in some way in special education.

Mr. RODDA: My experience has been that some schoolchildren are battling to keep up with the rest of the class, and they could benefit from the provision of special assistance. I acknowledge the Minister's difficulty in this matter: he must have the necessary teachers and money, despite the 25 per cent increase.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: In regard to the teaching of children in opportunity classes in Government schools, voluntary organizations—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Victoria is addressing the Chair. The member for Victoria.

Mr. RODDA: I appreciate the Minister's assistance. However, I am sure he acknowledges the expertise of the member for Kavel. Indeed, I know that he acknowledges that there are people in the District of Brighton who want to help out in this regard in any way that they can. It is in educating children who need special assistance that the efforts of these people can be harnessed. I hope that in the final analysis the Minister will endorse the suggestion embodied in the motion. I do not think it matters which district one examines: one finds a real need for special assistance for children in all districts. Who in the House would have more practical experience in this matter than perhaps the member for Kavel and the Minister of Education, both of whom are former teachers? Obviously, the Minister does not like being reminded of this matter, and the motion is an embarrassment to him. The member for Elizabeth, too, confesses to being a member of this honourable profession. This motion has been moved sincerely and obviously as the result of much research. The Karmel report deals with this matter and, for some reason or other, its findings do not fit in with the policy of the present Government. The inspiration for this motion came from the Karmel report.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Have you read the Karmel report?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. RODDA: I wish the Minister would not be so impatient. I am sure he knows what is in it.

Mr. Jennings: Have you read it?

Mr. RODDA: The member for Ross Smith is always asking awkward questions. What does he expect me to say other than that I have had my attention drawn to the relevant portions of it by the teachers. This motion is drawn with the worthiest of motives. It is intended not to embarrass but to assist the Minister. I make this plea to him as nicely as I can, and I am sure that, on reflection, he will support the motion. I have much pleasure in supporting it.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Goldsworthy:

That in the opinion of this House the Government should bear the full cost of transporting handicapped children, recommended by the Psychology Branch of the Education Department, to schools with special classes when these children are unable to use public transport because of their disability,

which the Minister of Education had moved to amend by leaving out all the words after "children," first occurring, and inserting in lieu thereof "to and from school when the necessary finance can be made available,".

(Continued from September 1. Page 1295.)

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I support the motion. To say that I am disappointed with the Minister, as I said I was when speaking to the previous motion not very long ago, is not enough: I am doubly disappointed with him for moving his amendment to the motion, the vital word in it being, of course, "when". To say that it is a case of this day, next day, some time, never, is putting it mildly. What costs are we speaking about? We are speaking about $40,000, which is mere chicken feed. It is nothing; it does not really need to be considered. As the member for Fisher said when he spoke, "If this money had to be found, it could be found tomorrow."

The $40,000 a year is the present cost to the parents of the children concerned. From personal contact with them, I know that this is causing great hardship to these parents, and to the families concerned. Sometimes people are unfortunate enough to have more than one handicapped child and, if parents have two such children, their expense in that direction is doubled. There are 622 children transported under the present system. I am sure the experts will agree that the figure may be larger. The member for Stuart said that his definition of an expert was a man who knew more and more about less and less. However, the experts say that there are many more handicapped children than 622. As far as I know, there are parents who cannot afford the luxury (if I may put it that way) of sending their children to school under the present system. What a horrifying thought that is! Parents who have in their care and are responsible for this type of child have, as I said in a previous debate, an expensive child, whether it is attending school (and we know that the cost of that is $40,000 a year) or whether they have other costs to bear. For

instance, equipment for these children is expensive and must be paid for by the parents. Many parents of handicapped children have to fight hard to get their children to school, and in that respect they are in a vastly different position from parents of normal children.

What is the position of any member of the public who wants to keep his child away from school? If he does that, he is open to trouble from the authorities, but for the parents of these handicapped children it is a different kettle of fish: their duty is to support their children in going to school and provide one-third of the cost of transportation where their children cannot use the ordinary buses. If they cannot afford this cost to send them to school, it is too bad. Many of these children are normal healthy children who are left merely to sit at home. I mean "sit at home"; there is nothing else for them to do. They just sit at home. What effect does this sort of thing have on the children and on the parents? It is a feeling of hopelessness.

The responsibility must be taken from the shoulders of these people, and some hope must be given these children. The Government must take over this responsibility and see that they are allowed to attend school by supplying them with transport to and from school. We must not forget that the cost involved is merely $40,000 a year. If we look around us, we do not have to look far to see ways and means of getting this money from areas where we think money is being wasted. We can look at the great exercise of thrift represented by the referendum! That beautiful exercise cost $70,000, which represents the cost of almost two years of this transport.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You'd spend that at every election by having a separate election for the Legislative Council.

Mr. MATHWIN: The difference between a referendum and an election is that an election is taken notice of. The Government does not even take notice of the results of a referendum anyway.

Mr. Clark: We got into trouble for taking notice.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member is nearly out of trouble now.

Mr. Clark: Surely this is a non-political matter.

Mr. MATHWIN: Whether it is political or not, I suggest that this is a source whence the money could come. We are speaking about only $40,000.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Are you suggesting that we shouldn't have held the referendum?

Mr. MATHWIN: As it was held, for goodness sake why did the Government not take notice of what the people said? The people did not know what the question was. People did not know what the ballot-paper meant, and I believe they wrote all sorts of things on those papers, some things which were rude and some which were complimentary. The site at Victoria Square is worth $600,000, and probably more property will have to be acquired for that project, as the present site apparently is not large enough. Therefore, more costs will be involved. Surely that is another area whence money could come. If we are considering places whence we can get $40,000, we could certainly prune this sum from the allocation of $1,166,067 from the Premier's Department or empire or, as the Premier has described it in a newspaper in another State, kingdom. Another place whence the money could possibly come is the Attorney-General's Deparment, where much money is wasted in getting people enrolled for the Legislative Council.

Mr. Evans: That's what they are attempting to do.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes. As people know that by law they can get on the roll, I do not think it is up to the Government to spend money to have people enrolled, but undoubtedly this serves some political purpose of the Government. When the member for Elizabeth spoke in this debate, he went to great lengths to say how much he sympathized with the motion, and I believe he was sincere.

Mr. Clark: I didn't waste my time making a political speech, because this is not a political matter.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member wasted a lot of time in his speech, as he spoke for three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. Clark: I'm wasting time now listening to you.

Mr. MATHWIN: I listened to the honourable member's speech and read the report of it, and I did not learn a thing.

Mr. Clark: That's not my fault.

Mr. MATHWIN: I have been told that the honourable member is a professional teacher.

Mr. Clark: Even a teacher as good as I am can't teach some people.

Mr. MATHWIN: I suggest that the Minister of Education should give the member for Elizabeth a refresher course.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: He doesn't need it.

Mr. Clark: You are acting like a character out of one of Dickens's worst books.

Mr. MATHWIN: There is no need for the honourable member to be nasty. I am losing my confidence in him; I thought he was a reasonable person.

Mr. Clark: And I am very fond of you, too.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member expressed sympathy to this motion, and I believed him.

Mr. Clark: I've been working for 20 years for people such as these.

Mr. MATHWIN: The honourable member said that, if Government members were in Opposition, one or other of them would undoubtedly have moved a similar motion. He added that he hoped this would not be a political matter. I am sure that he was sincere when he said that, and I agree that the matter should not be political; it should be far above Party politics. I was not introducing Party politics into the debate when I referred to ways in which the necessary money could be raised. We can never do too much in providing this type of assistance, where the need is so great. I appeal to members on both sides to support the motion. I appeal to the Minister to reconsider the matter and to withdraw his amendment. We are dealing with only $40,000 a year, which is not a great sum. If all members could vote on this matter according to their conscience, they would vote that the Government should spend this additional money to provide free transport to and from school for these children.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I support the motion. I suggest that the Minister's amendment does not necessarily require the support of Labor members so that they may remain within the bonds which control them. I can see no reason why the amendment cannot be tacked on to the end of the motion, for I can find nothing at all in the motion indicating that immediate action should be taken. All members who have spoken have indicated that they favour the motive behind the motion. In his speech, the Minister gave an excellent and laudable resume of the action taken by the Government and by him during the time he has been Minister. He spelt out to the House and to the community that the action contemplated by the motion could not be taken in isolation from many other matters. Although he could have done so, he did not specifically say that to implement this motion at this time would place his department in an embarrassing position, because obviously the facilities required to go hand in glove with making transportation available to everyone referred to the department by psychological examination are just not available.

The matters spelt out by the Minister give a clear and concise indication of the present situation. Unfortunately, the Minister saw fit to make these statements in something of a political barnstorming manner. Nonetheless, what he said is useful comment. I see no reason why the Minister could not have sought to attach to the motion the words "to be implemented when finance is available", as that was the tone of the information he gave. As that is not contrary to the motion, it could be reasonably attached; it would not upset the motion. All members who have spoken believe that there is a reasonable need to meet the cost parents must pay to transport these unfortunate children. The parents are willing to accept these children, even though they suffer some mental retardation or handicap. This action would allow the House to recommend that action in this respect be taken at the earliest opportunity.

It is unreasonable to suggest that the member for Kavel has an ulterior motive regarding the amendment moved by the Minister. Obviously, the intention of the motion is to obtain transportation for children living great distances from schools. In some cases the only possible form of transport would be a taxi, while in others one could foresee the possible use of a mini-bus or micro-bus. Many of the smaller communities from which these children are drawn, to be taken to larger communities, have access to mini-buses which could be usefully employed for the purpose and which would, I suggest, decrease the cost not only to the Government but also to the parents in the interim period during which they are expected to meet one-third of the taxi transport costs.

The Minister said that, when the parents of a mentally retarded or handicapped child are in needy circumstances, charitable organizations in the community generally provide assistance. It is indeed commendable that there are in the community organizations which, recognizing a need, rise to the challenge of that need. However, the resources of such organizations are limited. Many charitable organizations are becoming unsettled and somewhat upset by the Government's changing policy in this respect. In the past, the Government has accepted the joint responsibility for these people, to the community's advantage.

Probably the area of greatest need in this respect is the Adelaide Children's Hospital, for which thousands of dollars are raised annually by the community to help support its work and building programmes. However, the Government has seen fit to withdraw its support from that hospital. Be that as it may, it is not the purpose of the motion to assist organizations such as this. By the challenge of this motion, the Minister virtually had to have prized from him the present situation regarding his department. I do not deny the Minister the right to use this debate as he did to gain political capital. However, I refer to the comment made this afternoon by the Minister and the member for Elizabeth that the member for Glenelg, who has just resumed his seat, was making political capital out of the issue.

The Minister failed to say clearly that this situation could not proceed in isolation. The member for Elizabeth went further, saying it was good that Opposition members were giving the Minister a nudge. Indeed, he said he hoped they would continue to do so. He then said that, although he appreciated the present situation, he was unable to support the motion. I hope that he and the Minister will reconsider their position in the light of the comments I made earlier regarding the amendment to the motion which the Minister seeks to introduce, so that the House can, without political bias, support the commendable action envisaged by the mover.

The member for Elizabeth said that he, like the members for Salisbury and Playford and me, had received a letter from the Chairman of the Committee of the Elizabeth Special School for Mentally Handicapped Children. However, he did not say much more about that letter. Believing that it will benefit the discussion on this matter, I should like to read the last paragraph of that letter, which is as follows:

> With free transport the attendance at these schools could be made compulsory, thus giving every retarded child equal opportunity for education. The committee is aware of primary and secondary school committees obtaining fees from parents to offset expenses incurred by them, but our committee is reluctant in doing this and feels that the parents have enough expense getting their children to school, and have to work long hours raising money to supply equipment our children need.
>
> Three families have two children each attending our school and a large number of children are from broken homes, the mother supporting them on a small pension. One mother has her child's taxi fare paid by a charitable organization in Elizabeth. As a parent of a mentally handicapped child I know the big financial strain on a family. Most of these children are under constant medical treatment requiring frequent travelling to the Children's Hospital. Free transport to schools would offset some of these expenses for the privilege of giving our children a natural home environment and providing equal opportunities for their future.

Those last few words contain the crux of the submission made by the chairman of that school committee. They are indeed vital words, if this subject is examined with a futuristic attitude. Anything that can be done now to improve the possibility of a child's being able to take a useful place in society in the future, or to ensure that a child has an opportunity to live in a normal home environment, is of inestimable value. Such benefit is truly great when compared with the overall cost of this exercise, which involves $40,000. I again ask the Minister to consider withdrawing his amendment and attaching to the motion a slightly different wording that will truly have regard to the thoughts and desires of all members of the House and will not divide the issue by a play on words or a political endeavour or bluff by the Minister to ensure that every member of his Party votes according to the Minister's dictates.

Mr. WARDLE secured the adjournment of the debate.

REFERENDUM PROSECUTIONS

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Millhouse:

(For wording of motion, see page 894.)

(Continued from September 1. Page 1298.)

Dr. EASTICK (Light): I support the motion. The Attorney-General has expressed the opinion that the member for Mitcham changed his emphasis from the "time expired" concept in the motion to an argument for voluntary voting. I suggest that this was not a charitable attitude for the Attorney to take, because the speech made by the member for Mitcham makes one fully aware that he canvassed many items in moving the motion. The Attorney's attitude suggests that any member of this House should confine himself solely to one aspect of the subject and not canvass all the aspects that he may see fit to deal with.

The Attorney proceeded to give us a tirade on compulsory voting *versus* voluntary voting systems, and he gave a discourse on the Liberal and Country League and where it fitted into the present scene. In my opinion, he spelt out his fears about giving to the individual an opportunity to express an opinion on whether

he wants to vote or does not want to exercise that privilege. As reported at page 1296 of *Hansard,* the Attorney stated:

> What he is now saying is that, because certain complaints were not laid because the time for laying them had expired, other people who offended against the same law at the same time should therefore escape the penalty for their action. That is a remarkable proposition . . .

He went on to indicate that, in his opinion, we would be thrown back to a situation in which electors could be influenced. These influences and these factors about the individual being able to express his opinion seem to have preoccupied the Attorney for a long time, and he did not return to the prime object of the motion. We even had the intrusion of reference to wealth and resources, and their effect on people going to the poll. I have no hesitation in saying that, in my experience, the resources of the members of the organization that the Attorney represents have made sure that people, particularly the elderly, have gone to the poll. That is the position at least in the community in which I live.

My support of the motion is advanced on a slightly different premise from that already canvassed in this debate. I point out (as I did when the referendum was first promoted, on the basis of the information that was available to anyone who had a cursory glance at the roll to be used) that many people on the roll were not enrolled legally. I am not against computers and computerization, but the member for Peake has told us that computers involve a human element of, I think, about 3 per cent at all times and that these are failures or errors in preparing a computerized programme.

That leads me to the belief that many people in the Gawler area were on the roll because their postal address happened to be in Gawler. Many of these people lived as far as 15 miles from Gawler, outside the area of influence of the referendum, but by the very fact that their postal address was "Post Office, Gawler," the computer had taken them out of the list of all persons in the State, by whatever means or techniques were used, and they became eligible, according to the roll, to vote in the referendum. Other persons who lived just across the boundary road were also placed in this position.

I told the Premier in this House at the time that many people were incorrectly enrolled and I asked what would be the situation if these people were called on to explain why they did not vote. The Premier was proper in this situation and said that these people would have a simple defence that they were on the roll incorrectly, and this would be accepted and no charge would be laid against them.

However, my point is that many of these people would not know whether they were correctly or incorrectly on the roll. On the day of the referendum I received many telephone calls from people who told me where they lived and asked me whether they should vote or whether they were eligible to vote. I cannot answer for the member for Elizabeth, but he may have received similar inquiries. These people were confused, because they did not know the extent of the referendum area, more particularly, as they had, for the convenience of the Government, become part of the metropolitan area for this project. I suggest that many of these people, particularly the older ones, would not question a card that arrived from the Electoral Department asking them to give reasons why they had failed to vote. When these people receive any card or letter that comes from an authoritative body, to challenge their position in the matter being canvassed does not enter their minds. They will accept without question that it must apply to them, because they have received it. I ask the Government, particularly the Attorney-General, to inform the House how many of the $2 payments that were made in lieu of court action were made by people who accepted the fact that they were probably at fault and who took the line of least resistance and paid the $2 so that there would be no further action taken against them.

Mr. Payne: It is the same as parking stickers.

Dr. EASTICK: That is an entirely different matter and is a red herring in this debate. At least the parking sticker defines the number of the motor vehicle and the place where it was found when the sticker was attached to it. However, in the other situation a card is delivered to a person because he happens to be on the roll, whether legally or otherwise, and, taking the line of least resistance, some of these people will pay the $2. I do not know whether one could extend the matter further and ask how many people, who had actually had court action taken against them, were in a similar position, and how many of them had action taken against them when they were not, in fact, legally on the roll. Although I have highlighted my attitude concerning the Gawler area, I appreciate that

the same situation could apply in other areas on the fringe of what was the referendum district. It is on this basis that I support the motion, and look forward to the House upholding the rights of these people by supporting the motion.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I, too, support the motion and I commend the member for Mitcham for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. A highly undesirable state of affairs has arisen. As member for my district, I received several telephone calls after the referendum was held from people who asked me what course electors who had failed to vote, for one reason or another, should adopt. These people had received "Please explain" notices, and asked me whether they should pay the suggested sum in expiation of the offence. I had no option but to tell them that this was the course they should follow, if they were not able to justify their action by any other means. I think it is a highly unfair situation: people do not mind paying this penalty (as for a parking offence) if everyone else is in a similar position, but obviously something has gone wrong in this case. Someone has made a mistake: perhaps it was the computer, as that is always possible.

We heard about the unfortunate episode of many Matriculation students last year. At the end of last month I was told that my partner in practice was either dead or had retired, because the computer used by the Health Department to ascertain exactly our prescribing habits had gone haywire. According to the computer my partner had not written any medical benefit prescriptions at all and had not seen a patient. If my partner does not work it affects me and the practice is in trouble. This illustrates the fact that a computer can make mistakes, and explains the reason for the delay that extended beyond the period allowed for prosecutions to be launched regarding the referendum. I think it is unfair that people who paid the sum in expiation of their offence should not have that money refunded. This is discrimination: there is no other word for it.

The referendum was unfortunate in that the wording was ambiguous. We know that many people did not vote because they did not see what they had to vote about. They agreed with neither of the questions asked, and considered that the only course left to them was not to vote, and they did not vote. I appreciate the problem of the then Minister of Labour and Industry, but he should have defined more accurately what he wanted people to do. If he had wanted to find out, it should not have taken much to design an adequate referendum question. I think that was largely the reason why people did not vote. I suppose many excuses have been given, but the predominant excuse was that the person did not know what to say in reply to the two questions that were asked. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

LAND TAX ACT AMENDMENT BILL (REASSESSMENT)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

AGED CITIZENS CLUBS (SUBSIDIES) ACT AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Aged Citizens Clubs (Subsidies) Act, 1963-1969. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

Its purpose is to increase the maximum amount by which the Government may subsidize the cost of erecting a senior citizens club or centre. As the principal Act now stands, the Government may contribute, on a dollar-for-dollar basis with the particular council, an amount which does not exceed $6,000 in respect of any one club or centre. The limit of $6,000 is as provided in the original Act of 1963. The Commonwealth Government now provides a subsidy for an "approved" club of up to one-third of the total cost. Despite this aid, the burden falling on local government bodies is onerous, as the cost of clubs and centres now ranges between $35,000 and $120,000. Taking the lowest amount as an example, after Commonwealth and State subsidies are deducted, the sum the council must find would be about $17,700.

The Government proposes to ease the burden falling on councils by raising the maximum Government subsidy from $6,000 to $10,000. At the present moment about four or five clubs or centres are built each year, which means that the additional cost to the Government would not be likely to exceed $20,000 a year. I shall now deal with the clauses of the Bill. Clause 1 is formal. Clause 2 amends section 3 of the principal Act by substituting a reference to $10,000 for the present reference to $6,000.

Mr. HALL secured the adjournment of the debate.

DAYLIGHT SAVING BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 1. Page 1301.)

Mr. HALL (Leader of the Opposition): I support the Bill with some reluctance; I do so with reluctance because obviously it will hurt many South Australians. It will cause not only inconvenience but also economic disruption to hundreds, if not thousands, of South Australians whose livelihoods will be affected. Therefore, this Bill cannot be taken lightly; it should receive proper consideration, and the difficulties should be recognized. They were not recognized in the Minister's second reading explanation. As so often happens, the Government has simply failed to deal with the difficulties that will be involved in a decision it has made. We have another instance of a Bill being introduced into the House and the House being asked to approve it on the most superficial basis.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Why do you say that?

Mr. HALL: We are dealing with the Minister's statement that it is a Bill for an Act to promote the longer use of daylight during certain months of the year, commonly to be known as the Daylight Saving Act. This does not mean that this idea has not been tried before in South Australia. The history of the matter has been outlined at least to that degree by the Minister. We all know of, and some of us remember, the previous application of the daylight saving scheme in this State. When applied previously, the population of South Australia was happy to move back to Central Standard Time after a while and it is against this background that the Government moves, obviously under great pressure from a decision taken by the two major Eastern States of Australia—a decision they can take more easily than South Australia can because their time is more closely related to the true time as we know it than is the time in South Australia, where we are tied to a line drawn outside this State, running, I believe, through or close to Ararat in Victoria. I approve this move on the basis that it is a trial, because the Bill clearly states:

This Act expires on the fifteenth day of October, 1972.

That is the most reassuring part of the Bill, that at least this Parliament will have to deal again with this matter before two seasons are treated in this fashion and before the public of this State have to take a second dose of daylight saving. It may be that the public will overwhelmingly approve this move. If that is the case, we can expect to see this legislation reintroduced and approved by Parliament, as I believe this Bill will be approved this time.

I refer again to those people who will be hurt. There is no doubt that those people involved in the drive-in cinema industry will be severely affected. The experience so far in Tasmania has been that there has been an enormous fall in patronage of drive-in theatres. I do not have the statistics to show how many people are employed in that industry and how their livelihood, or a significant part of it, is affected by daylight saving. Anyway, it is a substantial number of people. We are not talking merely of personal inconvenience in rising in the morning in relation to the position of the sun: we are talking in economic terms of jobs and employment. I ask the Government to be especially careful in its assessment of the results of this trial period. The motion picture industry will make representations to the Government to ensure that it is kept well informed of the results and the effect on people employed in that industry and those who have a stake in that industry as owners.

I have, as no doubt other honourable members have, a detailed list of the times of sunrise for last year. As I understand it, the difference between last year and this year in that respect is minimal so, if we take last year's figures, they will be accurate enough for any discussion about when the sun will rise in relation to our clock time. I notice with interest that, on the day of the introducion of daylight saving, the people of South Australia will go to bed on November 1, and, as far as the clock time and their convenience are concerned, they will get up on September 17.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What?

Mr. HALL: If the Minister cares to follow this argument, it is really most pertinent in relation to people's convenience. I think we must express this aspect in the most simple terms we can so that the people will understand what they are facing. Personally, I do not think this is much of an inconvenience. However, I have already referred to the economic effect it can have on an industry. People who work between the hours of 8 a.m. and 4 p.m. or 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. and who have travelling time to and from work must consider the effect this change will have. Many other people do not have those hours and may start work much earlier because of their individual activities. I repeat that, with regard to the clock time in the summer, people will go to

bed on the last day of October and get up the next morning on September 17.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: It is obvious from the remarks of Ministers that they have not considered the effect on the public of this change. However, members of the public will go to bed at the end of this period of daylight saving on February 27 and get up on May 13.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: One can foresee all sorts of effects. With regard to the rising of the sun, obviously the greatest effect of the alteration will be at the end of the period and not at the beginning, because there is a difference of half an hour in the rising of the sun. With the change in February of one minute a day, the effect at the end of the month is extreme. One can play around with these figures, but at the end of the daylight saving period on February 27 or February 28, instead of the sun rising normally at one minute past six, it will rise at one minute past seven. Therefore, at the end of the daylight saving period, for the purposes of convenience, we are at August 11.

When I stated these figures I knew that members opposite would have some difficulty in understanding the problem, so I will make the position clear. At the beginning of the period of daylight saving, we will enjoy the same relation to the sun on November 1 as is the position on September 17. I do not think that that will be onerous to the individual in going about his normal activities, as that is an admirable time to get up in relation to the rising of the sun; I do not think that that will be an inconvenience. However, I draw attention to the comparative effect at the end of the daylight-saving period when we will be going about our activities with the sun rising at one minute past seven. I have already indicated that we will go from the sun rising at one minute past seven at that time to the same situation as applies on May 13. However, members can obtain the sunrise times from the library and make their own calculations.

The inconvenience caused to the ordinary citizen will not be great and, although the change in times will be advantageous to many people, I draw honourable members' attention to the inconvenience that will be caused to many thousands of other people. I am sure the Government has considered this matter thoroughly and has weighed the disadvantages that certain people will suffer against the advantages that will accrue as a result of our extended period of effective contact with the Eastern States. If the time were not changed, one could imagine the difficulties that would arise in relation to, say, the curfew at the airport, which I understand is at present 11 p.m. One could also imagine the difficulties that would be created if at 9.30 p.m. South Australian time the Melbourne airport was closed, and the difficulties that the last flight from Adelaide would have in making connections in other States.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They are going to change their hours also.

Mr. HALL: Yes, and that is one of the reasons why the Government is taking this action. Unless the State Government moves in this respect, the very considerable difference in time will create difficulties in that type of contact with the Eastern States. The difficulties regarding telephone communications must also be considered. I approve of the Government's action in this matter, in spite of the criticism that it and I will attract for supporting this action. I can only repeat that we must treat this as a trial period. The Education Department will have to be sympathetic particularly to those schoolchildren on Eyre Peninsula whose time is retarded even further. I think the difference in sun time between the extreme areas of Eyre Peninsula and Adelaide is almost 20 minutes.

Mr. Venning: Half an hour.

Mr. HALL: I thank the honourable member for that information. The difficulties are magnified even more as one reaches the extreme areas of that part of the State because of the distances peculiar to that type of country. The effect on the dairy industry of the change to daylight saving has been much debated, and only a practical experiment will establish what difficulties are involved. Although some rearrangement could be made regarding business times and points of collection for produce, and so on, this matter will be subject to practical assessment after the trial period has expired. I ask the Government to pay particular attention to the difficulties certain country areas are facing. I support the Bill on the basis that the change to daylight saving will be for a trial period only and that, if it causes economic hardship for a significant section of the community or personal inconvenience to a large section, I will oppose similar legislation if it is introduced again.

Mr. CARNIE (Flinders): As my Leader has supported the Bill, it grieves me that I

must oppose it. The Leader of the Opposition said that members of this Chamber appeared to be taking this Bill too lightly. I, too, have thought that most members have not sufficiently considered this matter or the effects it could have on many sections of the community. I can see the Government's dilemma, with the Eastern States advancing their clocks by one hour on the last Sunday in October. I admit that a 1½-hour difference between Central Standard Time and Eastern Standard Time could create difficulties. So, the Government was in an awkward situation but, nevertheless, I still must oppose the Bill. In his explanation, the Minister states the derivation of the three time zones used in Australia, namely, the 120°E. line of longitude used for Western Australian time (which is eight hours ahead of G.M.T.), our own time meridian of 142° 30′E. (9½ hours ahead of G.M.T.), and the 150°E. meridian on which E.S.T. is based (10 hours ahead of G.M.T.).

However, the Minister did not say where these meridians ran, and I think this information could be of interest to members. In making this comment, I intend to disregard Western Australia, because that State has no real bearing on this discussion, which is simply on the relationship between C.S.T. and E.S.T. The meridian on which C.S.T. is based runs through Warrnambool, which is 80 miles into Victoria from the South Australian border. The meridian of 150°E. runs very close to the eastern seaboard of New South Wales and, in fact, cuts through Cape Howe, the most south-eastern point of New South Wales, and this is the meridian on which New South Wales time is based. It does not touch Victoria at any point.

As the Minister has said, before 1895, South Australia based its time on the 135°E. meridian (or 9 hours ahead of G.M.T.). This meridian runs very close to Elliston, on the West Coast. In 1895, it was decided to advance our time half an hour to the meridian which is now used, and this was done to close a little the gap between C.S.T. and E.S.T. There can be no real argument against this, because most of the population lives east of Spencer Gulf, and the matter must be considered on this basis. Those people are certainly much closer to the Eastern States than they are to Elliston.

For many years, as members know, there has been agitation for South Australia to fall into line with E.S.T. I would be willing to debate some of the arguments put forward by some proponents of that plan, but accepting, for the sake of argument, that it would be a good thing for South Australia to have the same time as the Eastern States, it is obvious, with hindsight, that the time zones fixed in 1895 were set up wrongly. I say that because, assuming that it would be advantageous for the four Eastern States as well as South Australia and the Northern Territory to have the same time, the meridian for the entire area should be one used for C.S.T., namely, 142° 30′E., because this is near the centre line of the easternmost point of the Eastern States and the border of Western Australia and South Australia. Reverting to the question of C.S.T. falling into line with E.S.T., I point out that the United States of America has four one-hour time zones across the country. There is a time difference of four hours between New York and San Francisco, and the Americans do not seem to find this any real disadvantage. In Australia, we have a time difference of only two hours between Perth and Sydney.

Mr. Coumbe: About the same distance.

Mr. CARNIE: Yes, it is about the same distance across Australia as it is across the United States. It is obvious, if we look at the line of longitude of the border of Western Australia and South Australia (129°E.) and at the line of longitude of the easternmost point of the Eastern States (which is at a point almost on the border between Queensland and New South Wales and is, in fact, on the meridian 153°E.), that the mean line of longitude between those two extremes is 136°E. The C.S.T. meridian is slightly east of this, which is logical, because most of the population lives in the eastern part of Australia. To talk of C.S.T. being changed to E.S.T. is wrong. If we are to conform to sun time those States should come back to us.

I have used these slightly confusing figures of meridians etc. to lead up to my reason for opposing the Bill. The meridian of C.S.T. is 80 miles east of the South Australian and Victorian border, so that all of South Australia is, in fact, for true time already behind the clock or zone time. I shall quote a few examples. At Mount Gambier sun time is seven minutes behind zone time; at Adelaide it is 16 minutes behind; at Port Lincoln it is 27 minutes behind; at Streaky Bay it is 33 minutes behind; and at Ceduna it is 35 minutes behind.

On the Western Australian and South Australian border it is 54 minutes behind the clock or zone time, and that area is already almost one hour behind what the clock shows. It is obvious that the western part of the State

will be most adversely affected by this move. It may be that I am among the minority on this question, but I speak as I find it will affect my district. The Leader, in quoting the times of sunrise and sunset for Adelaide, seemed to cause Government members some amusement when he said that a person would go to bed on October 31 and wake up on November 17, but in terms of sunrise he is correct. I should like to quote figures for Port Lincoln, which is 11 minutes behind Adelaide for sun time. On November 1, at present sunrise will be at 5.25; under daylight saving it will be 6.25 by the clock; and sunset on that day will be at 7.56 by the clock under daylight saving. On January 1, in the middle of the period, under present time the sun will rise at 5.15, but that will now be 6.15, and it will set at 8.43. On February 28, which will be near the last day of this period, the sun will rise by the clock at 7.13 and set at 8.6. In the period from the beginning of November to the end of February the latest sunset will be at 7.45 true time or 8.45 by the clock, and that will be on January 7. It is interesting to note that the time of sunrise on February 28 will be the same as it is in early July, or will be under this scheme, and that will be equivalent to getting up in the middle of winter in relation to darkness.

I have dealt with examples at Port Lincoln, which is about the east-west centre of my district. Imagine what the situation will be in the Far West, near the Western Australian border, where that area is already 54 minutes behind our zone time. The correction we are now discussing will make that area almost two hours behind. On February 28 the sun will rise, according to the clock, at 7.40. This is getting rather late. Without doubt, this will affect many people. The Minister has recognized this because, in his second reading explanation, he said:

> In making the decision to adopt daylight saving in this State for a trial period, the Government recognizes with considerable concern the difficulties this decision could cause in some industries and quarters. That decision, however, was made after much consideration of the advantages and disadvantages that daylight saving would bring to the community as a whole.

This has yet to be proved, but, like the Leader, I am glad that the Bill is in the nature of a trial Bill and that we will have the opportunity next year, if this Bill is passed this year (as I have no doubt it will be), to debate this matter again in the light of what we will have learnt in the coming summer.

It is all very well to say that if people do not like getting up in the dark they can adjust their working times, but it is not always as easy as this in certain quarters. We are all in some way tied to the clock. All offices, shops and factories over the years have integrated their starting and finishing times to a mutually suitable time which over the years has proved to give the greatest convenience to the greatest number of people, and if just one of those services altered it could throw inconvenience on people in some of the other services.

For example, the Minister of Education, when this point was raised earlier regarding schools, said that he would authorize the headmaster to alter his starting and finishing times to suit the area as he sees fit. This again may not be as easy as it sounds.

Mr. Gunn: There could be many pitfalls in this.

Mr. CARNIE: Yes. The parents of a child attending school may both be working, perhaps one of them in a shop and the other in an office, and their times are still going to be tied to the clock; and their arrangements have been made over a period to suit everyone within that family. If the school alters its starting time by an hour or something like that, the whole family may be thrown into disorder in this regard. This may seem a minor point, but I still maintain that it could cause inconvenience and perhaps in some cases very great inconvenience.

I am very much concerned with the problem of children in all country areas, particularly those in the western parts of the State. As we all know, there has been a trend in recent years to close the smaller schools and transport children to bigger schools by bus. In many cases this means that children have very long distances to travel. I do not think city members realize fully just what is involved here. I know of many children who at present catch buses between 7.30 and 7.45 a.m. We must remember that the West Coast is already about half an hour behind zone time.

Mr. Keneally: Do you really mean to say—

Mr. Gunn: I hope the honourable member does not intend to interject. We could take a point of order on him.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre must conduct himself within Standing Orders and give his colleague an opportunity to present his case. Interjections are out of order.

Mr. CARNIE: At 7.30 in the morning in the winter time, which is when many children

catch their buses, it is barely daylight. These children will now be faced with a situation where it will be barely daylight all the year around when they catch their school bus because in February, as I have pointed out, the time of sunrise by the clock will be pretty much the same as it is in the middle of winter. As I have said, these are perhaps minor points, but they still affect very large sections of the community in country areas.

Mr. Clark: Headmasters have been told that they can alter school times.

Mr. CARNIE: The honourable member obviously did not hear my earlier comment. It is not always easy to alter school times, because such an alteration could disrupt family arrangements and working arrangements. The headmaster would need to consider how any change in school times would affect the families involved. Farmers always tend to work by the sun, and at present that practice fits in with the trading hours of shops, garages, etc. If farmers altered their habits under the system of daylight saving and businesses did not alter their hours, many difficulties could be created. It could disrupt an arrangement that has developed between the farmer and the banks, agents and suppliers with whom he deals.

Another problem for farmers that is posed by this Bill is that of silo deliveries. Presumably, silo workers are paid to work until 5 p.m., and any hours worked beyond that time would be paid for at overtime rates. No-one is arguing about that. Will the silos alter their hours to fit in with daylight saving? We must remember that farmers will want to deliver for as long as there is daylight; in other words, they may want to deliver until 8 p.m. during the summer. Will this mean that silo workers will be paid at overtime rates, or will they adjust their hours to fit in with the farmers' hours during harvest time? This point will need to be carefully considered. The situation becomes worse if we consider people in the Far West.

The Leader referred to the many drive-in theatre operators who will be adversely affected by this Bill. Obviously, if the sun does not set until 7.30 or 7.45 p.m. and if it takes another half an hour for it to be dark enough to commence showing a film, it could be 9 p.m. in the summer before a session commenced. So, this Bill will have an extremely adverse effect on the drive-in theatre industry. This Bill will perhaps not affect many people very greatly. Of course, people are capable of great adjustment to alterations in living conditions. On the far western border sun time will be two hours behind the clock. For the reasons I have given I oppose the Bill.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): Many objections could be taken to this Bill on behalf of some sections of the community. In considering this Bill we must have in the back of our minds that there may be a move by the Government or by pressure groups outside the Government to revert to E.S.T. at the end of the trial period; there is every possibility of that. Because at present the Eastern States have moved their time ahead one hour and we are moving our time ahead one hour, it will be easy at the end of the period of daylight saving for South Australia to change to E.S.T. and to move the clocks back only half an hour. I should imagine that that is at the back of the minds of many people both inside and outside the Government. I wonder what the long-term effect will be on the drive-in picture theatres, especially those in the western part of the State that operate on a small patronage and a shoe-string budget. I wonder whether they will be able to continue. It will be a pity if they cannot. The drive-in theatres within our own city will suffer. They will not be able to start the effective screening of films until about 9 or 9.10 p.m. on the longest day. It will be hard for them to attract patronage, especially from the family man, at that hour of the night. So it must be a real concern to that industry knowing, as it does, what happened to the industry in Tasmania when daylight saving was introduced there.

We can also say that, if we stay on our present time and the Eastern States advance their clocks one hour, we shall be 1½ hours behind them, which will make it difficult for businessmen in this State wishing to contact people in the Eastern States. We should be looking in terms of staggering the hours of the main work force, those people who work between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. or between 8.30 a.m. and 4.30 p.m. If we did stagger our working times, we would reduce the traffic congestion on our roads at peak periods. In that case, the Minister of Roads and Transport would not be so concerned to implement the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study plan straightaway: he could delay it for the 10-year period that has been mentioned. In a modern society, we could also reduce noise pollution with the help of daylight saving.

There is some merit in the staggering of working hours. This Bill will not benefit shift workers overall, because those shift

workers who knock off at 4 o'clock in the afternoon will be able to enjoy more daylight hours of recreation than at present, but the other group will lose by it. Where men work on a 24-hour basis, one group will gain by daylight saving and another group will lose. The group working on the night shift or the late shift will enjoy very little daylight time at all.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They change each week.

Mr. EVANS: True, but this particular shift will lose this benefit. One benefit will be that there will be more daylight recreation time for the general public.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: That will be beneficial.

Mr. EVANS: I do not know that it will be beneficial. If used intelligently, it will be beneficial. If recreation time is used intelligently, it will be beneficial, and that is the biggest benefit flowing from this Bill.

Mr. Venning: What about the effect on drinking in hotels?

Mr. EVANS: I do not know, but possibly there would be a distinct increase in the amount of alcohol consumed. There is also a distinct possibility of more road accidents because of the increased consumption of alcohol. It is possible that more people will think, "All right; I have two or three hours of daylight time to spare; I will go for a drive in the country to get away from the city rat race and go to a country hotel." In that respect, it will help decentralization, but these people will have a greater distance to travel back to their homes when, perhaps, they are affected by alcohol. I do not say this will happen but, as it could happen, it must be considered near the end of the trial period and certainly before similar legislation is introduced in future years. If what I have suggested could happen does happen, it will place a bigger burden on the community with regard to costs. I believe that daylight saving may benefit sporting stores, which will have an opportunity, if the recreation time is used sensibly, to cash in on this to some extent. Increased sporting activity would be to the benefit of the community.

Dairy farmers have expressed their objection to the change in the present time. In the district I previously represented, I had mainly dairy farmers as my constituents; I do not have as many dairy farmers in my present district. However, in the absence of the member for Heysen, I believe that I should express the objection of dairy farmers in his area to a variation in our time. We are now discussing more than a change of half an hour as was discussed originally with regard to a change to Eastern Standard Time; we are now talking about a change of one hour. If the change is made, most dairy farmers will be milking their cows in the morning in darkness all the year round instead of in only part of the year. Government members may say that it does not matter if dairy farmers are left in the dark, because the Government left them in the dark recently in regard to the milk strike. The Government may leave them in the dark at all times in future because it has no real concern for these producers, who have loyally served the community in the past. Dairy farmers have a real objection to a permanent change in times in this State.

Mr. Harrison: Tell us about the poultry farmers.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. EVANS: The poultry farmers would not want me to speak about their position, as the member for Murray would do that for them. However, I am sure that they would not be as chicken on this subject as are Government members, who are not even speaking in this debate. There is also a possibility that in a hot summer there will be an increased use of water because of this change. The average worker, who works between 8 a.m. and 4.30 p.m. or between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m., will arrive home during the hotter part of the afternoon and may then water his lawn and garden. As the period of the day will be hotter, there will be greater evaporation. In a year such as this, when the reservoirs are full, if there were a hot summer it could be beneficial to the Engineering and Water Supply Department because there would be a greater use of excess water. The amount of electricity used will decrease, and this could tend to break down the profits of the Electricity Trust, although not greatly. With a Labor Government, tariffs may be increased to account for any loss, of course.

Mr. Langley: But the poultry growers will not—

Mr. EVANS: The poultry growers will be able to give their fowls more light time to produce more eggs, so perhaps it has the same effect on human beings. However, if the honourable member is an expert in this field he has plenty of opportunity to put his expertise into practice. If passed, this Bill will introduce daylight saving for a trial period, during which, I think, the Government intends

to test the feelings of the community. I trust that if the Bill passes all sections of the community that are adversely affected will lodge their objections with the Government and the Opposition, and particularly with their local members so that representations can be made on their behalf and so that, at the end of the trial period, if an attempt is made permanently to adopt E.S.T. or to reintroduce daylight saving, the whole situation can be assessed. Although I raise doubts about the Bill and its effects, and although I have in the past said that I would not support a move for South Australia to go to E.S.T., I believe that any person with common sense would accept this Bill, introducing as it does daylight saving for a trial period, at least to see what effects this move has on the community generally. On that basis, I support the Bill, because I think it is a sensible move to assess the situation.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I join with the member for Flinders in opposing this Bill.

The Hon. L. J. King: What effect do you think this will have on the sex life of the wombat?

Mr. GUNN: I will leave it to the Attorney-General to investigate that matter, as I would be out of order in replying to his interjection. I do not intend to go into the technical details of this matter, as did the member for Flinders, who outlined all the aspects of it in an excellent manner. It being in the most westerly part of the State and the largest electoral district in South Australia, my district will be affected more adversely than will any other district. In this respect I refer particularly to its children, who must travel long distances to school. The member for Unley, who has interjected so much tonight, would not know anything about that. The Minister of Education has said that headmasters will be able to alter their time tables to ensure that unnecessary difficulties will not be encountered by schoolchildren in that area. However, I draw the Minister's attention to the fact that one child in the family may be catching a bus to a primary school while an older child in the same family may be catching another bus to a high school. It can be seen, therefore, that problems can arise in some cases. One instance that comes readily to mind is the township of Darke Peak where, after this year, the area school will close and there will be only a primary school.

It is interesting to note the absence of Government speakers in this debate. Obviously they are under instructions not to speak, not like members on this side, who are free to advance arguments on behalf of their constituents. Most of the major rural organizations in this State, such as the Stockowners Association and the United Farmers and Graziers of South Australia Incorporated, have expressed their concern at the effects that this legislation will have on the rural community in South Australia. I thought that the member for Adelaide, a former office-bearer in the Australian Workers Union, would support us, because this measure will affect members of his union, particularly those in the shearing industry. In his second reading explanation the Minister states:

> For many years, and especially since the end of the Second World War, industrial and commercial interests in South Australia have regularly and frequently made representations that South Australia should adopt Eastern Standard Time.

It seems that the Government will bow to the wishes of the industrial interests in South Australia and ignore the wishes of the primary producers, who have laid the foundations for the State and for Australia. When the Government gets this measure into effect, it will turn to Eastern Standard Time.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: There's nothing in this Bill about adopting E.S.T.

Mr. GUNN: This is only to soften up the people, and then the Government will turn to E.S.T.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Are you recommending adoption of that time?

Mr. GUNN: We are not recommending it. Although we know that the Government has said that the measure will apply only for a trial period of six months, we also know that this is just a softening-up process and that the change will be continued, to the detriment of country people. The Government has no regard for the wishes of country people. It could not care less about them. It has no regard for rural industry and is interested only in the city people and the industrial sections.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Does the same apply to your Leader, who supports this measure?

Mr. GUNN: He supports it with certain reservations. I have made the points I wish to make, and I repeat that I oppose the measure and I hope that, after the trial period, the Government will sympathetically consider the effect of the change on country people, particularly the small schoolchildren who have to travel long distances in school buses twice a day.

Dr. EASTICK (Light): My contribution will be short, as the situation has been explained well by other members on this side. No honourable member has yet referred to the problem that will exist for night sports—

Mr. Goldsworthy: Wombats got a mention!

Dr. EASTICK: —such as trotting and dog-racing. Whilst some members have said that there will be a problem associated with entertainment, such as out-door shows and drive-in theatres, there also will be a real problem associated with trotting meetings, because of shadows falling across the course. The Premier has said several times that one area in which the Government hopes to increase its income concerns the turnover in betting tax. Without doubt, this area will provide a worthwhile contribution to the State's economy. This is also spelt out in a document that has recently come before members.

The member for Florey, even if no other member opposite, would be fully conversant with the fact that a woolly goat acts even more like a woolly goat if it starts jumping shadows halfway around the course, and this is the situation that can occur in trotting. This will cause persons who patronize trotting to become unsure of the run that they will get for their money. The occasion will arise more frequently when races held in the early period of a trotting meeting, when there is still sunlight and when there are shadows across the course, will adversely affect the performance of horses. As a result, I suggest that trotting will have to start much later in the evening than it does at present, otherwise as a betting spectacle or as a betting venue the number of races on which people will bet with some certainty of result will change from the full seven or eight to possibly only the last four or five races of the night.

I know that trotting meetings are sometimes held during the day. The point I make (and it is a very real one for anyone who has anything to do with trotting) is that where there is provision for overhead lighting more shadows are cast across the course and this adversly affects the performance of horses. I am led to believe that the situation is exactly the same with dog racing, although I suspect that it is less of a problem with dogs than it is with horses. I say that from personal observation. Nonetheless, this is a factor that must be considered.

I appreciate the fact that because certain action was taken in the Eastern States it became necessary for the Government to act in the way it has acted. Anyone who has had business transactions with those States will realize that during the course of the day there is a loss of time, first in the morning of about half an hour, as between this State and the Eastern States. There is a further loss of half an hour in the late afternoon, and there is a period of between 1½ hours and two hours in the middle of the day when it is not always possible to make immediate effective communication with the Eastern States.

To permit the situation to proceed at a 1½ hours' disadvantage with the Eastern States, there would be a loss of 1½ hours in the morning and another 1½ hours in the afternoon, and for 2½ hours to three hours in the middle of the day there would be a communication problem. I do not suggest that it would be impossible, but there could be an ineffective communication period between this State and the Eastern States. This could total about five or six hours a day during the working period. One must also realize the situation that may arise concerning the embargo on the movement of aircraft from Adelaide Airport outside certain hours. Also, I appreciate that if this 1½-hour gap was allowed to persist there could be other communication problems.

The only persons in my district who have approached me about this matter are those who are opposed to the introduction of this proposal. Many names of constituents in my district and in the District of Kavel are contained in a document, which cannot be presented to the House because it is not in the required form. However, because these constituents have asked me to vote against the proposal, on their behalf I indicate that I oppose the Bill, even though I accept the practical difficulties that must be faced if it is not passed.

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): Perhaps we should discuss the history of daylight saving. When I was first elected a member of Parliament I was reminded by someone to be careful what I said because my words could be taken down in evidence and held against me.

Mr. Jennings: You won't be here long enough to have to worry about it.

Mr. BECKER: I remind the honourable member that the only way anyone can beat me is to cheat, and he is welcome to try. On September 17, 1968, as President of the Bank Officials Association, I began a campaign not only for salary increases but also for better working conditions for bank officers in South Australia, and part of our platform was that we should support the introduction of daylight

saving in this State. It is significant that the campaign was launched at Port Lincoln. It is therefore surprising to hear the remarks of the members for Flinders and Eyre.

I have the courage of my convictions, and I believe that daylight saving would benefit white-collar workers in South Australia. A union or association representative should be concerned about the health and welfare of the members of his organization, and we believed that daylight saving would benefit bank officers, white-collar workers, and blue-collar workers.

I cannot support the remarks of most members on this side in this debate, and I think the time has come when we should consider this matter of daylight saving seriously. It was first mooted in the United Kingdom, when William Willett started a campaign to alter clocks by one hour during the long days of summer. His views received considerable support, but it was not until 1916 that the Government, realizing that daylight saving would save fuel, decided to introduce it. From 1916 onwards daylight saving required Parliamentary approval each year, and that approval was always given. From Great Britain the idea spread to many other countries, until today it is practised in Brazil, China, Canada, Israel, Russia, the United States of America, the United Arab Republic and New Zealand. Great Britain has recently moved its clocks in advance for one hour for the whole year round and New Zealand has moved its clocks forward permanently by 30 minutes.

In Australia daylight saving operated during the First World War and the Second World War by virtue of the National Security Regulations. It was generally accepted that the purpose of daylight saving during war-time was to conserve power and to enable greater use to be made of manpower hours. At a conference of bank officers in 1968 it was decided to ask the Tasmanian delegates to provide a comprehensive report on the benefits of daylight saving.

The Minister's second reading explanation of this Bill does not go into sufficient detail. He may believe that, because New South Wales and Victoria have decided to introduce daylight saving, South Australia should automatically follow, but we should consider all the arguments, both for and against, that have been raised in this debate. Tasmania was the first Australian State to try daylight saving. As a former bank officer, I believe we should place on record the name of Mr. Steer, who promoted daylight saving in that State. He was a former bank officer who was elected to the Tasmanian Parliament. Unfortunately, he died about a fortnight before daylight saving was introduced into that State; he had fought for 11 years to get it. I sincerely hope that I do not suffer the same fate. Before making a final decision on daylight saving, the Tasmanian Parliament appointed a Select Committee to investigate the matter. Because the committee's findings are significant, I wish to quote the following extract from its report:

The most cogent arguments advanced by supporters of the daylight saving legislation lie in the fields of leisure and recreation. In furnishing evidence on behalf of the National Fitness Council of Tasmania, its Deputy Chairman, a medical practitioner, made the following comment: "Fitness, both physical and mental, is absolutely necessary for the fullest enjoyment of living; keeping fit has become a universal problem; as man has progressed from his primitive state to the comparative ease of modern living, his inventive genius has taken the hard work out of living, in the physical sense. Nature's cycle of effort and rest is not adequately provided for in the modern way of life."

So, daylight saving will provide more leisure time and the opportunity for people to participate in a greater amount of recreation. People who take sport seriously will have more time for practice and for preparing themselves for intense competition. The report continues:

The aspect of road safety was also presented and evidence supported the view that drivers were able to undertake longer journeys and complete them in daylight hours; that driving became more pleasant and the hazard associated with poor light was substantially reduced.

I do not subscribe to the theory advanced by the member for Fisher that people would leave the cities immediately after work and tear home. There is a theory, however, that daylight saving will benefit traffic on our roads when the workers return home. That leads to an area where there is a benefit from daylight saving—that most people who can finish work at 5 p.m. or 6 p.m. will be able to spend more time on the beaches and enjoy probably one of the best of our recreation facilities. I doubt whether anyone would dispute that swimming is one of the best overall sports for developing the body. Most people in the metropolitan area and people in certain country towns will be able to use the beaches beneficially for longer daylight hours. That aspect alone merits support for this Bill.

Of course, I recognize also the fact that the beach-side traders will benefit from this. Having worked at a branch where we had many beach-side traders and knowing that over the last three or four years only one season was

good, I think the beach-side traders will welcome the extra hour of daylight during the summer. So there are benefits for most people although there will be hardship for isolated people in the country areas. If the member for Eyre and the member for Flinders felt so strongly about the effect of daylight saving, I should have thought they would table an amendment to relieve the position in their districts. They could have done something about it if they felt so strongly. However, I do not live in their areas, and I will leave it at that.

The Tasmanian bank officials' report then deals with primary industry. It states:

Whilst it could be expected that the main opposition to daylight saving would come from the farming community it is most interesting to note that, at a recent plebiscite of the members of the Farmers', Stockowners' and Orchardists' Association, some 60 per cent voted in favour of the continuance of daylight saving. Moreover, the Tasmanian Farmers' Federation at their recent State Conference carried the following resolution:

"That if daylight saving is reintroduced conference strongly recommends that it be confined to a period of four months only, viz., November, December, January and February."

The conference defeated a previous motion strongly opposing daylight saving.

To sum up the pros and cons of the effects and opinions from the primary industries the Select Committee's report is most helpful and enlightening, and we quote:

Advantages submitted in evidence:

(1) More stock work and stock movement can be completed before the main heat of the day.
(2) Additional daylight is available for shepherding and shedding of sheep for the next day's shearing.
(3) Primary producers, their families and employees have better opportunity for travelling to cities and towns and return during daylight hours.
(4) It was claimed daylight saving increased rural productivity and gave greater opportunity for property repairs and maintenance.
(5) Rural workers were able to enjoy increased leisure time.
(6) Amateur apiarists found the additional daylight an advantage for handling bees.

Summary of disadvantages:

(1) The necessity to rise in darkness over a longer period.
(2) A longer working day.
(3) Considerable inconvenience to mothers of schoolchildren who travel by bus.

I think that has been adequately dealt with by the member for Eyre, and I sympathize with him in that respect. The report continues:

(4) Difficulty in settling over-tired children in daylight in warm rooms.
(5) Housewives in many cases obliged to prepare two meals in the evening.
(6) Family, as a whole, feels the strain of long hours.
(7) Over-tiredness affected efficiency.
(8) Social activities and meetings inconvenienced.

Dairy farmers were the strongest group in opposition to daylight saving.

I think it is only fair to consider the pros and cons dealt with in the Tasmanian Select Committee's report on daylight saving. The conclusions of the Select Committee were as follows:

That daylight saving provides additional leisure time for a very large section of the work force at no financial cost to the community.

I think that is most important. The conclusions continue:

That a shorter period of daylight saving would be acceptable.

That a further trial period is warranted.

The Bill before members provides for a trial period. The conclusions continue:

That the voluntary alteration of industry and business working hours to achieve daylight saving is not practical.

That, at the present time, the cinema industry has suffered substantial financial losses from the introduction of daylight saving.

I realize that proprietors of drive-in theatres will be severely inconvenienced by daylight saving. Possibly, instead of being able to show two films an evening, they will be limited to showing one feature film. The cost factor will have to be considered, but drive-in theatre operators will have an opportunity to show one film of a high standard, containing costs by having supporting featurettes. Drive-in theatre operators have my sympathy, but I think they can overcome their difficulty if they show initiative and accept the challenge. It will be interesting to see what is the position at the end of the trial period. The final conclusion is as follows:

That it would be an advantage if the Australian Capital Territory and Eastern States of the Commonwealth adopted a uniform policy of daylight saving.

Here we come to the crux of the reason for the Bill before us. New South Wales and Victoria having decided to introduce daylight saving, South Australia has been virtually forced into it; we have to go along with this whether or not we like it.

Since 1968 an argument has been put forward that we should also consider whether South Australia should adopt E.S.T. When I was a bank officer, I saw that we had to be realistic about this matter. We must recognize

the importance of competing in big business. The position with banking in the Eastern States was that when banks closed at 3 p.m. large companies found difficulty in placing their surplus funds on the short-term money market. At 2.55 p.m., there was terrific pressure in the Eastern States to remit surplus funds to South Australia. We had to get to South Australia before the banks there closed at 3 p.m. If there was a huge supply of surplus funds, we had to try to unload some of them in Western Australia. Because of the volume of business and funds in the Eastern States, if there was no need for the money the funds were sent across Australia in order to obtain the best rates available on the short-term money market. Business houses here were competing with companies in the Eastern States that sent money here, and the rate was slightly lower. The farther west across Australia the funds went, the more the rates dropped. There is, therefore, a good argument for South Australia to be on E.S.T., and this matter will have to be considered later. Indeed, it is only a matter of time before this House will be considering it.

Representing a seaside district, I realize that people in my district will obtain tremendous advantages when South Australia adopts daylight saving for this trial period. There will be more opportunities for recreation and for using the beaches, and people will be able to compete in many of the recreational sporting facilities which are at present provided in my district and which I hope will continue to be provided all over the metropolitan area. As society develops and improves, the working man will have more leisure time, and the onus will be on this Government to ensure that sufficient facilities are available to enable people to enjoy their leisure time, participating in the recreational activities of their choice.

I close by referring to a comment made by Mr. John Miles in the *Advertiser* of September 20, 1968, when, discussing the way we chase daylight hours, he said, "The easy availability of power and light has led people away from getting up and going to bed with the sun." I wholeheartedly support the Bill.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I rise to oppose the Bill, although I realize that South Australia has been placed in the hot seat, as a result of which those who favour the principle of daylight saving consider that they are justified in doing so. However, my district, a rural area that still supplies more than half of this State's export earnings, should be considered. I have listened with much interest to the arguments that can be advanced for and against this legislation. Some of the points that have been raised tonight have highlighted the problems that would be created in this State if there were a 35-hour working week. Similar problems to those that would arise in relation to daylight saving would arise if we had a 35-hour week.

Representing a rural district, I know that the primary producers commence work by the sun and finish by the sun, and they experience no difficulties. The member for Flinders has expressed concern as to how growers would deliver grain to the silos. However, that matter has already been discussed, and the General Manager of Co-operative Bulk Handling Limited foresees no problems in this regard, as his company will continue to work according to the clock, as it has in the past, and the co-operative's hours for taking grain from the primary producers will be extended as the need arises. True, the company will have to meet certain overtime costs, but it does this in most years in any case. It works beyond normal hours to take the grain from the growers when the pressure is on. As I have said, this Bill will not involve any problems regarding grain deliveries, so harvesting operations generally will not be affected.

Of course, the farmer has his social life as well as his chores, and this is where his problems will probably start. Mention of daylight saving reminds me of an experience I had on October 2, 1943. I spent my honeymoon at the Family Hotel, Glenelg, on the night of October 2 and we did not realize that daylight saving became effective on October 3 in that year, and we rose too late for our first wedding breakfast. We have not caught up with that honeymoon breakfast yet, but I hope that we will some day. The constituents that I am pleased to represent are far from satisfied with this legislation and, for that reason, I oppose the Bill.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): The Minister has explained that, after surveying the implications of daylight saving, the Government was virtually forced to introduce it, because Victoria and New South Wales had decided to implement it in those States. I take it from the Minister's explanation that New South Wales and Victoria acted without consulting South Australia. I live near the Victorian border and from time to time people from that blessed State ask when we intend to come into line with them and adopt E.S.T.

The action of the Eastern States in introducing daylight saving without consulting us shows scant courtesy, and it is like their cheek to act without consulting a sister State. If we did not comply, there would be a time difference of 1½ hours between South Australia and the Eastern States. I represent a primary industry area that includes dairying areas, and I have received representations from people who oppose the Bill. Obviously, from the tenor of the speeches that have been made, the Bill will be passed, but I protest at the action of the major States in going ahead in this way without consultation, in view of the discussions that have taken place over the years. I think the member for Hanson referred to this matter.

In this measure, we are now toeing the line. I admit the Minister's difficulty. The Leader has mentioned the curfew relating to aircraft movements over the city of Adelaide, and this position will be aggravated further. There will be grave disabilities for rural people.

The member for Rocky River spoke about the difficulties of harvesting crops and the delivery to the bulk handling facilities, but he suggested that these problems could be overcome. However, there will be disabilities inasmuch as some extra expense will be incurred: overtime payments will become necessary. The harvest will start earlier and, as people are now paid by the hour, additional expense will be involved. The fitting in of time tables will be difficult for the people I represent. Dairymen are not pleased about this change, as they will be kicking cows up while it is still dark. I do not know what irrigators will do, but they will have to adjust their irrigation times to combat the evaporation periods.

I do not think daylight saving will assist people living and working in the South-East. As this Bill is largely opposed to the interests of people I represent, it does not have my support. I do not know whether I belong to a dying race, but the people I represent always seem to be faced with a down-turn. Perhaps the member for Stuart will not be the white-haired boy in his district if he does not say something about this Bill. He is a back-bencher governed by the authority foisted on him by the front bench, but I do not know what the people out in the Middleback Ranges will have to say about this. No doubt he will be able to withstand any pressure brought to bear on him. I oppose this Bill, which the Minister has been forced to introduce by people in the Eastern States who have shown discourtesy to a sovereign State that has some real rights in the way it runs its affairs.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): It would be refreshing if a Government member spoke in this debate and even more refreshing if one or more Government members saw fit to vote in any way other than as a solid block on what is introduced by the front bench. I should have thought that this would occur with legislation in which there was a division of opinion in the community, but it seems that I will have to wait for that day. The Government has a large majority to play with, so one would have thought that one or two Government members could express their own opinions about the merits of this legislation. I oppose the Bill, particularly because opposition to it has been expressed to me by some of my constituents. Speaking personally, I would not think that this Bill would have any great impact on the life of a member of Parliament.

I shall not repeat all the points made by other members, but the farming community generally is opposed to the Bill. We must remember that the farming community contributes significantly to the economic welfare and standard of living of people in the metropolitan area. Although country people are in an electoral minority (and would be in an even smaller minority if the Government had its way) they deserve serious consideration—consideration that they do not get from this Government. The member for Rocky River said that there might not be great difficulties in connection with harvesting under a system of daylight saving. However, wheat farmers have told me that sometimes, particularly when there is a heavy dew, it is necessary to delay harvesting until late in the morning. This Bill means that those farmers will have to delay harvesting even longer.

I think there will be difficulties for youngsters who have to travel long distances to school. No doubt on the advice of departmental officers, the Government is pursuing its policy of closing small country schools for economic and other reasons. Three schools in my electoral district have been closed in the last few years. A bus takes small children from Tungkillo to the Birdwood school, and the youngsters are picked up well over an hour before the school's starting time. I can see that this problem could be even more serious in areas where children travel even greater distances to school. The Government should bear this pertinent point in mind. I,

too, have seen the petition referred to by the member for Light. I think that 75 of the names on that petition were names of people in the Kavel District. The petition is not in a form suitable for presentation to this House, but any member who wants to see it can do so. Representations about daylight saving have come from various parts of the district; many of the people involved are associated with the dairying industry.

It has been pointed out to me that, if daylight saving is implemented and milking is done on a 12-hourly basis, milking will be done in the dark at one end of the day and in the heat of the day at the other end, which is considered to be most undesirable. I know that many of these points have been canvassed already. I will not venture into the area of night sports, which have been dealt with ably by the member for Light. I am merely putting the points of view of the people I represent here, as we all should. For this reason, I oppose the Bill.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): Briefly, I will reply to one or two points made during the course of the debate. First, I thank honourable members for their contributions, with one or two exceptions. Those members opposite who support the Bill receive, of course, my support for what they have said. I appreciate the fact that other honourable members have expressed concern at the difficulties that may be created by the passage of this Bill. However, their fears may prove to be unfounded. One or two other members of the Opposition oppose the measure simply because the Government has introduced it. However, I think most members recognize that the Government introduced this Bill because of action taken by other States, an action that I deplored. Once we have had the trial period that this measure envisages, I hope that on the next occasion the Ministers meet to determine what has happened in New South Wales, South Australia, Queensland, the Australian Capital Territory and Western Australia they will discuss this matter in a proper way and determine jointly what should happen in the future without the two major States making a decision and then calling a meeting of Ministers to discuss it.

I am afraid that I cannot answer the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition on this Bill because I could not understand them. However, one matter is deserving of reply. He criticized the Government for introducing the Bill and asking the House to debate it this evening on what I think he regarded as a "flimsy excuse". It is necessary for this measure to be dealt with and approved by both this House and another place because other legislation depends upon it. That is why we asked the House to deal with it this evening, and it is important that we should do so. It is not, as the Leader said, a "flimsy excuse".

I refer to one matter that the member for Fisher raised when he pointed out that the passage of this Bill could well result in an increase in road accidents. I point out to him that the evidence given to the Tasmanian Select Committee on this matter is to the contrary, because one passage of the report states:

> The aspect of road safety was also presented and evidence supported the view that drivers were able to undertake longer journeys and complete them in daylight hours; that driving became more pleasant and the hazard associated with poor light was substantially reduced.

That is a fairly obvious answer to the point raised by the honourable member. It would seem evident to most people that the introduction of daylight saving would be more likely to reduce the number of accidents than increase that number. People represented by country members, especially those whose districts are farthest away from Adelaide, will perhaps be affected differently by this change than will be people who live in the metropolitan area, and the points made by those members have required their concern. It could well be that this first trial period will show up some of these problems and indicate whether they are real problems. I hope that the problem of getting children to school can be properly solved by people in the community. When we consider this matter later, no doubt we will look into how to overcome the problems that arise in the trial period.

The member for Light drew attention to the fact that the change would create a problem in the trotting and dog-racing field. This problem had occurred to me. However, I believe that the honourable member put forward his arguments too strongly. Most members will realize that in relation to dog-racing other States successfully operate meetings. South Australia has regular day-time trotting meetings. When I have attended summer trotting meetings, the first race has always been run in daylight, with no lights on.

Dr. Eastick: How many people bet on it?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am not able to give figures on that, and the honourable member was not able to give them, either. From my observations, I would say that

probably the betting on those races would not be as significant as that on races held later in the evening. I point out to the honourable member that if these clubs believe that the change will cause them difficulty they can possibly put the meetings back half an hour. Although I do not believe that this problem will be as great as the honourable member has suggested, we will have to examine it after the trial period. I thank members for their contributions to the debate.

The House divided on the second reading:

Ayes (30)—Messrs. Becker, Broomhill (teller), Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Curren, Evans, Groth, Hall, Harrison, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, Mathwin, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (9)—Messrs. Allen, Carnie, Eastick, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn (teller), Rodda, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dunstan and Hopgood. Noes—Messrs. McAnaney and Nankivell.

Majority of 21 for the Ayes.

Second reading thus carried.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Advance of time."

Mr. COUMBE: The Minister of Environment and Conservation did not say in his second reading explanation why 2 a.m. had been chosen as the time at which South Australia's clocks should be altered. So that the people will know why this time was selected, will the Minister give the reasons therefor?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): The time of 2 a.m. was selected as the time when the clocks would be altered because that time would have the least effect on the community, particularly in relation to transport and shift workers.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (4 to 6) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.34 p.m. the House adjourned until Thursday, September 16, at 2 p.m.