HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, October 4, 1972

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

PETITION: INDUSTRIAL LEGISLATION

Mr. CARNIE presented a petition signed by 91 persons expressing concern at the apparent intention of the Government to introduce an Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Bill to protect unions and union officials from the normal processes of the law, and praying that the House of Assembly would not vote this Bill into law.

Petition received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CAR DEALERS

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I ask leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Yesterday I replied to a question from the member for Fisher, who had asked why officers of the Department of Labour and Industry did not take action to stop the practice of secondhand car dealers trading on Sundays. In answering this specific question, I unfortunately gave the impression that it was lawful for used cars to be sold on Sundays, and a report to this effect was published in this morning's *Advertiser*. Although, as I have explained, there is nothing that inspectors of the Department of Labour and Industry can do to prevent used car lots opening on Sundays, it is a breach of the Secondhand Dealers Act for secondhand motor vehicles to be sold by a secondhand dealer on any Sunday or public holiday.

Any used car dealer who attempts to do business on Sunday will therefore be committing a breach of the Secondhand Dealers Act, which is administered by the Police Department and not by the Department of Labour and Industry. Therefore, I have drawn the matter to the attention of the Chief Secretary and asked him to see that the police take action to ensure that secondhand car dealers do not trade on Sundays and public holidays.

QUESTIONS

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I should like to ask a question of the Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Are you going cross-eyed?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I beg your pardon?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: What's this about being cross-eyed?

Members interjecting:

Mr. Venning: Order!

Mr. Payne: Who is the Deputy Speaker over there?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: If I can get on with the question: can the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether the march of members of the builders labourers union to his office this morning was connected with the current campaign by that union to compel workers in the building industry to join the union, or, if it was not, what was its purpose? I understand that a wireless report indicated that a march of about 100 members of this union took place this morning to the Minister's office. Reports have received publicity in the past few days, and I have received privately reports from several sources—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —about the efforts of the builders labourers union to compel those employed in the industry to join it, by putting pressure on employers and telling them that, unless their employees join the union, supplies will be cut off. As the Minister knows, I understand—

Mr. Langley: Are you a member of the Law Society?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Well, maybe the member for Unley supports this sort of thing.

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order, and I ask the member for Mitcham to co-operate in maintaining Standing Orders.

Mr. Jennings: Question!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I point out that—

The SPEAKER: Order! "Question" has been called: the honourable Minister of Labour and Industry.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I met a deputation this morning from representatives of unions involved in the dispute in the concrete and building industry. I also spoke to representatives of the management of Albion Reid (South Australia) Proprietary Limited. In view of the seriousness of the matter and the possibility of a further extension of the dispute, I arranged for both parties to go before the Industrial Court to settle the issue. I am most grateful for the co-operation of the President of the Industrial Court, who called a conference at 12 o'clock today; I understand the case is still proceeding. As I do not know the outcome of the case at this stage, I can make no further comment, for the matter is now before the court.

FISHING LICENCES

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Minister of Works obtain from the Minister of Agriculture a report on alleged trading in fishing licences? Honourable members will be aware that the new regulations restrict the number of licences that may be issued in each of several categories, such as crayfishing, prawning, and so on. It has been alleged that recently a boat and its licence were purchased for $50,000. Even allowing for a generous estimate of $28,000 as the value of the boat and equipment, the value placed on the transfer of the licence that went with the boat was about $22,000. Although I appreciate that an individual must apply for a licence, it is understood that the situation exists wherein the licence can be transferred, as the large sum paid for the boat I have mentioned indicates. I believe that it is not in the best interests of young people in this State who may wish to go into the fishing industry to have to compete with people who can pay an exorbitant sum for a boat, believing that they can obtain (or actually are obtaining) the licence that goes with the boat.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I share the Leader's concern about this matter. As he knows, I represent all the fishing ports in the South-East of the State, and I have heard reports of cases similar to that referred to by the Leader. I point out that these regulations were drawn up shortly after the industry was closed, in an attempt to prevent this type of practice. I think that the Leader will appreciate that, no matter what legislative action is taken, transactions can always take place under the counter, so to speak. Under the regulations, I understand that the Director and Chief Inspector of Fisheries places a reasonable value on a vessel, and he should determine (and I will have this checked) whether or not the transaction has been based on a sum close to the value assessed by him. Nevertheless, activities can take place behind the scenes that can easily be covered up. This is an extremely difficult problem, and I would appreciate hearing any suggestions that the Leader might care to make in order to assist in this regard. I am not placing any responsibility on the Leader, or on any other member of this House, in that respect, but it is a serious problem and it has the effect of preventing young people from engaging in the industry. Even though these people may have some claim to owning a vessel and may have acted previously as a deck hand or skipper, they may be precluded from entering the industry because of the exorbitant sums being asked for the vessels concerned.

The simple solution would seem to be to throw open the industry again, but that would have dire results, because we would face the situation that we were fast approaching in 1967, when fisheries were being fished out because they had been over-established. We cannot afford to allow that sort of situation to develop again. However, I will certainly take up the matter with the Minister of Agriculture, who is responsible for this industry, and ask him for a report, which I will bring down for the Leader as soon as possible.

RADIO WARNINGS

Mr. LANGLEY: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say at what stage it is intended that air pollution potential alerts will cease and will be replaced by fire ban announcements? I am sure that, since air pollution potential alerts, as well as fire ban announcements, have been operating the public has co-operated greatly, and I am sure that for many people it is important to hear these radio announcements and to know that they are doing the right thing. Indeed, I am sure that if these announcements continue to be made at suitable times during the day this situation will continue in the future.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The date on which air pollution potential alerts will cease has not yet been finalized. The period during which fire ban warnings are made usually commences at about the end of October each year and, as was the case last year, it is intended that when fire ban warnings

are introduced this year the A.P.P. alert system will cease. The reason for this is that it is considered that confusion could arise if both sorts of announcement continued, as people who heard that there was no A.P.P. alert might think that it was all right, from the point of view of air pollution, to burn rubbish in their incinerators when, in fact, there might be a fire ban on the same day. During last summer it was noticed, after the position had been examined, that, had the system of A.P.P. alerts continued through the summer, when the system of fire ban announcements was in operation, an announcement would have been necessary on only five days during this period and, therefore, there would not have been much advantage in continuing the A.P.P. alert system.

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION

Mr. CARNIE: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport reconsider allowing motorists to have motor vehicle registration numbers of their own choice? In July, 1970, the member for Hanson asked a similar question of the Minister and said that in New South Wales, on the payment of a special fee of $25, motorists could obtain a special combination of letters and numbers. In his reply, the Minister said that under the South Australian method of issuing registration numbers this would not be practicable, and he concluded his reply by saying:

Clearly, there is no purpose in upsetting a very satisfactory system merely to emulate New South Wales or to sell gimmicks.

A report in last Monday's *Australian* states:

Personalized car number plates have raised more than $600,000 for accident research in New South Wales, the Minister for Transport (Mr. Morris) said yesterday. The black and white plates, costing $25 each, have been sold to more than 24,000 motorists intent on having their initials on their car. The money raised by the sale goes to the Department of Motor Transport's traffic accident research centre in Sydney.

I do not believe—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The amount of money that the New South Wales Government has raised in this way is commendable and, undoubtedly, it has been put to good use. I have had the privilege of seeing the accident research division in that State, and it is certainly doing a good job. I suppose that, on that basis, one could say that the raising of money in such a way was justifiable. However, I point out to the honourable member that, under legislation that I introduced about 12 or 18 months ago, in South Australia motor car owners already contribute 50c per annum for road safety purposes, and I hope that the honourable member, with other members of Parliament, will see, at the opening of the Road Safety Instruction Centre on October 17, the work being done in this way.

Mr. Carnie: You won't knock back more, will you?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No, and I am also certain that the Road Safety Council will not, because the council still has a tremendous job, which it is tackling in an extremely commendable way. I fully appreciate this work. I think the honourable member has not considered the system now used by the motor vehicle authorities in Australia to allocate registration numbers. Each State has been allotted a specific section of the alphabet for use in issuing registration numbers within the State, and the newspaper report about New South Wales ignores the point that that State already is in serious difficulty regarding the allocation of numbers, because the authorities have used almost all the combinations that can be formed from that State's section of the alphabet. The system that is in operation there is not assisting in any way at all. We in South Australia are in an extremely good position, and I do not think that our practice should be changed. The other point I make is that I do not consider that there is any value in this gimmicky sort of situation that is suggested regarding special *alpha numero* registration numbers. I have no desire to have registration number GTV-000, or something like that, for my car: I am pleased to accept the number that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles allots to me. I have never had put to me a submission with sufficient substance in it to justify allocating a special registration number to a special person for a special purpose. If such a submission is made, the matter can be reviewed, but at this stage I see the New South Wales practice as only a gimmick. I congratulate the New South Wales Government on capitalizing on a few suckers, and the money obtained from those suckers has been put to good use.

SUMMONS SERVICE

Mr. RYAN: Will the Attorney-General consider reducing the period taken to serve a summons? On June 6, 1972, one of my constituents, who is a small business man, took

out a summons at the Port Adelaide court against another business, but service of the summons was not effected until August 23, nearly three months later.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will look into the specific case and see what complication caused this time lapse.

CORRESPONDENCE COURSES

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Education say what is the cost to the Education Department for each pupil undertaking correspondence courses in this State? The cost to the department for each child attending primary and secondary schools and the cost of school buses are clearly set out in the Auditor-General's Report, whereas the cost to the department of correspondence courses is not.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will look into the matter for the honourable member.

BUS TICKETS

Mr. HARRISON: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport consider re-examining the possibility of issuing transfer tickets on all metropolitan tramway trust bus service routes? It is common practice for trust feeder-bus services to carry passengers to a certain destination, passengers wishing to go beyond that destination having to pay another section fare on the next bus they take.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This is a matter that we are currently examining in depth, and I hope that we shall soon be able to introduce transfer tickets in South Australia as yet another step in our endeavour to encourage people to use public transport.

STURT CREEK

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Works a reply to my question of September 28 concerning the maintenance of Sturt Creek?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The maintenance of the concrete-lined Sturt channel near the Alison Street bridge, Glenelg North, is the responsibility of the Engineering and Water Supply Department. At this point the ponded water level of the Patawalonga Basin covers the channel floor and an appreciable build-up of silt and rubbish has occurred from this point downstream to the basin. The situation is aggravated by eroded material washed down from earthworks and excavation associated with the construction of the channel at upstream locations. For this reason silt removal has been deferred pending completion of the construction programme. This is expected to be finalized within the next few months. It is also expected that the level of the Patawalonga Basin will be lowered for approximately three days in a month's time to assist part of the Patawalonga works. This will provide an opportunity to remove some of the silt that has accumulated. On completion of all construction works a programme will be instituted to tackle the overall problem of cleaning the channel.

SURREY DOWNS SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to the question I asked on September 19 concerning a major addition in Samcon construction at the Surrey Downs Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The addition proposed to the school consists of four classrooms in Samcon construction. Tenders are to be called in October this year and the availability date is shown as June, 1973. Provided there are no unexpected delays, it is hoped that this date can be achieved.

MITCHELL PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain information about the projected commencing date and building schedule of work on the new solid-construction building that has been approved for Mitchell Park Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will obtain what information I can for the honourable member.

SCHOOL BOOKS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of September 19 about the supply of mathematics textbooks for primary schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The history of this matter shows that the new mathematics was introduced in its entirety into all grade 3 and 4 classes in 1969. In successive years, it was introduced into grades 5, 6, and 7. Two series of textbooks were specially written for the course. They were published and issued in successive years to coincide with the introduction of the new course at a particular grade level. In the first year of issue to a grade level, a school received an equal number of books from each series to meet its requirements for that grade. In subsequent years, it was supplied with books of its choice on a sufficient scale to provide the whole class with the same textbook, if the school so desired.

In 1972, the introduction of the new course to grade 7 was completed; therefore, the problem of new issues of mathematics books will not rise in 1973. The reasons for supplying schools with equal numbers of each mathematics textbook in the first year of its issue are: (1) the mathematics course was introduced each year into successive grades only after experimentation and evaluation; (2) new textbooks for a grade level could not be written until the course for that grade had been proved; (3) this happened about 15 months before the new books were required for pupil use in schools, consequently the new books were not printed ready for delivery until two to three months before the course was introduced into all schools; (4) it is customary for headmasters to make out their orders for free textbooks in February each year, 12 months before the books are required for use. This is done in order to allow sufficient time for calling tenders and letting contracts for supplying them. Thus no grade 7 mathematics textbooks had been printed when headmasters made out their orders in February, 1971, for grade 7 mathematics books required for use in 1972; and (5) when tenders are let for textbooks, it is essential that the number of copies required be known, hence the policy of supplying each school with equal quantities.

MURRAY BRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Education say who is responsible for preserving buildings and equipment on the site of the old Murray Bridge High School, and who is the controlling authority for the grounds, including the tennis courts and the oval? It is obvious that when buildings are left without supervision they deteriorate: windows are broken, oil heaters damaged, and doors are broken open. Those who have been responsible through the high school council and the teaching staff in the past for the care and control of these buildings are unhappy to see them deteriorate to their present condition. Not only is an opportunity given to vandals to cause much damage but also, unless repairs are effected, there is the danger of fire when people are able to occupy such buildings. I understand that several educational and religious groups in the town are anxious to purchase the buildings. Can the Minister say what is the future of these buildings, and whether they can be purchased by local bodies to be used locally, not necessarily on the present site but after removal to other sites? The Minister would be aware that several groups of people have used the grounds and facilities in the past for netball, tennis, cricket, soccer, etc. People organizing summer sports are now interested in using these playing fields, and it seems that there is a need to establish an overall management committee. I am sure that the high school council would be willing to accept the responsibility if it could be given the management for a specified number of years, perhaps under a lease for five years or 10 years to control and manage the area. I am sure that the council would be willing to call all sporting groups together and form a management club or association. In this way someone would be responsible for watering and cutting grass on the ovals and generally taking care of the grounds.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Although the title of the land is vested in me as Minister of Education, the buildings are controlled by the Public Buildings Department. I will obtain detailed information about the plans for this school. We are planning to use part of the school, and I hope to be able to announce details soon. I appreciate that, if buildings are left unoccupied, it is an open invitation to vandals to damage them, and I appreciate the aspect of the honourable member's question about maintaining recreation facilities at the school so that they can be used by the community. I remind the honourable member that, when disposing of surplus buildings, we give priority to kindergartens, independent schools, and church and youth groups. Generally, we make the buildings available to these groups free of charge. They get priority for the use of the buildings, provided that they meet the cost of removing the timber buildings and restoring the site to a reasonably tidy condition. It is only after the requirements of these groups have been met that timber buildings are now sold for other uses. I will inquire also about that point and obtain a detailed report for the honourable member.

Mr. Wardle: Is it possible for people to apply now?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: They could apply, but I doubt whether an immediate decision on the disposal would be made now. I am willing to consider that matter also.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport, when conferring with the Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Peter Nixon) tomorrow, try to reach a formal agreement about the next stage of rail standardization in

South Australia? It is believed that, if agreement could be reached on some aspects of this project, a start could be made that would create employment for the unemployed persons about whom we hear so much from Government members. My colleague in the Commonwealth sphere (Senator Jessop) the other day raised this point; I believe it is a valid point in trying to have the project started.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I was amazed to hear the honourable member refer to Mr. Nixon as his Commonwealth colleague. I thought Mr. Nixon was a member of the Country Party—

Mr. Gunn: Hear, hear!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —and the honourable member is still a member of the Liberal and Country League, I think.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Be that as it may, I know that the honourable member will be delighted to know that the Commonwealth Minister for Shipping and Transport and I reached agreement about the standardization project about eight or nine months ago. I thought that the honourable member would have picked that up from my replies to earlier questions asked about the matter.

Mr. Venning: You should—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member cares to look back through *Hansard* at the replies given to questions he has asked about the matter, he will find that I have told him that the Commonwealth Minister and I met in Canberra, where we successfully determined broad guidelines of policy.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You don't mean to say you told him that, and he doesn't remember it?

Mr. Venning: I knew all about this. Get on with the job.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will try to get on with the job of explaining this to the honourable member, if he will sit quietly for a few more moments. After points of policy had been determined, the matter was referred to a committee, established with the concurrence of the Commonwealth Minister and me to work with consultants on details of the scheme. The committee is still working on those details and doing the necessary planning work. The consultants were due to bring down their report in, I think, August or September. However, because of the magnitude of the work and some of the unforeseen problems that have arisen, they are running a little behind schedule. I do not think the Commonwealth Minister and I can say or do anything that will produce this report any more quickly. The committee and the consultants know that the attitude of both Governments is that we want to get on with the job. However, obviously common sense must prevail. We cannot start the job until it has been planned properly and, until then, the agreement cannot be drawn up. Until the agreement is drawn up, ratifying legislation cannot be introduced in both Parliaments.

Mr. Hall: A space of five years has—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know what the member for Gouger is saying; perhaps it is just as well, because I would be out of order in replying to him. I have given the facts in relation to standardization. I hope the job will be started soon. I should be pleased to discuss the matter tomorrow with the Commonwealth Minister. As I understand it, the member for Rocky River has spoken to the Commonwealth Minister, who expects me to speak to him. Is that the position?

Mr. Venning: No.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Oh, the honourable member was just flying a bit of a kite, but that does not surprise me. The work will be proceeded with as soon as possible.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE

Dr. TONKIN: The Attorney-General has been kind enough to inform me that he has replies to six questions that I have recently asked. I am sure you, Mr. Speaker, would rule me out of order if I asked all six questions (although perhaps you would not) relating to such diverse subjects as amoebic meningitis, the treatment of drug and alcohol addicts, and so on. Since it happens to be private members' day, I intend to ask for the reply to only one of my questions.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Aren't you allowed to ask the others? The gag has been put on.

Dr. TONKIN: There are more important things, even though the Minister does not think so. Has the Attorney-General a reply to my recent question about the Flinders Medical Centre?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Chief Secretary states that the financial provision of $20,555 in the Estimates for 1972-73 provides for the salary of the hospital administrator and office assistants who are already employed, as well as for two senior nursing staff whom it is intended to appoint later in the financial year. Previously, the administrator was included under "General Planning and Development". A temporary planning office has now been provided on the site area of the Flinders Medical Centre, and this building houses a planning group from the Public Buildings Department as well as the Hospitals Department staff. There is a very considerable amount of detailed planning of specific hospital services, and the hospital officers referred to in the Estimates will advise on, discuss, and co-ordinate the detailed services requirements with the Public Buildings Department architects and consultants. The role of the proposed senior nursing staff will be to plan the detailed nursing services, nurse training, and staffing proposals. If an initial staff of trained and student nurses is to be available by the time the centre is to be opened, it will be necessary to commence planning of nursing services and recruitment and training of student nurses well before that date.

ADDITIONAL LEAVE

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Roads and Transport clarify his reply to my Question on Notice (it appears at page 1373 of *Hansard*) about additional leave granted to transport workers in this State? Concern has been expressed to me by the leaders of rural industry in this State about the following part of the Minister's reply:

> Therefore, the additional cost of the extra day's leave is estimated at about $65,000; that is about one-quarter of what the cockies would get three times a week.

The people who have spoken to me regard the latter part of that statement as rather unfortunate. They would like the Minister to clarify the statement, because they were worried that they might have been thought to be receiving hand-outs that they were not in fact receiving. They were sure that the Minister did not wish such payments to be made to them.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: This was a reply to a Question on Notice.

Mr. Gunn: That's right; that's what concerns me.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously an Opposition member had interjected and I was replying to that interjection, which is not included in *Hansard*, because the words at the end of this sentence do not fall into line. I will obtain another copy of the reply, although the honourable member should have the copy I previously gave him, and I suggest that he will find that those words are not included in that typewritten reply.

Mr. Hall: Did you say it?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must resume his seat. Far too many questions are being asked about questions that have already been asked, and the result is confusion. I will not allow these additional questions by way of interjection.

RIDGEHAVEN SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of September 21 about when tenders will be called for the building of an infants school at the Ridgehaven Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Tenders for the Ridgehaven Infants School building are to be called in October of this year and the availability date is shown as March, 1974. Provided there are no unexpected delays, it is hoped that this date can be maintained.

WHEAT QUOTAS

Mr. ALLEN: Has the Minister of Works obtained from the Minister of Agriculture a reply to my recent question about wheat quotas?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The method of determining quotas is laid down in the legislation, and the responsible authority is the Wheat Delivery Quotas Advisory Committee. An appropriate amendment to the Act could be considered for the future, but it is too late for the committee to increase quotas for this season. In any case, to increase small wheat quotas would achieve little in providing worthwhile additional quantities of wheat unless the increases were of significant proportions; and, generally speaking, these growers have small areas of land or are dependent to a large extent on other sources of income. Irrespective of the size of their quotas, all quota-holders will share equally, on a percentage basis, in any increase in the State quota which may be approved, on the recommendation of the Australian Wheatgrowers' Federation, by the Australian Agricultural Council for the 1973-74 season to build up depleted wheat stocks in this State.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COUNCIL)

Mr. HALL (Gouger) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to amend the Constitution Act, 1934, as amended. Read a first time.

Mr. HALL: I move:

That this Bill be now read a second time.

This is a simple measure, which should be non-controversial. It sets out to remove the bar to those under the age of 30 from standing for a seat in the Legislative Council, and it aims to make every person who is eligible to vote for that House also eligible to stand at an election for that House. This is a principle accepted by all other States in Australia that have elected Upper Houses. It should not be necessary to say that the Upper House does not belong merely to those who are members of it: it belongs to the public at large who elect members to it. However, as matters stand, the Legislative Council does not belong in a representative fashion to a person under the age of 30, because he is prevented from standing for office in that Chamber. The purpose of this Bill, therefore, is to remedy something which is a left-over from the nineteenth century. I said earlier that other States accept the principle that the age at which one may stand for an Upper House is the age at which voting applies in that State. The following table explains the position in those States:

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ELECTION AGE

Western Australia	18 years (amended in 1970, from 21)
New South Wales	18 years (amended in 1970, from 21)
Tasmania	21 years (amended in 1968, from 25)
Victoria	21 years
Queensland	No Upper House
Commonwealth Senate	21 years (in line with the voting age)

It is interesting to note that 18-year-old voting has been accepted by the South Australian Parliament as at July 1 this year. At that time the Legislative Council accepted the principle of the 18-year-old vote after a conference between the two Houses. In the Lower House, our Party decided to support 18-year-old voting in this State, when the Commonwealth passed similar legislation. However, the Council did not insist on that proviso. Consequently, any attitude expressed concerning this Bill does not involve the rights or wrongs of 18-year-old voting, which has been accepted fully and freely by both Houses. People over 18 years in this State are adult citizens. In putting forward such legislation as this, one must try to anticipate what the criticism of it might be. I have already heard several people say that the Upper House is a House of Review, and therefore needs more mature people to consider legislation that comes from this House. The answer to that, however, is that the Upper House is not at present solely a House of Review, because some of our legislation is still initiated in it.

There can be no doubt, however, that the South Australian Upper House has enormous power by any standards. In this State the power is equal to, and in one respect greater than, that of the House of Assembly. It is only proper, therefore, that all electors should be represented in that House, and there are obviously many people in South Australia between the age of 18 and 30. In fact, the proportion in this category is about 20 per cent. No argument can justify the exclusion of these people or an exclusion of their representatives from a House which possesses such powers as those of the Legislative Council. There is little basis for the more conservative members' fears that we might have an Upper House largely composed of immature people. I suggest that the practicability of being elected to the Upper House will obviously inhibit from entering it anyone who does not have substantial public support. There are two ways of becoming a member: a person either proceeds through the Party preselection system, and then through a general election; or he proceeds without Party support, as an Independent, to the general election. There is no doubt that the path of an Independent is much harder to follow than the one that involves Party preselection.

Let us ask ourselves, however, at what age is a person suitable to be a member of an Upper House. Is age itself in every case significant? Some members of this House, as well as of the other House, were largely devoid of political expertise when they entered Parliament, and they have acquired their usefulness since that time. I suppose it is true that some people would never make a member of Parliament, whether they were 18 years

old or 80 years old. If there is a disability in relation to age, it should apply at either end of the scale, that is, at 18 years or 80 years. I am personally attracted to the view that there should be a retiring age for politicians, and I am pleased that our Party has now adopted this course.

It is fair to say that it is most unlikely that we would see a greater proportion of members of the Upper House under the age of, say, 25 than of people in the general community who are under the age of 25. To oppose this Bill is to demean our view of the effectiveness of the 18-year-old vote itself. There are enough safeguards in the general electoral situation to prevent any deterioration in the general standard of the work of the Upper House as the result of the passage of this Bill. Indeed, I hope that any alterations made to the Constitution are aimed at improving the standards of the Upper House.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEADOWS ZONING REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Evans:

That the Metropolitan Development Plan, District Council of Meadows planning regulations (zoning), made under the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1971, on July 6, 1972, and laid on the table of this House on July 18, 1972, be disallowed.

(Continued from September 13. Page 1284.)

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I oppose the motion. The member for Fisher has made it difficult for me to answer what he has said about this matter because it seems that, having advanced various arguments during the course of his remarks, he immediately proceeded to destroy those arguments. As a result, I suspect that the honourable member appreciates the weaknesses in his case but has considered it desirable to move the motion because he has presented several petitions to Parliament on behalf of his constituents. It may well be that the member for Mitcham will be in a similar position later in the debate.

First, it seems that the petitioners are trying to create a situation in which the Minda Home area (or Craigburn, as we know it) should be zoned so that the open space in the area will be maintained and will be available to the community in the future, not zoned so that development can take place in the area. I do not think that any member can argue against that basic point. The letter supporting the petition, which the member for Fisher has quoted, states that Craigburn at present is a beautiful large open tract of land and that we must ensure that it is kept for future generations to enjoy. The honourable member has also said that. Therefore, he and the petitioners are saying that the area would be useful for open space and that, to achieve that, Parliament should disallow the regulations.

I ask members to regard this principle seriously, because any Government must consider the likely use of any land in the State. As the Minister responsible for purchasing open space and national parks, I must consider whether areas are necessary from the public point of view and whether we ought to retain them for use by the community. If an area passes all the tests and is open space that is required, the Government must purchase it. We should not take the action suggested, namely, to open the area—

Mr. Evans: I think I have made three suggestions.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I am referring to the suggestion that the petitioners have made. This Government has not been backward when studies have shown that land ought to be preserved for the community, and we have acted on several occasions. I refer to the Hallett Cove area, where, because of the unique geological features, the Government decided that it should be preserved and a decision to acquire the land was made. Further, the Government recently stated that it considered that additional open space was required in the Para Hills area, and we purchased stock paddocks and other land there.

In the past two years we have spent over $2,500,000 to purchase open space. This is a field to which previous Governments have not been committed financially. This Government has moved rapidly towards purchasing planned open space areas. In addition, over $1,500,000 has been spent on national park purchases in the past two years, and recently the Minister of Local Government stated that a record sum of about $800,000 had been allocated to provide public parks. I do not think anyone can justly criticize this Government for not providing open space where it is required.

The National Parks and Wildlife Service, at my request, undertook a considerable test of the area in question. I asked the service to consider the importance of this area from the point of view of the features involved and to consider whether it was important to purchase it as a conservation park or national

park. The advice from the service is clear, namely, that, whilst it is desirable to preserve the Sturt Gorge and the rugged parts of Craigburn that adjoin the gorge, the remainder of the land is cleared and is not significant for national park purposes.

On that information, the Government had to decide whether it should purchase the land for open space or national park purposes, for use by the community. Frankly, the cost and type of land in the area do not meet the tests that properly should be applied before the Government purchases it as a priority. It seems wrong to suggest that the Government should purchase the area to prevent building development there so that the land will be available for future generations. Even if we disallowed these regulations and continued to zone the area for special use, it still would not be available for public use. People would not be able to visit the area, picnic on it, and do the other things that the petitioners want to have it availabe for.

The honourable member has stated that he appreciates the difficulties that the proposal would place on councils if we agreed to disallow the regulations. However, I am not sure that he does appreciate those difficulties. Members ought to realize that these regulations have been on public display and the council has considered objections and approved the regulations in their present form. They have been referred to the State Planning Authority, which is responsible for seeing that they comply with the objectives of the development plan. Having passed that test, they were approved by the Government and referred to the Subordinate Legislation Committee. That committee also approved them and now Parliament is asked to approve them finally.

Disallowance of the regulations would involve the councils in recommencing the procedures of public display, as well as the other procedures involved. The promulgation of regulations in this important and developing part of the metropolitan area would be delayed for many months, and the Meadows council specifically would be bitterly concerned at that, because for many years it has been considering these proposals. If we took this step, I believe the problems that would result would be far greater than the honourable member indicated during his remarks on the matter. Even if we did take this step and indicated that we were dissatisfied with these regulations, there would be no certainty that, after the disallowance and after the matter was referred to the council and all these steps had been taken again, we would not have an identical set of regulations brought to us again. The member for Fisher claimed that this area was originally zoned for special uses in the 1962 development plan, and this meant that the community was assured that the area would remain in its present open state indefinitely.

The Meadows regulations now before the House allocate most of the Craigburn land within its council area to an R1 zone, whilst the Mitcham regulations allocated over 40 per cent of the Mitcham portion in a "special uses" zone with the remainder in a Rural A zone. Much of the criticism of both sets of regulations has been based on the fact that the 1962 Metropolitan Development Plan allocated Craigburn in a general "special uses" category and development thereof for urban purposes was not planned. In fact, when the Metropolitan Development Plan was prepared, it was understood that the Craigburn property would remain in its present institutional use. The "special uses" category was designed to reflect this type of private open space. It was not intended that the allocation of land in this category should operate in effect as a confiscation of development values. In fact, such an intention would have been inconsistent with the law as it stood then in 1962, and indeed as it stands today. Section 29 of the repealed Town Planning Act, repeated in section 61 of the Planning and Development Act, provides for the proclamation by the Governor of private land as open space, but only on application of the owner of the land.

Members will appreciate that the reason for the "special uses" category being placed in the 1962 plan was not to freeze development in the area. In this regard I refer to the stock paddocks at Gepps Cross as another typical example of what was done in 1962 and an indication of what was in the mind of the planners at that time. The stock paddocks and the Craigburn property were being used in a way that was obviously going to continue for many years and, rather than establish a situation where development plans or other planning for that area should be undertaken in 1962 (in an area where it seemed unlikely that development would take place), these two areas were simply zoned for special uses. It was clearly not intended to restrict the development of these areas.

The report to which I have referred from the National Parks and Wildlife Service should also be borne in mind, because it referred to the desirability of obtaining this land for

public park purposes. The report indicated that the land did not pass the test normally applied to determine the usefulness of an area. However, it was made clear that the gorge itself and the rugged areas adjoining it should be preserved in the interests of the community. I point out that it is desirable that the complete Sturt Gorge (not only that part running through the Craigburn property) and the rugged areas to which I have already referred should be included in a recreation park at a future date, and steps have already been taken towards this end. Ideally, such a park will extend from Darlington to Coromandel Valley. Between Darlington and the flood control dam 192 acres has already been obtained by the Government and the Government is in the process of obtaining a further 138 acres in the immediate future. In this way the buffer open-space function will be preserved as a principle of the Metropolitan Development Plan.

I have made clear in replying to questions in this House that, if at some time in the future the present board of Minda Home intends to develop the land (and this is unlikely), the present board of the home has indicated that it will hand over 40 per cent of the total area to the Government free of cost. It is obvious that the 40 per cent that the Government would require would be that area comprising the gorge and the rugged area surrounding the gorge to tie up with the total project of the recreation park extending through the total length of the gorge. The honourable member said that basically his reason for moving the disallowance was to enable the matter to be held over so that discussions could take place with the council, so that a map could be drawn to show exactly what would happen to the 40 per cent or any other additional land that the Government considered desirable to have, so that the plan could be brought back to Parliament, and so that everyone would know what part of the area would be preserved. Then the regulations could be proceeded with. I do not believe, however, that this is a strong reason for disallowing the regulations.

Mr. Evans: It is to the people of the area.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I do not know that it is even to the people of the area. I suggest that it would help them if the honourable member explained to them clearly that the land the Government would require if development ever took place in the area would be in the gorge and surrounding areas.

Mr. Evans: You cannot speak for future Governments.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It is only common sense that, if this Government or a future Government allows development to take place and does not take the 40 per cent of the land involving the gorge and the surrounding areas, the Government concerned would be placing itself in a situation where the community would have something to say about it, so I do not think that that is a sound argument at all. The honourable member made clear that he believed the recreational possibilities of the area should be fully exploited, but I repeat his statement that the Government has been active in providing open space in the area generally. The honourable member used this point as a complaint when he said that the Government had been too active in this area and that it had provided too much open space.

Mr. Evans: I said that the provision of so much open space had resulted in the loss of rates.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: It should be remembered that within the Meadows area we also have Cox's Scrub Conservation Park, Mount Magnificent Conservation Park and Kyeema Conservation Park. It has been said by several people (including the honourable member) that the use of the Craigburn area as a park would relieve the pressure on Belair National Park. That is a reasonably valid point, because that park does have too many visitors during the year. However, to offset that, the Government has announced that, in addition to other Hills park purchases, priority is being directed toward the purchase of land at Cherry Gardens (or Scott Creek as it is sometimes called) for the purpose of reducing the number of Belair visitations. At present 883 acres of an intended 1,300 acres has been acquired in that area, which is most attractive for recreational park development and which is close enough to the city and to National Park, Belair, to act as a secondary national park area for the metropolitan community. I do not deny that there has been a reaction from the public following the announcement that it was possible (by the passage of zoning regulations) that in future Craigburn could be developed, but the same reaction has occurred in other areas.

We had a similar reaction from the community at Campbelltown when it was suggested that market gardens would be developed in future: we had a reaction when Penfolds announced that its holding would be

sold and the area it was using for vineyards was likely to be developed. We had a similar reaction at Para Hills, and we had it when other areas such as Foxfield were developed in recent years. Because of the increase in population, the reduction in the number of building blocks available within the metropolitan area, and the need for development to move away from areas recently developed, people have noticed the disappearance of many of the open areas that they have always tended to consider as part of their environment, which they think should continue to be open space. Because of the pressures from the community concerning all these aspects, it has become evident to me that the open-space provisions contemplated in 1962 (when it was considered that the areas would be large enough to cater for the future open-space needs of the community) have not been readily accepted by the community.

Many people consider that we should have more open-space areas than were contemplated in the 1962 development plan. I have discussed this matter with the State Planning Authority, which has agreed to undertake a study to establish whether or not we have planned for sufficient open-space areas, and the authority is now examining the total metropolitan area to determine what additional open-space areas should be provided. However, that examination does not help the present problem. What I am suggesting to honourable members is that to accept the proposal to disallow these regulations so that zoning conditions applying to Craigburn cannot proceed is not the correct way for Parliament to determine where recreation or open-space areas should be situated in future. I ask members to consider carefully my remarks and to oppose the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE secured the adjournment of the debate.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Hall:

That in view of the hardship caused by the unfair incidence of death duties on those who have inherited businesses or farming properties, the Government should this session introduce legislation to adjust and reduce succession duties to enable individuals dependent on those concerns to earn a reasonable living from them.

(Continued from September 27. Page 1627.)

Mr. BECKER (Hanson): In supporting this motion, I believe that no-one likes to pay taxes, and certainly no-one likes to pay taxes on something that he inherits. Probably no tax has been more discussed than succession duties have been. It seems that, somewhere in our system of taxation and raising revenue, we have created an extremely distasteful situation. We have created a tax that has been used by Governments to discourage people from passing on to their survivors the results of their life's work. If someone works hard and builds up a sizable asset, such as a farm, by pioneering the country, and then decides to leave his property to members of his family, he believes that he has provided for them.

What he does not know is that, when he dies and his survivors take over, they face a greater task than he in developing the property, because they must pay succession duties. This is the crux of the problem: we are not doing enough to encourage this type of development and we are not encouraging people to pass on the result of their life's work to their survivors. This situation has become more apparent since the present Government was elected to office. An article in the *Advertiser* of December 4, 1970, under the heading "Industry warns on duties", states:

South Australia's major industrial and commercial organization yesterday attacked the Succession Duties Bill. The president of the South Australian Chamber of Manufactures (Mr. I. H. Seppelt) said the ownership of South Australia's productive capacity should remain in this State. If succession duties were made too steep there would be an increase in the trend for South Australian businesses to be taken over by companies in other States and overseas and the local operation being, at best, a branch operation.

We have seen this happen in the past few years, probably more rapidly than Mr. Seppelt contemplated. Many small wineries have disappeared from the local scene, having been purchased by foreign ownership, and many small businesses that were started in this State by pioneer families have passed into the hands of take-over merchants from other States and from overseas. The major reason for this situation is that people who build up a business can no longer afford to leave it to their survivors for their benefit. In some respects we are losing our heritage because of succession duties. The article continues:

Even in this latter situation, it was necessary that South Australia had cost advantages sufficient to offset the disadvantages of distribution costs. Eighty per cent of the State's manufactured goods had to be transported to the Sydney or Melbourne markets or sold overseas.

Anyone establishing a family industry in this State and then building it up has to compete

on the open market, and in this situation such peope are discouraged from remaining in this State, because they face this type of taxation. The motion asks the Government to introduce legislation to reduce the amount of succession duties paid by farmers and people who own small businesses. Probably nothing causes more heartache to most farmers in the State (and probably this has been accentuated in the last few years as a result of lower land values in the rural industry) than to see their properties carrying mortgages that amount to far more than the value of the property. Banks have experience of such cases, where the owner of a property on which there is a mortgage dies, leaving the property to his widow, who is then faced with a hefty succession duties bill.

The question then arises whether finance companies or banks should assist her to carry on in the hope that the property can earn enough for her to pay her way, or whether the property should be sold. The widow is probably used to living on a farm where her house, living conditions, and income have been reasonable. If the farm is sold, she then has to go on the pension and take whatever accommodation she can find. The whole question of succession duties must be re-examined. The idea of succession duties merely as a means of fund raising should be reconsidered. The Attorney-General's speech, as well as being abrupt, was inappropriate. At page 1626 of *Hansard* of September 27, he is reported as saying:

When this matter was last before the House I said that, if this State was to provide social and other Government services comparable with those provided by other States and to the extent the public expects, the State's taxes and charges must also be comparable. At present we are faced with the necessity of making up for the lower incidence of succession duties in this State by extra efforts, economies and efficiency elsewhere.

That is all very well, and we know we have had a social welfare Budget. We know that the Government's policy is to pursue the ideal of a welfare State, as part of its socialization of South Australia, but we should get our priorities in order in some respects. If people did not pay succession duties, there would not be money available for these purposes. If people cannot afford to pay succession duties, I cannot see why they should be continually taxed in this regard. On May 25, 1970, in reply to a letter written by the present Minister of Education on May 23 of that year, Mr. McEwin of North Adelaide wrote a letter to the editor of the *Advertiser*, part of which states:

I would have believed that South Australians of all shades of political opinion would prefer their future to be controlled by someone much closer to home than an imported academic who is the self-appointed arch-priest of the shabby and outmoded hard-left philosophies of the London School of Economics.

Mr. McEwin was commenting on succession duties generally. His letter continues:

These philosophies from the old world were conceived in humourless hatred and nurtured in jaundiced jealousy against a background that existed in England generations ago.

I think that sums up the whole approach and attitude of the present Government towards succession duties. It is taking this money from those who have earned it to provide for the future of the State.

Mr. EVANS (Fisher): I strongly support the motion. I have no doubt that the original concept of succession duties was necessary for, without this tax, one or two families would by now have owned most or the rural land in the State, and this would have been undesirable. I believe that in the case of rather substantial estates that are not necessarily wholly involved in one business it is still desirable to have succession duties, although perhaps not at the present rate. At present, for example, two families may provide for the future of their children in two different ways. One family may be able to send the children to university, having them qualify in a profession. The children can then expect a reasonable income for the rest of their lives. For instance, they could become lawyers and be guaranteed a reasonable income throughout their life.

The second family may decide to try to maintain and build up the family business. Therefore, the children may not continue at school for such a long period. Economic pressures could be such that it might be undesirable for the children to continue at school, and the family might benefit from the labour on the property of the children, who might leave school at an early age, putting their efforts into the family business, whether it be a farming, engineering, or building business, or any other business that could be described as being of middle size. I do not suppose that it is ever the case that members of a family who work to build up a business take out of that business in financial terms the proper reward for the work effort they have put into it. They have a loyalty to their

family and to the business. Some members have experienced that sort of situation, but those who have not had the experience would perhaps never be able to understand those circumstances.

If the father of such a family dies, the family faces a considerable bill for succession duties, and the value of the business is the result of their own work effort. In some cases, they cannot raise the money necessary to pay the duties, so they cannot continue the business. If it is a farming property, they may not have enough equity to pay the succession duties without reducing the size of the farm. Similar circumstances apply with regard to other types of business. People have to sell part of the business; immediately they do that it is no longer a viable proposition. In other words, we are taxing them out of existence. Provided that the rates are reasonable, I really have no objection to succession duties in relation to those in the higher income group who have enough assets to meet the commitment. However, it cannot be said that the rates are reasonable if a business is put out of operation.

In the case of a family that takes the opportunity (some families do not have this opportunity) to educate the children, those children, given good health, can go through life to retirement age without suffering at all. In the main, they will have been educated by the State, and it costs us, as a society, more than $20,000 to take a student through to graduation as a lawyer or doctor. I have shown the differences in the two cases I have cited. Some consideration should be given in relation to businesses of middle size when they are likely to be forced out of existence because of succession duties. I believe that the present basis for the assessment of succession duties is not fair. Unless a person engaged in farming has a substantial area of land and unless a person engaged in an engineering business has a fair annual return, the chances of surviving today under the present economic conditions are nil, especially if one is mortgaged to the hilt.

If we do not try to remedy the situation, we are merely encouraging monopolies to develop and we are forcing out of business the small man in the community who, in the main, is the real worker, who does not bludge on the rest of society, but who desires some reward for the efforts that he and his family have made in connection with their business undertaking. I support the motion in the hope that a more equitable system of succession duties can be introduced in this State, and I commend the member for Gouger for moving the motion.

Mr. HALL (Gouger): I thank members for their attention to this motion, which I take it will now proceed to a vote. I should like to think that Government members have been sufficiently impressed by the substance of the argument advanced from this side of the House to support the motion.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Did you read my speech?

Mr. HALL: No, I forgot to read it, but I took it that the honourable member would be supporting the motion, as I should have thought Government members also would be supporting it. However, I find from their attitude that Government members are even less sympathetic today to the predicament of those referred to in the motion, and I am sorry that it seems the motion will not be carried. If one takes a farming and grazing property as an example (although I realize that the motion is not directed solely to primary production), I ask which is the correct capital value to be applied this year when assessing succession duties. Should it be the value that applied in January when prices were at a low ebb, or should it be the value that will apply in November, after the rise in wool prices? This large variation, whether it applies to a farming property or to a family business undertaking, can have disastrous results for people who are trying hard to earn a living. An untimely death may occur in a family, and those inheriting the property in question may have no intention of realizing on its capital value; it is the people in these unfortunate circumstances who are worst affected by this tax. I believe that no fair-minded person should oppose this motion; indeed, I hope even at this late stage that Government members will have a change of heart and demonstrate their approval of the motion, which is moved for the most proper and humanitarian reasons.

The House divided on the motion:

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

Noes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Corcoran, Crimes, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, Payne, Ryan, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

NATIONAL PARKS

Adjourned debate on the motion of Dr. Eastick:

That the regulations (general) under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972, made on June 29, 1972, and laid on the table of this House on July 18, 1972, be disallowed.

(Continued from September 20. Page 1470.)

Mr. WARDLE (Murray): I oppose the regulations, mainly on the basis of two propositions. The first is the declaring of certain birds that are protected and the second is the keeping of records. The objections of several keen aviculturists in my district are based mainly on the keeping of two species, the scarlet-chested parrot and the princess parrot. The aviculturists society and associated societies comprise about 1,600 members, and this responsible group has made a submission to the Minister. I am wondering what weight the Minister has given to the evidence that these people place before the Subordinate Legislation Committee. Doubtless, other groups, such as the South Australian Ornithological Society, also gave information to the Minister and the committee. I ask the Minister how much consideration he has given to the submissions made and whether these submissions were considered when the regulations were prepared.

Dr. Eastick: Do you think one group may have got all the consideration and the other none?

Mr. WARDLE: I am reasonably neutral and unbiased towards any group. However, having read what the Minister has said and heard what other groups have submitted, it seems that one group received much consideration and most of its suggestions were incorporated in the regulations, whereas the suggestions by the aviculturists were largely disregarded. If that is so, it is unfortunate, because I regard the aviculturists as being practical people.

Surely, if anyone is considering the preservation of bird life in our State, these people are doing that. I do not think any group is more dedicated to preserving wild life species in this State. They claim that obviously many rare species will die out unless people such as aviculturists are allowed to breed them and dispose of them. We must know that there is no fortune to be made from breeding native birds in aviaries and disposing of them, because of the cost of feed, equipment and shelters, and the amount of time that these people give to caring for birds.

Therefore, I consider that the regulations ought to favour and assist these dedicated people. Doubtless, the Minister knows the painstaking care that this group gives, even to injured birds. I know one such person well, and I, not having had this interest, am amazed at how much time these people give to caring for birds which have injured wings or injured legs, which cannot look after themselves, and which otherwise quickly would become the prey of foxes, wild birds, and cats. These birds would be lost to our wild life if it were not for the work of these people.

We ought to be doing all we can to encourage an increase in the number of native birds in our State, but the number must be decreasing each year consequent on the amount of clearing that is done and the onslaught by wild animals. Those people who are willing to build up stocks of these birds, even to the point where they can sell them to other keen aviculturists, ought to be encouraged to breed this form of wild life. As is the case with so many other regulations that Governments promulgate, there is a tendency to bog these regulations down in regard to keeping records. It is obvious that people who sit in Government offices (as well as those in private enterprise) sit in an isolated world far removed from practical experience and, in following through their theoretical principles, they apply many rules and regulations that are impracticable and restrictive in their application to people in the field. Although these people may have the best intentions concerning the preservation of wild life, their theories cannot be carried out in practice. In this case surely members of the aviculturists society have displayed their practical interest and ability not only in the construction of their cages and the purchase of equipment, but also in the way they have made themselves familiar with the feeding, breeding and other habits of the wild life in which they are interested. There is much to be said for the practical ability of these people compared to the theoretical knowledge which tends to be applied in such matters and which lacks practical experience and application. Greater consideration in the framing of these regulations should have been given to people in the field.

The regulations also require the monthly submission of records, even though the wild life involved in these records mate and propagate only once a year. Not only is this requirement restrictive: it is also unnecessary. True, it is not difficult to submit a "nil" return.

Mr. Becker: It is just another statistical requirement.

Mr. WARDLE: True, and in the field of local government it seems that statistics are the ultimate ambition of certain public servants. Consequently we have to have more and more statistics. Indeed, I know that local government has become almost overburdened with requests from both Commonwealth and State Governments for more and more statistics. In a simple matter such as this, surely monthly returns are not necessary to provide information regarding what birds are being kept. I believe that we should look at the regulations again so that the method of informing the department of the stocks of birds being held is made more efficient and less time-consuming.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I, too, support the motion. Although I do not object to most of the content of the regulations, they are anomalous regarding these two rare species, and I believe that this is a significant reason for moving the motion. I have had the opportunity to examine the evidence placed before the Subordinate Legislation Committee on this matter. I refer first to the point raised by the member for Murray concerning the evidence given to the committee by Mr. Barry Richard Hutchins. I refer to the transcript, as follows:

The Chairman: Are you before us as an individual or are you representing an organization?—I am representing the Aviculture Society of South Australia and all affiliated societies. We have 1,200 members.

Have you a written statement?—Yes, it is as follows:

Mr. Hutchins was the spokesman for many people interested in these regulations. The Aviculture Society of South Australia is the body representing many people concerned with the keeping of these birds, although both the Leader and the member for Murray indicated that other people are interested, such as the Ornithological Society, which no doubt was consulted. However, the Aviculture Society is the major group concerned with the keeping of birds, not for profit but primarily because its members are interested in the birds and their protection. This certainly applies to members of the Aviculture Society. One member of the society who lives near me has contacted me regarding these regulations. He takes great pride in his birds and, from my knowledge of his circumstances, the birds he keeps have a far better chance of survival with him than they have in the wild, especially the two species referred to by the regulations, the scarlet-breasted parrot and the princess parrot. I now refer to the statement submitted to the Subordinate Legislation Committee by Mr. Hutchins, as follows:

In April, 1972, a meeting was convened by the Hon. Minister of Environment and Conservation (Mr. Broomhill) to interview two delegates from the Aviculture Society of South Australia, to discuss the proposed new regulations to be governed by the National Parks and Wildlife Act, 1972. In the course of this interview with the Minister, mention was made that prior to any regulations under the Act being passed, a copy in relation to the amendments would be passed on to the Aviculture Society for their comments. No correspondence to this effect was received.

That is a factual statement, and it seems that the Minister gave an undertaking to the society that he would disclose what was intended to be placed in the regulations before they were introduced. Apparently, however, that was not done. Mr. Hutchins then made a submission on behalf of the society, part of which states:

Part V of the Act, Conservation of Native Animals, and Part VI Miscellaneous Provisions were approved by the subcommittee, and all were in harmony of both Acts being necessary for the preservation of native fauna. The Eighth Schedule contains rare fauna, two of these species, namely the princess parrot and the scarlet-breasted parrot of which we are most concerned about, and are well aware of the fact, that, in all probability, these species are rare in the wild.

This is an important point. These birds are rare in the wild, certainly in South Australia, and, if it were not for the efforts of members of the society, the birds would have far less chance of survival. The evidence of Mr. Hutchins continues:

We wish to bring to your notice the avicultural position concerning the princess parrot, and the scarlet-breasted parrot, which we claim has been instrumental in placing them in a category not comparable to that applying to these species in the wild.

I understand that the regulations are to prevent birds in the wild from being trapped and exported: in other words, the exploitation of these creatures for profit. I do not argue about the merits of the regulations.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: How can this be done if they are not included as rare species?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It is submitted that these birds should be placed in a separate

category, as they do not exist in large numbers in the wild. However, it seems there is no evidence that they have been trapped, or can be trapped, in the wild. Mr. Hutchins has submitted that the birds do not exist in the wild, so that the protection contemplated by the regulations is not necessary.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: Who said they do not exist? They are rare.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The birds are not trapped in the wild, because of their scarcity. As they are aviary-bred birds, they should be in a different category.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: They are trapped to build up the number of aviary birds: that is the evidence of the department.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The point made in evidence submitted to the committee is that they are not trapped in the wild.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I am willing to take the word of my officers on that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I shall quote from the evidence of the officers later, so perhaps the Minister should apprise himself of the facts. I think his officers supported the evidence that these birds were not trapped in the wild.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: There is differing evidence on that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister cannot advance any evidence that the birds are trapped in the wild, because they are now generally aviary-bred birds, and that is why they have not reached the point of near extinction. Mr. Hutchins's submission continues:

Initially, in the case of the princess parrot this was first officially bred in captivity in South Australia in 1929, and in the case of the scarlet-breasted parrot, this was first bred in 1932; both breedings accordingly were recorded with relevant detail, and, as first official breeding achievements bronze medals were awarded. By incorporating the princess parrot and the scarlet-breasted parrot under these new regulations as applies to rare fauna, the persons beginning in aviculture will surely have second thoughts about obtaining these birds, as the fee of $10 annually, plus the limited opportunity of disposal after breeding, most certainly would sway them to other fields.

This point must be considered, as people who are interested in these birds will be deterred from keeping them because of the effect of these regulations. I know of two teenagers in my district who were interested in keeping birds in aviaries (which is a sound and healthy interest and should be encouraged), but who have now decided that, with all the red tape involved, they will not continue with this interest. The submission suggests that the annual fee of $10 will deter people from keeping these birds, although that is one of the major ways in which these birds have been saved from near extinction.

Government officers gave evidence before the committee. The Director of National Parks and Wildlife (Mr. Lyons) and the Senior Wildlife Officer of the National Parks and Wildlife Service (Mr. Delroy) appeared before the committee on August 8 and were examined at some length. The Chairman asked Mr. Lyons the following question:

These two species are the only two mentioned. The evidence is not that the animals should be removed from the schedule but that the $10 fee will not encourage people to breed, because people would find it difficult to pay $50 a pair, especially now that dealers are not allowed to sell them. Why are dealers not allowed to sell them?

Mr. Lyons replied:

The animal is declared a rare species and should not be the type of animal that is traded around. These two species have developed in a particular way, but if we could differentiate between the animal in the wild and the animal bred in an aviary we would not object to the dealer handling the aviary-bred varieties. I think we must prevent the dealer from handling them until we can differentiate.

I believe that we could differentiate between these two species and other species by naming these two species and thus excluding them. The Chairman then asked Mr. Lyons and Mr. Delroy the following question:

It has been inferred that the birds are almost extinct in the wild and would become extinct completely if not bred in aviaries. If dealers cannot handle them it reduces the opportunity for people breeding them to sell the birds. Also, the $10 fee must also be considered. It is possible that these birds could become extinct?

I should have thought that was a fairly sensible question. However, Mr. Lyons replied:

I would not think so, and I disagree with that contention. I should think that a large proportion of these animals that are sold are sold between individuals, and a relatively small number would be sold by dealers.

Mr. Delroy said:

I think it is about 80 per cent to 90 per cent not handled by dealers.

Mr. Lyons said:

We are not restricting the sale of aviary-bred birds, but we are closing up a real source of illegal taking of these animals from the wild.

There is no shred of evidence here to indicate that the birds are being taken from the wild, although I shall be pleased if the Chairman can point out any such evidence. These birds

are maintained by people who keep them in aviaries, but the regulations will tend to discourage this activity. Although I believe it would be better to amend regulations 47 and 48 to write in the names of these birds (as suggested by Mr. Hutchins), I do not think this course is now open to us, so we must take the fairly extreme course of moving that the regulations be disallowed.

The one or two people who have spoken to me about this matter have been genuine in their concern. I have had complaints made to me about the books issued by the department. One gentleman showed me about four books, which were very flash and looked fairly expensive and elaborate, although the Minister assures me that what is inside them is simple. These books are issued by the department so that people with aviaries may make records, but I believe that the first year's fee, which is fairly high, will be taken up in paying for these books. The gentleman who spoke to me was not enamoured of some other aspects of the regulations as well, and my perusal of the evidence supports his statements.

Mrs. BYRNE secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADVERTISING

Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Becker:

That, in the opinion of this House, all Government and semi-government advertising should be placed with Australian and preferably South Australian owned and controlled advertising agencies.

(Continued from September 13. Page 1298.)

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I support the motion. In speaking to this motion, the Premier made a remarkable speech in which he was particularly scathing and sarcastic. From my brief experience in this House and from my experiences in my schooldays, I find that the Premier is always at his best and most shining when he has something to hide. Once again he has shown that he is prepared to cover up. In this excellent speech, he flew off at a tangent and appeared to be flying towards another tangent. In the end, I thought he was back at the beginning.

Mr. Langley: I didn't think a member of your Party did too well on this subject.

Dr. TONKIN: I expect such comments from the honourable member; I do not really know whether he understands what I am talking about. One has this feeling that there is something to hide about this matter. It is time that we got back to the subject, because the Premier successfully skirted around it. Although his was an amazing speech, if one likes sarcastic speeches, it really did not deal with the basic facts involved. In moving his motion, the member for Hanson said:

I take this action to bring to the attention of this House and of the South Australian taxpayers the fact that we should do everything we can to encourage the Government to support local advertising agencies and ancillary organizations.

What is wrong with that? In the past, we have heard many Labor Party members say that they support Australian organizations, and there is nothing wrong with that, either. Where I draw the line is when we get the Premier of the State, who has made those remarks in favour of Australian organizations, turning around and justifying most vehemently the Government's attitude, obviously being willing to do nothing whatever to change the situation. The member for Hanson goes on as a corollary, I suppose, of his first statement to state that in his opinion the Government is corrupt and "breaking the Australian Labor Party's rule and principle which does not support foreign-owned and foreign-controlled organizations and the foreign ownership and takeover of Australian assets".

Indeed, in supporting foreign-owned and foreign-based advertising agencies in respect of its advertising, the Labor Party is breaking its own stated aims and rules, so I think the member for Hanson is correct in both respects: he is correct to draw attention to the present state of affairs, and he is correct to give his opinion that the Labor Party is not being consistent in this regard. One is forced to conclude that the Premier has something to hide regarding this matter, and I should like to know what it is. Perhaps it simply involves what Max Harris said in his column. I must say that I enjoy reading that column, although I do not always agree with Max Harris, but he usually has some elements of common sense.

Mr. Hopgood: You're easily pleased.

Dr. TONKIN: I disagree. Perhaps the fact that Mr. Harris has changed his atttitude from one of slightly left of centre to one that is more middle of the road (I admire him for that) displeases the member for Mawson. I was pleased to read that Max Harris confirmed an opinion I have had for many years, namely, that the Premier is not happy at being wrong. I suppose none of us is happy in that respect, but at least some of us admit when we are wrong. I believe we can come to our own conclusions concerning whether or not the Government is corrupt in this instance; it is a matter of opinion, and I know what mine is.

The speech made by the Premier was full of glib assurances, but it did nothing to reassure members of the community about this matter; indeed, I think the reverse is the case. The member for Hanson referred to the question he asked in this House, the reply to which was glossed over by the Premier. Indeed it is not uncommon for us not to get a straight answer.

I had a similar experience earlier when I asked a question, the reply to which was also glossed over. I put a Question on Notice regarding a change in advertising agents for the Savings Bank, and this question was completely ignored by the Premier; it was not even answered, and the excuse the Premier gave at that stage was that the Savings Bank was not controlled in any way by the Government and that the choice of an advertising agent was not the Government's responsibility. I suppose conditions vary: the Premier was anxious to quote the Savings Bank figures when it came to putting his own case recently. When it suits him, he can ignore the Savings Bank advertising account, or he can have regard to it and add it up with all the other totals. This is an interesting double standard. The Premier's flat statement was that the Government had nothing to do with the appointment of advertising agents for the Savings Bank. However, in using this example to boost the total of the advertising accounts not handled by Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson, the Premier forgot (perhaps he hoped we would forget) that he was adding to the total amount, in fact, handled by foreign-owned companies, and in this case it involves a subsidiary of an American firm, namely, the Bates Agency. He did a first-class job of white-washing, but I repeat that the Premier still ignores most conveniently the major point at issue—that, as a matter of policy, we should do everything we can to encourage Australian and South Australian advertising agencies. If the Government cannot give a lead in this way, who can?

Mr. Jennings: Why does McMahon want to take them over?

Dr. TONKIN: I thought someone might raise that subject, and I will come to it in a little while, if the member for Ross Smith can be patient. I suspect that the Premier's preoccupation with the member for Hanson's expressed opinion that the Government had something to hide or might be corrupt in this regard allowed him to deal only with that subject, and I think that his concern and preoccupation must raise strong doubts in the minds of members of the community concerning just what is the Government's attitude and what it is going to do. At best, the Government has done nothing to change the balance of advertising between locally-owned and oversea-owned agencies. Where it can, through Government departments, direct that there should be a change in advertising policy, it has done just that, and we have evidence of this. The South Australian Government has increased the amount of advertising undertaken by American-owned agencies and nothing the Premier says, and nothing he achieves through the poses and posture he assumes, makes one bit of difference to that fact.

Mr. Venning: He's tried to pull the wool over our eyes.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, and he has tried to defend his attitude. The Premier said, first, that the preponderance of South Australian Government advertising was handled by South Australian agencies operating in Adelaide. He said that Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson handled the advertising of the Woods and Forests Department, the Municipal Tramways Trust, the State Government Insurance Commission, the State Electoral Department, the Department of the Premier and of Development, and the Government Tourist Bureau. According to the list he tabled, the advertising of the Railways Department is being handled by Aldwych Advertising; the Electricity Trust by NAS/Macnamara and Taylor O'Brien; the Housing Trust by NAS/Macnamara and the Lotteries Commission by Birrell Kaine. The sum involved is about $240,000, a predominant sum ($150,000) being spent by the Lotteries Commission. When we consider that the Premier claimed that the preponderance of Government advertising was handled by local agencies, it is necessary to equate the fact that Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson has billed $90,338 to July 31 this year. The State Savings Bank account, handled by Patterson is about $100,000, and Patterson also handles the Totalizator Agency Board and the South Australian Gas Company accounts, amounting to $130,000 in expenditure, and the South Australian Gas Company is not a Government utility. The amount of advertising by Government and semi-government authorities seems to be more with the two American agencies than with the two local agencies, and it seems that the only worthwhile account handled by a local agency is the account of the Lotteries Commission, which is handled by Birrell Kaine.

The Premier has also said that the distribution of Government advertising is equitable.

If it is, I should hate to see what was inequitable, biased, or prejudiced. The distribution will not be equitable as long as Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson handles the various Government department accounts and Patterson handles the accounts of the Savings Bank of South Australia and the T.A.B. Doubtless, money goes into foreign hands because Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson is wholly owned in America and Patterson also is American owned.

Further, American agencies are allowed to rebate 1 per cent of their turnover back to America, tax free, as a service fee. The Premier has said that there are advantages in employing an agency with international connections, but he has not said that every reputable agency has access to international facilities of the highest standard by association with other houses in oversea countries. The Premier has said that American agencies are used because they can draw on international techniques in advertising. I submit that Australian advertising is well regarded as being on a par with that anywhere else in the world. Anyone in any advertising sphere now must keep up with the times. That was another red herring that the Premier deliberately drew across the trail.

He has said that Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson executives have been trained in the United States, but he has not said that other executives from Australian firms can go to the United States (indeed, they have gone there) and be trained in the same techniques as he claims, somehow or other, to be the sole prerogative of Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson. That does not make sense or stand up to detailed examination.

The Premier also has referred to the fact that Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson employs only two people of foreign nationality in a total staff of 229. That is another telling point! Probably, it is true of any foreign-owned agency, because Australian personnel and Australian talent are employed almost universally by foreign companies. The Premier has referred to the small profit made by Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson in the year ended December 31, 1971, and then he has referred to the loss of $4,294 sustained this year. This merely proves what we have been saying. This is the trend of the industry in South Australia, and it will continue to sustain a loss here.

Most agencies in South Australia have had a significantly reduced turnover in the past six months. Much of the reason for that is that many local industries, following the State Government's example, have turned to foreign-owned agencies in Sydney and Melbourne. If the Government showed responsibility to local operators, instead of merely paying lip service to a principle, local industry would follow its lead. South Australian agencies can compete with foreign-owned agencies, but only while they have a reasonable turnover. If turnover diminishes, staff must be reduced and, in turn, this leads to a depletion of the reservoir of talent that local agencies can draw on, and people will go to other States to the foreign-owned company.

The Premier has referred to the advertising policies of other State Governments and the Commonwealth Government. I think the member for Ross Smith had something like this in mind when he interjected earlier. We must remember that the takeover by foreign interests of local advertising agencies has occurred only in the past 10 years, and the Senate committee report on the matter gives the dates when American or British operations took over or were established. In many cases, where the Premier has carefully detailed the employment of foreign-owned agencies on Commonwealth Government and State Government business, the business was handled by the original Australian company before the takeover occurred. Perhaps that has happened in South Australia, or perhaps that is what we could say has happened here.

That may be some justification, but I repeat that the South Australian Government has taken active action to remove advertising and put it in the hands of Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson. In other words, although it is a justification for other Governments and other activities, merely because the foreign ownership was not realized, in this case the Government must have known what it was doing. If it did not, it ought to have known. The Premier has implied that all this business of other Governments has been apportioned to foreign-owned companies only recently, but the records show that the business merely has been retained by those agencies when the takeover occurred.

I agree entirely with the statement by Max Harris that he does not care what other State Governments or the Commonwealth Government do in this regard. Members opposite have asked us many times about what we did when we were in office or about what Liberal Governments in Victoria, Queensland, or somewhere else, have done. I am interested in

South Australia and in what happens here, as the Government should be. However, it is patently obvious that the Government is not interested in that.

Mr. Clark: That's merely evading the issue.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased to hear the member for Elizabeth say that the Premier has evaded the issue. I agree, and he has done it to a remarkable degree.

Mr. Clark: That's the first decent sentence you have spoken. The rest was just silly.

Dr. TONKIN: I apologize if I have upset the honourable member.

Mr. Clark: You couldn't upset me.

Dr. TONKIN: To use a colloquialism, you could have fooled me. The Premier has said that the position when the Liberal Government was in office was the same as that which applies now. However, that is not so and we have evidence that the account of the Woods and Forests Department was taken from Taylor O'Brien and given to Hanson Rubensohn McCann Erickson when that company was given the other Government contracts to which I have referred. To summarize—

Mr. Clark: How can you summarize when you've said nothing?

Dr. TONKIN: If the member for Elizabeth could wrench his eyes away from that book—

Mr. Clark: I can assure you that the book is more informative.

Dr. TONKIN: Government advertising handled by oversea-owned companies includes nominated Government departments handled by Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson, about $160,000; the Savings Bank of South Australia, handled by Patterson, about $100,000; the South Australian Totalizator Agency Board, handled by Patterson, about $5,000, a total of about $265,000. The figures presented by the Premier regarding local agencies are as follows:

	$
Railways Department	25,000
Electricity Trust	35,000
Housing Trust	30,000
Lotteries Commission	150,000
Total	240,000

Therefore, the Premier's claim that the preponderance of Government advertising is with local companies is not correct. The Labor Government has not awarded departmental accounts to local agencies except in the case of the Lotteries Commission, and possibly the South Australian Railways. The Savings Bank account was awarded to Patterson, and the Housing Trust account has been handled for years by NAS/Macnamara. There is no advantage in having a foreign-owned agency. Local expertise is as good and access to international companies is equally available. The Labor Government has actively reviewed its advertising policy and has placed it with Hansen Rubensohn McCann Erickson, not because of takeovers. The Labor Government is doing nothing and appears to have no intention of doing anything about the situation. In fact, it is doing nothing to encourage local advertising agencies and ancillary organizations, and I once again commend the member for Hanson for moving his motion.

Regarding his view that the Government may be corrupt in this respect, I believe that the Premier's speech on this motion speaks for itself. It has given many people in the community much food for thought. What is the Premier hiding or trying to hide? It cannot be denied that his handling of the issue was extremely skilful and masterly, but equally it cannot be denied that he did dodge the issue. The Premier refused to keep to the point of the motion. Why? It will be most interesting to see whether any Government action on advertising contracts results from this airing of the problem. Instead of speaking as he did, the Premier would do well to introduce definite and positive action.

This motion was moved by the member for Hanson to bring to the attention of this House and the South Australian taxpayers the need to do everything we can to support local advertising agencies and ancillary organizations. I cannot understand how any member could possibly object to or vote against that view.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): In rising to oppose the Bill, I believe that the best way for me to illustrate my arguments is to consider the introduction of the Bill when it was first brought into this Chamber by the Leader of the Opposition. At that time, when he spoke—

Members interjecting:

Mr. PAYNE: I was sitting reading and I got the call. I always defer to your authority, Mr. Speaker. Since you called me, I rose. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (ELECTORAL)

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 1648.)

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the Bill. When I secured leave to continue my remarks, I was outlining the principles of our bicameral

system of Government. I was trying to explain to members opposite why they have continued to advance their strange attitude of wishing to abolish all Upper Houses. Government members generally like to see themselves as true democrats. Indeed, I once heard the member for Mawson describe himself as a Social Democrat.

Mr. Keneally: I can tell you how he describes you!

Mr. GUNN: I have been called many names, and on all occasions members opposite have been completely uncharitable. However, I consider myself to be a democrat. When I last spoke I was trying to explain the reasons why Socialists in Australia are out to abolish all Upper Houses in this country. It is a result of the attitude to which they subscribe: members opposite do not believe that people should have a second look at a matter. If we read their policies—

Mr. Keneally: We insist that we do have a second look.

Mr. GUNN: The member for Stuart is taking a peculiar attitude. I quote from page 40 of the South Australian Labor Party platform, 1970, as follows:

The Legislative Council should be abolished after a favourable vote of the people—

Mr. Keneally: That's out of date. It's 1972 now.

Mr. GUNN: This is the 1972 platform.

Mr. Clark: You said 1970.

Mr. GUNN: That was a slip of the tongue.

Mr. Clark: All your speeches are slips of the tongue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just outlining the A.L.P. policy. Of course, we on this side have an enlightened policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: Members on this side believe in the rights of the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: We have an enlightened policy. Our attitude on the Legislative Council is written clearly into the principles of the L.C.L., and we believe in a bicameral Parliament. This Bill was introduced by the Leader of the Opposition in another place and sets out to alter the structure of that Chamber so that members may be elected on a proportional representation system of voting.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Clyde Cameron has taken that up again!

Mr. GUNN: Of course, because he subscribes to this line of thought. The Council would be elected by a democratic system of proportional representation, and I cannot understand the Premier's argument. We know that he has a personal hatred of the Legislative Council.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member would do himself much more good if he spoke to the Bill and refrained from getting down to personalities.

Mr. GUNN: In linking my remarks to the Bill, I have been trying to reply to the Premier's criticisms of the measure. This is one of his active exercises, and he uses his speeches to denigrate the Legislative Council.

Mr. Venning: He is dancing again.

Mr. Clark: He is in step, though.

Mr. GUNN: In addition to providing for a voting system of proportional representation, the Bill also divides the Council into a country district and a metropolitan district. If Government members violently oppose this provision, they should advance valid reasons for dividing the State in some other way. Different types of district could be suggested, but the system of electing members and of defining boundaries should be different from the system that applies to the House of Assembly. The Bill also provides for an increase in the number of members of the Council from 20 to 24. Generally, members of Upper Houses represent larger districts than do members of Lower Houses, and the Council members with whom I have been associated do a wonderful job in representing the people. They give sterling service to their constituents. Usually, the Upper House has half the number of members that are elected to the Lower House.

Mr. Clark: They work half the time, too.

Mr. GUNN: The Premier has given no valid reason why we should not increase the number of members in the Legislative Council, nor does he give any reason for opposing the proportional representation system of voting, in which minority groups may have the chance to be elected as members. However, this measure would be of great advantage to our Parliamentary system, because it would enable a minority group, with a reasonable following in the community, to be allowed some representation in another place.

Mr. Brown: What about the D.L.P.?

Mr. GUNN: I was not considering any specific group. I hope sincerely that Government members will take a realistic view of this measure. For as long as I can remember Labor members have continually attacked the

present system of electing members to the Legislative Council, but now they have the chance to take part in a fruitful discussion about a new system.

Mr. Clark: It might be worse.

Mr. GUNN: No, it would be fair and democratic, and I do not agree with what the honourable member has said. If Government members have other ideas, they should move suitable amendments when we discuss the Bill in Committee.

Mr. Clark: It's hopeless.

Mr. GUNN: That is a negative attitude that seems to be taken by Government members. Whilst they continue to adopt that attitude no changes are possible, and the attitude can be described only as complete nonsense.

Mr. Clark: That's what I suggested about the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: If Government members have different ideas about this measure they should allow further discussions about it. The arguments advanced by Opposition members are purposeful, particularly if our Parliamentary institution is to continue in a way that will protect the rights of the people of this State. I strongly support the measure, because I believe that its provisions are a move in the right direction.

Mr. PAYNE (Mitchell): When this Bill was introduced on August 30 by the Leader of the Opposition group of the Opposition (I think that is the correct way to describe him), it was evident that he spoke with mixed feelings. I suggest that he knew this was a shonky proposal simply designed to perpetuate in another place the Garismander, which will shortly be threatened by the election to that Chamber, in a mere eight years or so, of sufficient Labor Party members to change the present balance of power. As well as members of this House, the people of the State know what the Bill is designed to do. Some articles about this have appeared in Adelaide newspapers. For example, *Onlooker* has pointed out that Legislative Council enrolments will ensure that the Midland District will go to Labor. Writing in the evening newspaper, Rex Jory has pointed out what is likely to happen in Midland, and also in the Northern District. In an article in the *News* of August 10, he said:

> The two positions in Central No. 1 will be won again by the Australian Labor Party while Midland, now held by the Liberal and Country League, is likely to tumble to the Government.

I endorse those remarks. When he spoke, the Leader was aware of these facts, and he knew everyone had woken up to why the Bill had been introduced at this time. Faced with this dilemma, he decided that a smokescreen would be his best course, so he filled up five or six pages of *Hansard* with the virtues of Upper Houses of various kinds both here and overseas, leaving nothing out (even Cromwell got into the act at one stage).

I believe that the Leader thought that the Bill was so crook that he had better talk about all sorts of other things, and then the real nature of the Bill would not be so noticeable. That is the only premise on which he could act. He served up much pontifical tripe about how members of Upper Houses are a special race. In some peculiar way, they are always the goodies, whilst elected members of Lower Houses are the baddies. Members of Lower Houses cannot be trusted to deliberate properly, because they are elected by everyone, whereas in the case of the Council and similar Upper Houses (in the past anyway) members are automatically goodies because they are elected by a special group different from that which elects members of the Lower House. That sort of argument boggles the imagination; it has no logic or sense of humanity, and is completely phoney. When the Leader saw that what he had on his hands was obviously a shonky proposal, he sought to put up a smokescreen by giving all this information to which I have referred. I wonder what is the true position in the Upper House in this State. In his regular column *Politically Speaking*, Mr. Rex Jory wrote:

> Mr. Hall has admitted that it was the conservative and restrictive attitude of some members of the Upper House, together with aspects of the L.C.L. administration, which led to his resignation as Opposition Leader in March.

In that case we have an opinion of the Upper House of a member, not of my Party, but of the Liberal and Country League. We can only assume that, being in closer contact with the majority of members in that House than we are, he would thus be able to make a reasonable statement about it.

Mr. Rodda: Do you agree with those sentiments?

Mr. PAYNE: I will ignore that red herring. The Bill provides for the election of 12 Legislative Councillors by one voting group of the population of the State. Electors in one area will have a vote weighted about 2.3 times against the vote of people in the metropolitan area. In other words, a vote in the Flinders

District, for example, will have more than twice the value of a vote in the Ascot Park District.

What is the special quality that would justify such a proposition? One of the arguments raised is that much more distance is involved in country districts. I think that the member for Eyre pointed out that Legislative Council members do much work and that, if the district is large, that work takes longer. The Premier pointed out in this debate the true position in relation to members of the Upper House as agents for their electors, compared to members of the Lower House as agents for their electors. All members know that no comparison can be made between the work load of members of this House in dealing with electoral problems and that of members of another place in dealing with their problems. That statement can be made certainly and safely, and no member opposite can challenge it.

Mr. Evans: Would the same point apply in the Commonwealth sphere as between Senate members and House of Representatives members?

Mr. PAYNE: It is an old tactic, when one cannot answer, to try to sidetrack. I challenged Opposition members to deny what I have said, but the honourable member has attempted to sidetrack me by introducing another issue. We are talking about this Bill, which relates to the Legislative Council, and that is what I intend to confine my remarks to for the moment. As well as weighting the vote in favour of certain electors, the Bill sets out a separate polling day for House of Assembly and Legislative Council elections. In fact, the relevant clause even prevents a referendum from being held on the same day as the day on which a Legislative Council election is held. It is a wonder that a voter does not have to bring his own pen and write an essay before he qualifies for the vote.

Mr. Mathwin: Then the Labor Party wouldn't get a vote.

Mr. PAYNE: If there are to be any essay competitions, I think I would be able to match any effort produced by the honourable member. If he thinks I am nasty, he is in for a rude awakening should I ever, in fact, turn nasty. I think the reason why a separate day is specified in this measure is quite apparent: it is to try to keep down to a minimum the number who might vote. In these circumstances, money will obviously count, and this will allow the Liberal and Country League to win seats that it should not hold.

Mr. Mathwin: Why are you frightened of voluntary voting?

Mr. PAYNE: Our position on this issue is quite straightforward and, concerning whether we are frightened of this type of measure, I will outline our position on this matter, if the honourable member will be quiet a little longer, and then let the people judge which is fair and just. We say, first, "Let every person of the statutory voting age have a vote of equal value." If a person meets that minimum requirement, he will have an equal say. The next thing we say is, "Let every person record his vote. Let him give his opinion."

Mr. Evans: You say, "Compel him to record his vote." There is a difference.

Mr. PAYNE: The member for Fisher ought to know better than to say that here. He knows that it is not true to say that people are forced to vote. Certainly they are required to attend the polling booth.

Mr. Coumbe: Who's splitting hairs now?

Mr. PAYNE: I am not splitting hairs; I am stating fact.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. PAYNE: We say, "Let every person record his opinion on polling day by voting," and that is the only requirement. Our Party will accept the majority result, and we have always advocated this. There are no special arrangements or set-ups; we want to let everyone have his say and to let it be of equal value relative to each person, and we will accept the majority result. There is silence opposite, because Opposition members cannot answer that. The position I have outlined is fair, just and equitable. However, the Bill sets out to rob the people of this State of their rights in this matter, and there are no two ways about it. The Bill sets out to rob some people of the value of their vote and to rob them in the matter of the election of their representatives (those who will make the laws under which these people are required to live). Such a proposition must be utterly rejected, and this I do. I oppose the Bill.

Mr. HOPGOOD (Mawson): After hearing the speech of the member for Mitche'l, I do not think there is much more that I have to add. This has been called a 12-12 Bill; that term sounds like a used car warranty! We all know the value of some used car warranties, and I put this Bill in much the same category. I want to reply to the points made in the debate by the member for Kavel,

because, alone of members opposite, he gave us something to sink our teeth into. I do not agree with much of what he said, but it was said concisely. The honourable member's basic assumption was that this Bill placed the Legislative Council in virtually the same position with regard to this House that the Senate occupies with regard to the House of Representatives.

His next assumption was that the Labor Party accepts the situation between the Senate and the House of Representatives, and the honourable member's conclusion was that the Labor Party is therefore being inconsistent in opposing this Bill. Of course, both the honourable member's premises are false; although, if they were true, his conclusion would follow. First, even if this Bill passed into law, there would be significant, relevant differences between, on the one hand, the relationship between the two Houses at the State level in South Australia and, on the other hand, the relationship between the Senate and the House of Representatives. The second premise is also wrong, as the Premier indicated in reply to a question by the member for Kavel. The Premier does not accept that the situation existing in connection with the Senate is desirable, and I, too, do not accept that it is desirable.

The member for Kavel said that the Senate was half the size of the House of Representatives, and that that was written into the Commonwealth Constitution—the so-called nexus clause. He said that this Bill would provide for a similar kind of arrangement between the two Houses of this Parliament. True, the similarity would then exist, but I do not regard it as very important and I cannot agree with the Opposition that there is generally a consensus in the Western democracies that Upper Houses should be half the size of Lower Houses.

The member for Kavel talked about equal powers between the two Houses. True, the Senate has powers very nearly co-equal with those of the House of Representatives; similarly, the Legislative Council has powers that are equal to those exercised by this place. However, the honourable member did not at any stage come to grips with the interjection of the member for Peake to the effect that there were effective deadlock provisions in the Commonwealth Constitution, whereas such provisions did not exist in this State. There are deadlock provisions in our Constitution, but the effect of invoking them would almost certainly be that there would be no alteration at all. The unsatisfactory *status quo*, a deadlock, would be retained in the event of those provisions being implemented. For example, it is provided that all members of both Houses should face the electors. However, it is beyond my comprehension why that should change the position of the Upper House, as compared to a situation where only half the members of the Upper House faced the electors. Under the Commonwealth system there are effective deadlock provisions that are far more democratic than those written into our Constitution which date from the 1880's. The member for Kavel referred to the holding of an election for the Upper House on a different day from that for the Lower House. Again, this would be a similarity between the two systems, but I am opposed to the present Commonwealth set-up in this respect; it is a heritage from the manoeuvrings of Sir Robert Menzies in the 1950's, when he called a Lower House election for Party-political advantage. The sooner we can get elections for the two Commonwealth Houses back into phase the better it will be for Australia. I do not want to see the mistake that was made at the Commonwealth level repeated at the State level.

A major point of the member for Kavel related to the weighting of votes, and he referred to statements made by Government members about a gerrymander. True, under the present Senate system, votes in the smaller States are weighted, but I remind the honourable member that that is not something that we in the Labor Party accept. However, we understand the great difficulties involved in changing the balance of the Commonwealth Constitution and, for as long as the rules are there, it is necessary that the Labor Party recognize them. However, we do not basically accept them.

The term "gerrymander" can arise in two different ways. We could be talking about a system that deviates materially from the concept of one vote one value. In that sense, it is true that the Senate system is in some way a gerrymander. However, I remind the member for Kavel that the original situation to which the label "gerrymander" was applied was a system deliberately drawn for the benefit of a Party, individual or group. The system was first used by Governor Gerry of Massachusetts in 1812, but nowadays it would be more relevant to talk about a deliberate distribution of electoral boundaries that favoured a Party, rather than an individual. Although we have a significant weighting of the votes in the smaller States, I do not think anyone

has yet been able to prove that this weighting favours one of the major Parties as against the other. This is the point that has to be raised, because it is quite clear that what is intended in this Bill at the State level would involve a material advantage in the electoral competition to the Liberal Party over my Party, whereas the type of weighting occurring at the Commonwealth level (I am not sure whether it is purely fortuitous or not) does not, as far as I can see, favour one Party as against the other Party. This may have something to do with the fact that there is a fairly even spread of Party support between the various States. Over the years the Labor Party has done better than the national average in South Australia and worse than the national average in Victoria but, generally speaking, we have performed about the same in the various States.

The member for Kavel also raised a point that he has raised on three or four other occasions in this House: he referred to the last Commonwealth election and said that the Labor Party, in terms of seats in this State, did better than it did in terms of votes. We have tried to educate the honourable member on this point, but I am afraid that we have not got very far. However, I will try again, because the point is very important. It relates to an understanding of a system based on two major political Parties and single-member electoral districts; I am afraid that that point has escaped the honourable member. I illustrate my point by quoting from an article, in the *Australian Journal of Politics and History* back in 1958, headed "Under-representation and Electoral Prediction", by C. S. Soper and Joan Rydon. This, in a sense, was a milestone in psephology in this country, because for the first time it set out in a public article a means whereby it was possible to measure the under-representation being suffered by one or other of the major Parties. This is what the writers said about the point raised in this debate by the member for Kavel:

It is reasonably well-known that the distribution of seats in a two-Party single-member electorate system is rarely, if ever, in the same ratio as that of the overall votes gained by the Parties. The tendency for the winning Party's majority to be exaggerated is now accepted as an essential ingredient of such an electoral system, so that a Party which loses an election is not regarded as "under-represented" simply because its opponent's majority has been exaggerated.

The following is the important point:

The simple exaggeration of majorities, however, should operate in the same way for both Parties: for any given proportion of the overall vote, the same proportion of seats should be won, whichever Party is concerned. In practice, though, it has been noticed that this frequently does not appear to occur. The electoral system seems at times to discriminate against one of the Parties, which is "under-represented"—the other being, of course, "over-represented". A Party is "under-represented" in this sense when it would appear that, if it polls a certain proportion of the overall votes, it wins fewer seats than would its opponents had they instead polled that proportion. It follows that the "under-represented" Party would need more than 50 per cent of the overall votes in order to win 50 per cent of the seats, so that it would be possible for that Party to win a majority of votes and yet lose the election.

That was the situation in 1968. The article continues:

It is in such an event that "under-representation" becomes quite apparent.

In that case, it is not apparent, but it is there and it is measurable. I recommend this article to the honourable member for his consideration, because I think he will find it instructive. If he is interested in the mechanism whereby there is an exaggeration of majorities in the type of system under which we operate, I recommend him to read the *British Journal of Sociology*, Volume 1, No. 3, September 1950, in which two writers, Kendall and Stuart, published an article entitled "The Law of the Cubic Proportion in Electoral Results". The article sets out exactly how these figures operate, and we could apply the same kind of thing to the 1970 State election. It is clear that the Labor Party in 1970 got a higher percentage of seats than it did of votes, but that does not mean that the system favours us, because, if the Liberal Party had been able to get the same number of votes as the Labor Party got, it would have won more seats than we did: 30 or 31 seats. In this situation we can say that the present system in South Australia under-represents the Labor Party. That is the situation as it exists under our system.

I wish to say one other thing regarding proportional representation, because there may be those who perhaps think that this exaggeration of majorities is undesirable, and something that could be eliminated by the introduction of proportional representation. That is true, but that is all that would happen. It is not true to say that there would be a great opportunity for minor Parties to become represented in this House under the system illustrated in the Bill. The Bill provides for a 24-seat Upper House, which would mean 12 from the metropolitan area and 12 from

the country, and half of these would retire at each election. So we have the situation that in the metropolitan area at any one election six men would come up for re-election, the other six being in the country. I assume that we would use what has been called the Droop quota to determine the quota of votes for a person to become elected. If we had to elect six members, a person would have to get one more than one-seventh of the votes, because the one-seventh would be one over six plus one. That is how the quota works.

A Democratic Labor Party candidate, a single tax candidate, a League of Rights candidate or a Communist candidate would still have to get one-seventh of the votes cast in that large constituency in order to get elected. None of these minor Parties has ever achieved it in South Australia, nor is it ever likely to do so. The Country Party might get representation under this system, but that would not affect the situation much, because I could name six or seven Opposition members who could easily transfer to the Country Party tomorrow without any change in their personal beliefs or political ideology. I do not see how the intrusion of the Country Party into the House (although it might be embarrassing to some Opposition members) would change the political situation in any way. All that the introduction of proportional representation would do would be to even out the numbers a little between Government and Opposition. However, we could run ourselves into the problem of a permanently deadlocked House, as occurred for some time in Tasmania. Even if we could retain the situation of there being a small majority, how would that affect the situation? A majority is a majority no matter how small, and Sir Robert Menzies was able to illustrate that between 1961 and 1963. He might just as well have had a majority of 30 as a majority of one or two; it was still a majority.

Mr. Simmons: What about Sir Thomas Playford?

Mr. HOPGOOD: Precisely, but other things were involved in that, including the assiduous wooing of Independents. I do not think that in the present situation in South Australia proportional representation has anything to offer minor Parties in particular or the electorate in general. I wish to say one or two other things about the performance of the other place so far as democracy and representative institutions are concerned. I believe it is important that people should be condemned out of their own mouths; that is the only honest way, if they must be condemned. I promise the member for Eyre that I will not present a tirade. After all, I read that a tirade is a sneak attack on a haberdashery. Legislative Councillors have had much to say about representative institutions from time to time. I think that we must look at their genuineness in this measure and their adherence to the cause of democracy by what they have said in the past. For example, in 1970, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said, at page 2031 of *Hansard*:

> If there is to be a change, we should consider the question of having some nominated members in this Council.

That was the sort of commitment he had to elections at that time. Another interesting statement, made this time by the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill, at page 298 of *Hansard* for 1965-66, is as follows:

> I believe that many people who voted Labor said, "Well, I can vote Labor, because we have still got the Legislative Council if they do not do what we think they ought to do."

That is one of the silliest statements I have ever heard. In 1970, the Hon. M. B. Dawkins said, at page 2114 of *Hansard*:

> Once the younger people of 21 and 23 years have got away from their mothers' apron strings, as it were, and secured for themselves not a wealthy man's home but merely a self-contained flat under rental, not necessarily owning their own house, they could enrol for the Legislative Council if they so desired . . . No person need be excluded if he or she is prepared to take the trouble today of performing two positive and simple acts: first, to enrol, and secondly, if he or she is still living at home, to become independent of the home and so become entitled to enrol . . . it is reasonable and proper that this Council be elected by people who, whether they be Liberal or Labor, take an intelligent interest in politics and are prepared to do something positive about it: that is, to take active steps to enrol or become independent of their home ties so that they will be entitled to enrol.

That is all one has to do: get some property or rent some property and qualify for the franchise!

Mr. Clark: But you still have to vote.

Mr. HOPGOOD: In *Hansard* of 1965-66, at page 3954, the Hon. Mr. DeGaris said:

> I believe that household suffrage is possibly more democratic than is complete adult franchise.

Then, of course, at about the same time the Hon. C. M. Hill said, speaking of the enrolments between the two Houses:

> The difference is about 15 per cent. There is not a great difference.

There is, of course, a tremendous difference. Just to quote one or two other examples, the Hon. R. A. Geddes, in *Hansard* of 1968-69, as an exclamation, said:

One vote one value in a State geographically situated as is South Australia, where 90 per cent of the State receives less than 10in. of rain in a year!

In other words, according to the honourable member in another place, voting systems, far from being politically determined, sociologically determined, or even historically determined, should be climatologically determined. That is about one of the most extraordinary statements I have heard. Perhaps we should draw a boundary along Goyder's line! In 1965-66, at page 4080 of *Hansard*, the Hon. G. J. Gilfillan said:

One of the great values of this Legislative Council is that it maintains democracy in South Australia.

And yet we hear statements such as this from those who claim to be maintaining and upholding democracy in this State. At about the same time, the Hon. Sir Arthur Rymill said:

I shall oppose radical moves that I feel would not be the permanent will of the people.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: We have heard about the permanent will of the people.

Mr. HOPGOOD: That phrase has echoed down through the years. The same gentleman said, at about the same time:

I should like to point out that we in this Chamber have our own mandate, and we have a mandate from a highly responsible section of the community.

With those honourable members that is all that counts. They believe they are elected on a qualitative vote, and that that should prevail over the quantitative vote of the majority Party in another place. In 1965-66 *Hansard*, at page 64, the Hon. Sir Lyell McEwin said:

There is no Party political partisanship in this Chamber. . . . My Party does not associate itself with Party discussions in another place: it acts impartially in the interests of the people of South Australia.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What a biased statement that was!

Mr. HOPGOOD: I suggest to members opposite and their colleagues in another place that they stop trying to kid the people of South Australia. Boiling it down to bedrock, the situation is that people tend at election time to vote in one of two ways: for the Labor Party or for the Liberal Party. Anything that gives a bias or an undue advantage to one Party or another in an electoral redistribution is a gerrymander. That is what this Bill does, and that is why it is a gerrymander. I oppose it.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the Bill. I think it is a good move that we are approaching adult franchise in South Australia. I have advocated it for many years. It is something we must have and must believe in if we are democrats. I have advocated this over the past six or seven years in this House, and I am pleased that it has been accepted by the Party I represent. At the same time, however, I have always stood for voluntary voting, which is consistent with my belief in democracy and democratic principles. Surely the right of a person to vote or not to vote is his own decision. To say that, although people must go along to the polling booths, they can either throw out their ballot-paper or make use of it is one of the most childish things I have ever heard said in this House. To me, this is based on the same principle as adult franchise: the right of a person to vote when and how he wishes. I shall hold to that principle in this debate.

During a recent by-election in the Midland District, people came along and asked the person at the polling booth whether voting was voluntary or compulsory, and when they were told it was voluntary many went away without voting. Could it be said by members opposite that these persons should be made to vote?

Mr. Crimes: They are not made to vote.

Mr. McANANEY: They are made to go through the motions of voting. Members opposite have no confidence in themselves. They simply want to compel people to vote. They say people must be permitted to vote at 18 years of age so that they can express their views, and yet they say they are not sufficiently grown up at that age to make up their minds about when and how to vote.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You are compelled to come into this House. You don't object to that.

Mr. McANANEY: I voluntarily worked very hard to come into this House. I did not have to work as hard as some others to get here, of course.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. McANANEY: I am not compelled to vote in this House on certain things I do not believe in, as are members on the other side. If I had to carry out the dictates of someone from outside Parliament and outside my own district—

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: What has this got to do with the Bill?

Mr. McANANEY: I was speaking of the voluntary principle, about which the Minister interjected. Now we have got to the basic difference between compulsory and voluntary voting, which is very much a part of this Bill. Members opposite say that people at 18 years of age have grown up and should be given a vote, but then we are told they are too young, too infantile, and not sufficiently developed to be able to decide whether or not they will vote. Whether or not they want to vote, they still have to go along to the polling booth. They could be 50 miles from the polling booth and perhaps it would cost $20 to get there and back by car. That would be equivalent to the amount of any fine incurred. This is a basic problem with the Labor Party. It believes in compulsion for everything, yet in the same breath members opposite say people must have the right to do this or that.

Mr. Payne: Are you going to Rostrevor on Friday night?

Mr. McANANEY: I shall be in the Heysen District at a very large public meeting of people protesting against the activities of the Labor Government regarding water catchment areas. People there are having great hardships inflicted on them, because they are not allowed to do things that they have been doing for the past 100 years. Although some action has to be taken, it is not being taken with the humane and sympathetic attitude that is necessary. The Labor Party provided Blackwood people with a $2,000,000 sewerage scheme that will cost $100,000 a year, but another group of people, doing the same as was done by the Blackwood people, are being compelled to reduce their activities. The Labor Party will not assist them, but is robbing them of their right to live, without paying any compensation to them.

I am pleased that we are on the way to adult franchise for Parliaments in South Australia. To my knowledge Ulster is the only other country in the world without adult franchise, and enough trouble has been caused in that country to satisfy everyone that people should have the right to vote. A person should have the right not to vote or not to go to the polling booth if he so decides. I object to any form of compulsion. I am sure that Labor members do not think that the principle of one vote one value is practicable, because there must be some loading for large areas. It may be a mining area in the back blocks of the State and the Labor Party representative could be the sitting member. Before the last redistribution the two smallest districts in number of electors were held by Labor, so the system worked to the advantage of the Labor Party. I fully support adult franchise and voluntary voting.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPISTS BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 9. Page 616.)

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): This Bill, introduced by the member for Davenport, has caused the Government some anxiety, because the principle underlying it is undoubtedly correct. True, occupational therapists will soon require a proper organization with the necessary machinery, a system of registration, disciplinary provisions, and so on. However, there are several difficulties about the Bill that I shall outline in due course. The Government department that will be responsible for this matter has not had the chance to develop a scheme and to discuss it with occupational therapists, in order to work out an acceptable scheme that would be practicable from the point of view of Government administration. The question that needs to be considered by the department is how a scheme of registration of occupational therapists could be combined with a scheme for other paramedical vocations. It is undesirable to have too many registrars or too many registration boards.

I believe that the suggested scheme is not an urgent matter, because the three-year occupational therapy course is in its second year and no significant number of therapists will be available until the end of 1973. By that time the department will have been able to consult with occupational therapists in order to work out a suitable scheme. I make it clear that, although the Government opposes the Bill, it is not opposed to the notion of the registration of occupational therapists. I ask leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL (No. 2)

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

DAYLIGHT SAVING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

CREDIT BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to regulate and control the provision of credit; to repeal the Money-Lenders Act, 1940-1966; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

CONSUMER TRANSACTIONS BILL

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide protection for consumers in certain classes of transaction; to repeal the Hire-Purchase Agreements Act, 1960-1971; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL (COMMITTEE)

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments:

No. 1. Page 2, lines 27 to 30 (clause 3)—Leave out subsection (4).

No. 2. Page 3, line 33 (clause 3)—Leave out "or expedient".

No. 3. Page 3, line 33 (clause 3)—After "proper" insert "planning and".

No. 4. Page 4, line 15 (clause 3)—Leave out "and construction".

No. 5. Page 4, line 17 (clause 3)—After "conform" insert "and the types and standards of materials to be used in the course of any such building work".

No. 6. Page 4, line 27 (clause 3)—Leave out "," and insert "or".

No. 7. Page 4, lines 27 and 28 (clause 3)—Leave out "or some other body or person nominated in the directive", and insert "or by a committee of members of the Council, any officer of the Council or a building surveyor employed by the Council to which or to whom the Council has delegated its powers of approval under the directive".

No. 8. Page 5 (clause 3)—After line 9 insert new paragraph (*fa*) as follows:—

"(*fa*) the effect (if any) of the proposed planning directive upon any building or structure of architectural or historical interest;".

No. 9. Page 5, line 10 (clause 3)—Leave out "and".

No. 10. Page 5 (clause 3)—After line 12 insert—

"and

(*h*) the interests and welfare of the owners and occupiers of any land or building affected by the directive.".

No. 11. Page 6, lines 4 and 5 (clause 3)—Leave out "submit plans and specifications of the proposed work to the Committee" and insert "seek the approval of the Committee for the proposed building work".

No. 12. Page 6, line 7 (clause 3)—Leave out "other information, plans and specifications" and insert "plans, specifications and other information".

No. 13. Page 6 (clause 3)—After line 41 insert new paragraph (*ga*) as follows:—

"(*ga*) the effect (if any) of the proposed building work upon any building or structure of architectural or historical interest;".

No. 14. Page 6, line 42 (clause 3)—Leave out "and".

No. 15. Page 7 (clause 3)—After line 3 insert—

"and

(*i*) the interests and welfare of the owners and occupiers of any land or building affected by the proposed building work.".

No. 16. Page 7, after line 9 (clause 3)—Insert the following subclause:—

"(5a) Where a person applies for the approval of the Committee under this section and the application has not been disposed of by the Committee—

(*a*) at the expiration of six months from the day on which the application was made;

or

(*b*) at the expiration of such longer period as may be determined by the Minister in relation to and particular application,

the application shall be deemed to have been unconditionally approved by the Committee.".

No. 17. Page 7, lines 29 and 30 (clause 3)—Leave out "or any other body or person" and insert ", a committee of members of the Council, any officer of the Council or a building surveyor employed by the Council".

No. 18. Page 8, lines 18 to 21 (clause 3)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 19. Page 8, after line 25 (clause 3)—Insert new section as follows:—

"42i a. *Crown to be bound*—The provisions of this Part, and of any planning directives under this Part, shall bind the Crown."

No. 20. Page 8, lines 26 and 27 (clause 3)—Leave out "a day to be fixed by proclamation" and insert "the thirtieth day of June, 1975".

Amendments Nos. 1 to 18:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1 to 18 be agreed to.

The Legislative Council has made a number of amendments to this Bill, but amendments Nos. 1 to 18 are not major and do not seriously alter the provisions of the original Bill. For instance, amendment No. 15 inserts a new paragraph in new section 42h (4) as follows:

(*i*) the interests and welfare of the owners and occupiers of any land or building affected by the proposed building work.

Another amendment inserts new subsection (5) (*a*) as follows:

Where a person applies for the approval of the committee under this section and the application has not been disposed of by the committee (*a*) at the expiration of six months from the day on which the application was made, or (*b*) at the expiration of such longer period as may be determined by the Minister in relation to any particular application, the application shall be deemed to have been unconditionally approved by the committee.

That could have created considerable difficulties in administration. However, finally that was resolved by providing that the Minister could, in relation to any particular application, determine a longer period where that was needed.

Mr. Millhouse: Which amendment is that?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is amendment No. 16. The Government has examined these amendments and consulted with the City Council, which has agreed that they do not cause any difficulty to the general principles of the original proposal.

Mr. COUMBE: I am pleased that the Government has accepted these Legislative Council amendments. I appreciate the comments made about the clause to which the Premier has just referred. Mainly, these amendments will make for easier working, and protection is provided for the people in the area concerned. I am talking now not only of the people working there but also of the people living there.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 19:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 19 be disagreed to.

The effect of this amendment is that the Crown is to be bound by it. This Legislative Council proposal departs completely from the principles of the principal Act. The proposal is that the Government (which, after all, is directly answerable to the people of the State for matters of overall planning, on which it must take an overall view beyond the narrow limits of the city) is to be bound by what is, in effect, a body subordinate to the Government. In other words, decisions could be made in relation to the form of Government expenditure not by the Government but by an entirely outside body, although the Government would have minority representation on the body. I do not think this is the way in which to proceed; it would bind the Government in a whole series of areas in connection with local government. This principle would be quite wrong. The Government is answerable to this House and to the people as a whole, and what it does in connection with planning or other topics should be matters for public scrutiny in the normal, constitutional way.

The Legislative Council has taken a view in putting forward this amendment that is not applied to the rest of the legislation; it is only in this matter that the Crown is to be bound. Elsewhere, the Crown is not bound by the legislation. The Crown is to be bound by this interim committee but not by the State Planning Authority; it is a completely inconsistent view. In putting forward this amendment, the Legislative Council may have feared that the Government would proceed without consultation with the committee or the council, but those fears are groundless. Of course, this measure does not bind the Commonwealth, and it is doubtful whether it could bind the Commonwealth. However, the Commonwealth will proceed within the city of Adelaide as the State Government has agreed to proceed; that is, we will not undertake building activity within the city except after proper submission of the matters to the Adelaide City Council and proper consultation with it, so that there is overall conformity between the activities of the Government, the administration of the Building Act, and the administration of this legislation. While the Commonwealth Government and the State Government have adopted that policy and are carrying it out, it is certainly our view that it is wrong to bind the Crown within this sector of the legislation. We believe that it is wrong to bind the Crown under the legislation generally, and it is wrong to do it in this case, too.

Mr. COUMBE: I must take issue with the Premier on this matter. This Bill deals only with the city of Adelaide. I have often heard the Premier espouse the cause of urban development at considerable length, and I think that most members agree in principle with that idea. The provisions of this Bill are different from some sections of the principal Act in that this Bill deals wholly and solely with the city of Adelaide. The Premier does not agree to having the Crown bound. Let us consider the committee set up under the auspices of the Government to consider the development of Victoria Square. I assume that any Government plans for erecting an office block or an Asian-type hotel at Victoria Square would have to go before that committee for its general imprimature. In some instances, the rights of local government are being whittled away.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Where?

Mr. COUMBE: I want to defend the rights of local government for as long as I can; they must always be seriously considered. The committee set up under this Bill is an amalgamation of Government appointees and council appointees, and the Chairman will be the Lord Mayor of the day. The purpose is to preserve to some extent the rights of the city of Adelaide, its ratepayers and its residents. In connection with the Premier's emphasis on proper planning, we must remember that the Adelaide City Council administers not only the square mile of Adelaide but also North Adelaide. A large Government building could well be affected by this Bill. If the Government decided to erect a multi-storey building in Adelaide, we might find that the whole purpose of this Bill was upset. I suggest that such a possibility should be covered. I do not suppose for a moment that the committee would really reject a Government proposal, but it is preferable that the necessary provision be in writing. I strongly oppose the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Obviously the Government intends to preserve its opportunity to act contrary to the committee. There can be no other reason for the resistance to this amendment, and the Premier's reasons are extremely weak. It is implicit in the reasons the Premier put forward that the Government wants to be able (if it thinks in its superior wisdom that it should) to act contrary to everyone else and go its own way, but that should not be the case. The Premier said it was wrong that the Crown should be bound in this instance but not elsewhere in the legislation. I see nothing wrong with this, and no reason was advanced why it was wrong. It may be an anomaly, but that does not make it wrong or immoral, simply because the Crown is bound within the city of Adelaide. This is a new departure altogether. What is wrong in binding the Crown? Buildings erected by the Government or other Government activities within the square mile of Adelaide may be just as ugly or objectionable as if built by anyone else. As the Government is not superior to anyone else in these matters, why should it not be subject to the committee? I see no reason, except pride, for saying that the Crown should not be bound. Why should the Crown not be bound, simply because other interests are represented on the committee?

Mr. Jennings: What National Anthem do you prefer?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The member for Ross Smith has already done me one disservice today by calling "Question". I hope he will not persist with his interjections.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham knows that we are dealing with an amendment in Committee, and that is the only matter which is to be debated.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not want to say anything else about the member for Ross Smith.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member for Mitcham will not get the opportunity to say anything more about the honourable member for Ross Smith.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Why should the Crown not be bound, unless the Government intends to go its own lordly way if it so wishes? There is no reason why the Crown should not be bound if it is prepared to co-operate. The Premier said that, as we cannot bind the Commonwealth, the State should not be bound. We know that we cannot bind the Commonwealth, but that is no reason why we should not bind the State. Parliament has the jurisdiction to do it and, if that is the proper course, we should do it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Roads and Transport): We have heard sufficient biased rubbish from two former Ministers, who would have said exactly the opposite if they were still in Government. The member for Torrens (the former Minister of Works) did not have the courage to say that, as Minister, he would support being bound by the Crown.

Mr. Coumbe: I just said it should be bound.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: It is fine to hear these members say that the Crown should be bound, but will they give me an example of any Act they passed in their two years on the Treasury benches in which the Crown was bound?

Mr. Millhouse: So what?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Much hypocrisy has taken place during the last 10 minutes. The member for Torrens claimed that the rights of local government were being whittled away but, when I asked him where, he did not hear me. The Government has extended the rights of local government, and the member for Torrens knows that.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The Minister must confine his remarks to the amendment under discussion.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am dealing with the point raised by the member for Torrens in speaking to the amendment to which I am speaking. What the amendment seeks to

do is provide the committee with powers not possessed by this House or another place. I do not think that Opposition members have thought this matter through. We are hiding our heads in the sand if we say that the Bill deals only with the city of Adelaide and that we should not concern ourselves with the flow-on that must inevitably come if the amendment is adopted. We must decide whether the Crown will be bound in all respects over the whole sphere or whether we believe the Crown should be answerable to the people who elect members to this place and to another place. I join with the Premier in saying that, if we want to hand over the reins of Government to outside committees, we should support the Legislative Council's amendment. If we believe that the seat of government is at North Terrace, the amendment should be rejected.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I cannot accept the Minister's argument. He talked of the seat of government being on North Terrace, but he knows that at present it is on South Terrace.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! That remark is out of order.

Dr. EASTICK: The Premier said that, by accepting the amendment, Parliament would be a subordinate body to the committee. I do not believe that the committee would consider itself to have greater power than the Government but, if the committee is to provide the necessary direction to fulfil the scope of the Bill, it will require the full support of the Government.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It has that, and that's something it never had from the previous Government.

Dr. EASTICK: That support is doubtful, after what the Minister said a moment ago, namely, that the Government will not be told what it must do.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It has, and that's something it never had from the previous Government.

Dr. EASTICK: Although I accept that Commonwealth law is above State law where the Constitution provides, we should give a lead, expecting and accepting the support of the Commonwealth if we showed that we were willing to have the Crown, in the State sense, bound by virtue of the amendment. It is all very well to say it has not been included in the past. Section 51 of the Building Act (and the Minister was in charge of that Bill when it was debated in this House) provides:

(1) Except as provided in this section, this Act does not bind the Crown.

(2) Where a building is to be erected by or on behalf of the Crown in the area of a council, a notice shall, before the erection of the building is commenced, be sent to the council notifying the council of the fact that a building is to be erected.

(3) The council, shall, in addition, be supplied with a plan delineating the site of the proposed building and the position of the building in relation to the site.

That section was not in the original Bill as presented to this House, but was included after the Bill had been debated in this and in another place. This went a long way towards meeting the request of the Opposition that the Crown should be bound.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That isn't binding the Crown.

Dr. EASTICK: I said it went a long way towards it. I did not say it bound the Crown.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have allowed the Leader some latitude in referring to other legislation, but he must link up that matter with the amendment under discussion; it must not become the subject of a second reading debate.

Dr. EASTICK: On an earlier occasion we acknowledged the necessity for an authority of the nature of the authority we are dealing with now. On that occasion it happened to concern local government. It was an authority to provide this type of liaison and integration of effort. I see no reason why the Committee should not accept the amendment, if not totally, then in a move along similar lines to the provisions inserted in other legislation, so that there will be maximum integration of effort and maximum liaison between the Government and the committee being set up. I commend the amendment to the Committee.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill, Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Clark, Curren, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, King, Langley, McRae, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Carnie, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Ferguson, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, and Rodda, Mrs. Steele, Messrs. Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pair—Aye—Mr. Corcoran. No—Mr. Nankivell.

Majority of 5 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment No. 20:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 20 be agreed to.

This makes the terminating date of this legislation June 30, 1975, as it is expected that within that period the necessary supplementary development plan to accomplish effective planning for the city of Adelaide will have been prepared, exhibited, and adopted. It was the intention, of course, that this legislation should be temporary, and the Government sees no reason to disagree with the date set by the Legislative Council.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 19 was adopted:

Because the amendment departs from the principles of the principal Act and makes the Government, which should be answerable to the people, subordinate to a committee not so responsible.

JUVENILE COURTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Read a third time and passed.

FOOTWEAR REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 13. Page 1300.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I support this measure, which is one of the many minor types of legislation which comes under the care and control of the Minister of Labour and Industry. I had the pleasure of introducing a new Bill in 1969, and these are amendments to that principal Act. The original purpose of the legislation was designed to protect people who bought footwear, so that they would know whether they were buying footwear with a leather sole, because several products on the market were made of synthetic material that looked similar to leather. The purchaser would not find out the difference until he had worn the shoes for some time, and would then realize that he had purchased something that was not leather. Also, the original Bill was introduced in order to support the leather industry in this State.

These amendments deal with the uppers and parts of the footwear other than the sole. Present legislation specifies that the sole has to be branded (and we are referring to an Australian produced article), but the problem arises in branding the uppers and straps of shoes, particularly women's evening slippers. I understand that this legislation will be uniform throughout Australia, and it will be necessary to place a brand on the underneath side of the sole showing the maker's name, the size, and a description. As adhesives can be removed in the shop, the Factory Act prohibits the use of adhesive types of branding. This is not a nation-rocking measure, but, as the Minister and other State Ministers have agreed to make it uniform throughout Australia, I support it.

Mr. SLATER (Gilles): As it is desirable for the buying public to be aware of what materials have been used in the manufacture of footwear, I support the Bill. This legislation is complementary to that which has been, or is to be, enacted throughout the Australian States. It is important to understand that the original legislation was promoted by tanning interests in order to protect and promote the Australian leather industry. It was introduced because of the increased use of synthetic materials in the manufacture of footwear. It is important that we understand that the footwear industry in Australia has been concerned in the past year with two problems: first, in relation to the substantial increase in the amount of imports into Australia, with the present figure indicating that 25 per cent of the Australian market consists of imported footwear, and secondly, the use of synthetic materials.

Imported footwear from low-labour cost countries, although of inferior quality, has produced some undesirable effects on Australian manufacturers. As a result the Australian manufacturer has tried to compete in price, and has provided footwear material that is not of a high quality. Several manufacturers in the Eastern States have gone out of business or have been absorbed by large oversea interests, and the number of persons employed in this industry has been reduced markedly. In South Australia the numbers employed in the industry have not been reduced but, despite tariffs imposed on imported footwear, the Australian industry has not been able to compete in price and quality with low-price oversea footwear.

The footwear industry has a substantial record in Australia and was classified during the Second World War as an essential industry. If another emergency occurred, it would receive a similar classification. The difficulties faced by the industry in past years were real, and I do not consider that these amendments will solve the problems in the industry, but at least the buying public will know what materials have been used in manufacturing footwear. The manufacturer will now be required to brand the type of upper and quarter-lining

as well as the name of the manufacturer and the type of sole, but some difficulties may be experienced with women's fashion shoes and children's first walkers. I believe that it may be possible by regulation to allow the manufacturer to attach an adhesive label to the footwear concerned, although the member for Torrens indicated that that procedure could be difficult in practical application. However, I believe the suggestion has merit in regard to the branding of women's and children's shoes in particular. I have also previously mentioned the problems from imports facing the industry. Complementary legislation has been passed by the States and it is necessary for the Commonwealth Government to amend its Act, the Trades Description Act, to ensure similar branding requirements for imported footwear are covered. Of course, the public is protected in the same way regarding Australian-made footwear as it is with imported footwear, because the people will be aware of the materials used in the manufacture of the shoes. I believe that the Australian industry will not be disadvantaged in any way if imported footwear is branded in a similar manner. I support the Bill.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I will not keep the House long.

Mr. Gunn: I am glad to hear that.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I notice that the member for Eyre wears a face of amusement, and I must remind him that amusement is the happiness of those who cannot think.

The SPEAKER: There is nothing in this Bill on that matter. The Minister must confine his remarks to the debate.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member wears elastic-sided boots and that indicates that he follows the harrows, and I remind him that, if he does not watch the way he is going, he will be back following them again. The member for Torrens has held past Ministerial responsibility in the department of which I am now a Minister, and he knows that this legislation has been discussed at Ministers' conferences that he has attended, and he is well aware of the problems associated with this legislation. This is uniform legislation agreed to by all the States and the Commonwealth. However, if such legislation was not uniform, it would not work. I am pleased to know that I am not dealing with the sole. If I was dealing with the soul of honourable members it would be a much more difficult task than administering the department I now administer.

Mr. Harrison: Haven't members opposite got any souls?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I will not go so far as the member for Albert Park has gone, bur perhaps there is merit in his interjection. The member for Gilles is a past Secretary of the Federated Bootmakers Union, and his brother is the current President of that union. The honourable member has worked in the footwear industry and has expressed concern regarding imports. This problem has caused members of this union concern, but it has concerned the industry and consumers as well. I believe it is necessary for both the Commonwealth and the States to look at the matter of branding because of the protection it affords the consumer and the Australian leather trade. Australia produces a high-quality product, and I believe that we should set out to protect this industry in which we have pride and in which the employees of the industry have pride. It should be the responsible action of good Government that such an industry is protected, thereby ensuring security of employment for those engaged in the industry. I will certainly raise the matters mentioned by the member for Gilles at the next Ministerial conference. I should like to thank all members for their co-operation to ensure the swift passage of this Bill.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

RIVER TORRENS ACQUISITION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 20. Page 1473.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): This is another short Bill for which I indicate my support and that of the Opposition. In 1970 this House passed a special Act to deal with the acquisition of certain land comprising the Torrens River and land adjacent thereto. This amending Bill modifies that Act. In 1970 we thought that everything necessary had been incorporated in that Act, but it seems that that is not the case. I personally have a special interest in the Torrens River, which is the only major waterway in Adelaide, but I point out that it is a much cleaner river than that which runs through Melbourne upside-down.

Mr. Hopgood: Without the Yarra there would be no Tasmania.

Mr. COUMBE: Good comment. We decided in 1970 that certain things should be done to put the Torrens River and the acquisition of adjacent land on a proper basis.

Section 3 provides that, if in the opinion of the Minister it is desirable to acquire land comprising or adjacent to any portion of the river, he may cause surveys to be made and a plan to be prepared delineating that land. The Minister has now found that two problems have arisen. First, he may require a survey to be made before he wishes to acquire that land, but the Act does not give him power to do that. This Bill enables him to do it. I know that, apart from the councils located on the side of the river that I represent, the councils in the area represented by the Premier have considered that a complete survey of the river should be made to assist in the future development of the river and to assist those councils whose areas abut the river. Under the current Act that survey could not be carried out or a plan prepared unless the Minister aquired the land. So we now have an amendment in this Bill to provide that the Minister may require a survey to be made before he reaches a decision on the acquisition.

The second point is that there is some doubt whether the Surveyor-General has certain powers under the Land Acquisition Act and the Surveyors Act to do what this House in 1970 proposed and agreed should be done. All that this Bill does is put the matter right. It is an interesting feature of the Act and of the Bill that we talk about the "top of the river bank". It is defined as follows:

"the top of the river bank" means a point that is, in the opinion of the Surveyor-General, the top of the bank of the river.

That is not a bad definition but I point out to those honourable members who are not so familiar with the vagaries of this river as others are that its banks do change from time to time.

Mr. Ryan: It is easier to find the bottom than it is to find the top.

Mr. COUMBE: The main course of the river changes considerably. Since I have been the member for Torrens, part of at least one house, and possibly another, is disappearing into the river, in the Gilberton area. So the bank of the river is moving.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

PREVENTION OF POLLUTION OF WATERS BY OIL ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 26. Page 1561.)

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): This short Bill is fairly straight-forward. It merely increases a whole series of fines in connection with the pollution of ocean waters by oil. I have complained previously in this House of the lack of explanations by Ministers when introducing Bills. Perhaps I said that yesterday, that Ministers attempt to introduce Bills as a result of conferences with other States without much explanation; but in this case not much explanation is needed. The Minister of Marine said:

The purpose of the Bill is to increase the fines which may be imposed under the principal Act, in view of certain recommendations made at meetings of the Commonwealth and State Ministers of Marine . . . Oil pollution of the world's seas and littoral zones results in the destruction of both marine and bird life.

If any member needs convincing on that point, I refer him to the report on the *Torrey Canyon* disaster, with which all honourable members are familiar although they may not have read the report. It is available to them. I shall not quote from it at length but shall quote one or two brief passages in the report pertaining to this debate, making the point that oil pollution creates much havoc and damage to marine and bird life and to fauna and flora generally in the sea. The summary of the investigation into the *Torrey Canyon* disaster is to be found at the beginning of the report. I will quote one or two passages that show the effect that oil pollution has on marine life. Under section 8 "Effects on Marine Life" paragraph 126 states:

In general, crude oil, when spilled on the sea or washed ashore, very quickly loses its more toxic component fractions and has then no measurable effect on plankton, fish, shellfish or any other forms of marine life with which it may come into contact. It can, however, cause serious tainting of fish which are caught in nets that have been fouled by oil.

That is the first point, that fish can become tainted, and this tainting can persist for many weeks. Mention was made of an operation to rescue some of the sea birds, not only in the case of the *Torrey Canyon* disaster but in other cases, too. Attempts have been made by interested people (conservationists and others) to rescue some sea birds that have become incapacitated through becoming covered in oil. It is interesting to learn from this report about the *Torrey Canyon* disaster (I did not know it) that the effectiveness of these rescue operations was very limited. Paragraph 153 of the report states:

Oil pollution has been a hazard to many species of sea birds for at least 50 years, and the yearly toll round the British coast is reliably believed to be some thousands of birds. The marked decline in auks (guillemots

and razorbills) breeding on the southern British coasts over the past 30 years is considered by many ornithologists to be due primarily to oil pollution.

The report goes on to deal with the efforts made to rescue sea birds: some 7,849 birds were treated by conservationists and others at centres especially set up for the purpose. As a result of investigations made, it appears that less than 1 per cent of those birds found their way back to their colonies in the sea. Not many people were aware of the failure of those conservationists, who were of course well-meaning, in this work. They treated between 7,000 and 8,000 birds but less than 1 per cent of them recovered or found their way back to the colonies where they lived and propagated. It is apparent that oil pollution causes much damage to bird life. As regards flora and fauna, I quote now from paragraph 161 of this report:

Two officers of the National Environment Research Council spent five days (April 24-28, 1967) investigating the pollution of the coasts of Brittany. Their general conclusion was that contamination was heavier and more continuous than in many Cornish areas, and that it was mainly in the form of "chocolate mousse"—

the name given here—

which was hence not easily removed by treatment with detergent. The avoidance of the use of detergent in Brittany may have helped to reduce damage to flora and fauna, and it was noted that even in the worst polluted stretches of rocky coast there were patches of surviving vegetation and fauna from which recolonisation could occur. Nevertheless, it seems probable that the difficulty of removing contamination may have resulted in greater damage to the Breton oyster industry than was experienced in Cornwall, and it is doubtful whether the discolouration of miles of rocks will disappear for very many years. An account of these observations will be included in the Marine Biological Association's report.

So, one can readily see the possible extent of harm to marine flora and fauna; further, one can see the futility of attempting to rescue birds once they have been fouled by oil. The report also states:

Coastal pollution by floating oil has grown as the volume of tanker traffic has increased. The problem has long been recognized, and methods have been developed in Government laboratories for disposing of oil on the sea surface and for dealing with pollution of foreshores. Hitherto, most of the oil has come from illegal tank washings at sea, and tanker accidents have not been a significant factor.

The point is forcibly made that the most significant cause of pollution is the illegal washing of oil tanks at sea. It is therefore appropriate that the steepest fine ($50,000) in the Bill is directed against that activity. In view of the need for significant deterrents, I believe that the scale of fines in the Bill is completely realistic. The deterrents provided previously would have been chicken feed to the huge enterprises involved. I am convinced of the need for this legislation, as are authorities throughout Australia. The fine for offences connected with the keeping of oil records has been increased to $5,000.

Mr. Payne: What is the fine for filibustering?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: There has been no element of repetition in my speech, so that comment is ill-directed. Because the fines provided for in the Bill are entirely appropriate, I support the Bill, and I believe that most Opposition members support it.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6—"Reporting and investigation of discharges of oil, etc."

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I have heard no reports of deliberate oil pollution in South Australia, but I daresay there have been reports of accidental pollution from time to time. Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say how many prosecutions have been launched in connection with oil pollution since the Port Stanvac oil refinery has been operating?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL (Minister of Environment and Conservation): I cannot give the honourable member exact details now, but I believe a prosecution was launched about 12 months ago in connection with pollution at Whyalla. I cannot recall a prosecution in relation to Port Stanvac, but there certainly have been spillages. The honourable member can probably recall a newspaper article dealing with oil on the beach in the area. I shall obtain details for the honourable member.

Mr. MATHWIN: I, too, am interested in the question of the pollution of the beach in the area. Did the Minister say that he would get information on that matter?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Yes; I shall obtain the information for both honourable members.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 and 8 passed.

Clause 9—"Regulations."

Mr. RODDA: Recently, a spillage of oil in the Torrens River created a hazard for the bird life there. Can the Minister say whether, under the Act, he is empowered to

investigate, and invoke these appropriate penalties for such an offence, even though it is on restricted waters, because this matter should come within the ambit of the Act?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Bill relates to pollution of the sea, not pollution of the Torrens River. However, I share the honourable member's concern at the problem that occurred recently on the Torrens. An accidental spillage of oil found its way into a drain and from there into the river. I understand that this fault has now been corrected. Although oil spillage on the Torrens affects bird life, it is not as serious as the spillage of oil at sea. Spillage of oil at sea would probably be of considerable quantities, whereas the problem on the river was immediately apparent and steps could be taken to correct it.

Clause passed.

Clause 10 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

ADVANCES TO SETTLERS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from August 30. Page 1123.)

Mr. ALLEN (Frome): I support the Bill. The original Act was passed in 1930. In his second reading explanation the Minister said that since it had been decided that the maximum loan which might be made by the State Bank for ordinary housing purposes was to be increased to $10,000, it appeared equitable that the maximum loan under the Advances to Settlers Act should also be set at $10,000. Section 7 (1) of the Act provides:

Subject to the provisions of this Act, the bank may, in its discretion, make advances to any settler on the prescribed security for:

(*a*) making improvements on his holding, such as ring-barking, clearing (including rolling or logging down and burning), grubbing, fencing, draining, erecting or making permanent water improvements (such as dams, wells, tanks, watercourses, windmills, and the like), boring for water, erecting permanent buildings, or such other improvements as are prescribed; or

(*b*) stocking his holding; or

(*c*) discharging any mortgage already existing on his holding; or

(*d*) any other purpose.

The original Act did not apply to dwellinghouses, but in 1944 it was amended to include them by the addition of section 12a (2), which provides:

The bank may make an advance of any amount not exceeding $2,000 to any primary producer for the purpose of erecting, enlarging or altering a dwellinghouse on the holding of that primary producer.

In 1952, the Act was again amended to increase the sum to $3,500, and the word "settler" was substituted for "primary producer". In 1958, the Act was again amended to increase the sum to $7,000. Therefore, in six years the maximum amount that could be advanced doubled from $3,500 to $7,000. Ten years later, in 1968, the Act was again amended to increase the sum to $8,000. I consider that the sum should have been increased by more than $1,000 because, in the 10-year period 1958 to 1968, building costs increased by about 40 per cent. Had this increase been considered, the sum should have been $9,800 instead of $8,000.

The Bill increases the maximum advance available to a settler to $10,000. I point out that, as the total increase in building costs in the 14-year period since 1958 was 70 per cent, the maximum advance available to a settler should be about $12,000, not $10,000 as provided in the Bill. It would appear that the sum was set too low in 1968, taking into account building costs, but I realize that other factors must be considered when determining the maximum advance. A settler who received a $7,000 advance in 1958 was in a far better position than is the one who receives $10,000 in 1972. The interest rate, which is fixed by the Treasury from time to time, is now 7.3 per cent. An increase of, say, $2,000 should be no problem to the Government because, according to the Auditor-General's Report for 1971-72, the total advances made amounted to only $83,000 and the total repayments to $67,000.

Mr. McANANEY (Heysen): I support the Bill. Possibly not much use has been made of the Act, because a first mortgage must be given over the property. A person who purchased a house in Adelaide would probably borrow money and take a mortgage over his house. Where a first mortgage is taken over the whole of a settler's property, however, his ability to borrow elsewhere if the occasion arose is lessened, because money would be advanced only if the second mortgage were a collateral on the first mortgage. In 1971-72, $150,000 for advances was provided in the Loan Estimates, of which only $83,218 was spent. In the Loan Estimates the actual payments were shown to be $83,219, which is a difference of $1, but we do not need a Public Accounts Committee to investigate the difference. I can remember on one occasion when I was in a bank and we were 1c out, so we had to spend 24 hours finding it. The books had to balance, but apparently Government bookkeeping is not so accurate.

This year $80,000 has been allocated for loans under this Act, and the repayments will amount almost to that sum, so the Government will not suffer much strain. I do not think many people are aware of the existence of the Act and the assistance obtainable under it. That group of settlers still in a viable position but finding it difficult to borrow money is the group to which the Government should provide money. The interest rate is 7.3 per cent, and I do not think many bad debts would arise when the loan is secured by a first mortgage over the whole property. The Government makes more than one half of one per cent profit on these loans. It is a public utility and gets a percentage to cover money it lends.

I support the increase to $10,000 as being of some advantage, particularly to new settlers. However, the security would need to be something other than a first mortgage over the property, because that would inhibit a person's ability to secure other loans. I support the increase, but I think the activity covered by this Act should be investigated, and possibly this would need to be done on a national scale. If primary producers could get long-term loans in the same way as people in business in the city can obtain loans, at a reasonable rate of interest, many of their problems would be solved.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I support the Bill. It is a short measure to increase from $9,000 to $10,000 the maximum advance to settlers. Like the member for Frome, I think the amount could have been increased to a more realistic sum. At present the definition of "settler" contained in the Act is very wide, and many people could qualify. It is as follows:

"Settler" means any person who is engaged in agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, or pastoral pursuits on any land.

Even though any primary producer could qualify, the amount of $10,000 would not go far to assist him if he wished to engage in any large development programme. In the past people have not been carrying out a great deal of development in clearing country or putting down—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member must come back to the Bill under discussion, which raises the maximum advance to a settler for the building of dwellings. The honourable member must relate his remarks to the Bill.

Mr. GUNN: I shall not canvass that point any further.

Mr. Payne: Do you—

Mr. GUNN: The member for Mitchell would not know anything about settlers.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Is he going to make a speech on it?

Mr. GUNN: He does not make many speeches about anything—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Eyre should know that interjections are out of order.

Mr. GUNN: Like the member for Frome, I am disappointed that the amount is not greater. I am concerned to know that the Government has decided to make future alterations to the scheme by regulation. It is another example of the Government's dislike of following legitimate Parliamentary methods. It always does things by backdoor methods, sneaking them in by regulation.

Mr. Keneally: You would be a wake-up. We couldn't put it over you.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I am concerned to discover that the Government is doing these things in a backdoor fashion. However, we have not got much to worry about while we have a responsible Upper House to scrutinize these matters. The Auditor-General, too, examines them closely. After carefully scrutinizing the Auditor-General's Report, I think that many people are not aware that the benefits of this scheme are available to them. In my own area people to whom I have spoken have not been aware that it is available.

Mr. Keneally: Well, tell them.

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member is brilliant!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Standing Orders in this House apply to all members and I must warn the honourable member for Stuart that if he persists in interjecting he must suffer the consequences of Standing Orders. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: Thank you, Sir. I do not believe many people are aware of the scheme and its benefits. It would be in the interests of many who need financial assistance to build dwellings on their properties, and with the improvement in the rural position they will need assistance to enable them to build new homes which will give them the same facilities as people in the metropolitan area. I hope the Premier will investigate the possibility of making this knowledge available to as many people as possible.

Mr. VENNING (Rocky River): I support the legislation, but I do not intend to go into great detail about its history. The member for Frome has done this to very good effect and has explained to the House how, over a period, the sum of money made available has been lagging behind the requirement. It is significant that the position is still the same. Although the Government is to increase the amount to $10,000, any subsequent increase will be done by proclamation, and this proves conclusively that the Government is loath to keep up with the situation. If I may be permitted to refer to the principles of comparison, I point out that the Commonwealth Government assists the rural producer in relation to gift duty—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have reminded other speakers that this Bill deals with an advance to settlers for the purpose of erecting dwellings. This is the only subject matter that may be discussed. The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING: I can link up my remarks, if you will permit me, Sir. The principle is that the Commonwealth Government has increased the gift duty allowance to about $10,000, when in fact the State figure is still $4,000—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. VENNING: I want to link—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I must call the attention of the honourable member for Rocky River to the fact that he, too, has to abide by Standing Orders. The Bill increases the amount available to settlers for building dwellings from $9,000 to $10,000. Any subject matter outside the scope of the Bill is not permitted under Standing Orders. The honourable member for Rocky River.

Mr. VENNING: I wanted to make the point that, although the Government has introduced this amendment, it is lagging behind present needs. In building a dwellinghouse, $10,000 would not go far, as the member for Goyder can testify. Why should country people, who produce more than 50 per cent of our export earnings, have to be satisfied with second-rate dwellings on their rural holdings, when many times they work six days or seven days a week and 10 hours or 12 hours a day? This legislation improves the present set-up and that is why I support it, but I hope that soon, by proclamation, the Government will increase the amount to a more realistic figure in keeping with present-day costs.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): I, too, support the Bill. By increasing the amount from $9,000 to $10,000 the Government has recognized a need in the rural community. Whilst it is a pittance to the cinderella industries compared to the amounts we have considered in the Appropriation Bill, the limiting factor has been referred to by my old friend the member for Stirling.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I think the honourable member means the honourable member for Heysen.

Mr. RODDA: I mean the member for Heysen. On this side we consider the honourable member to be a financial genius: not only does he know where the money has come from but also he knows where it has gone or where it should have gone. He correctly drew attention to the fact that a limited number of people will qualify for this grant, because of the first-mortgage requirements. I know from experience that many rural people are seeking to use the benefits of the rural reconstruction scheme, for which they are grateful, and the $10,000 provided by this legislation will be useful to some people represented by pins on the map at the department's office. At present, my district on the map looks like a jungle. However, not many people from my district will be able to have the blue pin of final acceptance, or be able to avail themselves of the Government's generous offer. I think the member for Heysen said that the previous grant had not all been used, and that some restrictions will limit the ability of people to take advantage of the provisions of this legislation. However, in essence, I support it.

Bill read a second time and taken through Committee without amendment.

INDUSTRIES DEVELOPMENT ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 27. Page 1649.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): The Industries Development Act, amongst other things, set up a Parliamentary committee to consider aspects of industry, and its main function to date has been to assist industries that wish to establish in this State and those industries here that wish to expand or need assistance. It is the committee's duty to examine all propositions referred to it by the Treasurer in order to ascertain whether the suggestion is viable, is likely to increase employment in the State, or is likely to be profitable, and to consider several other aspects.

Also, under the Act, the Housing Trust is empowered to build factories as a result of propositions suggested by the trust, recommended by the Treasurer, and referred to the committee, on lease-back arrangements for up to 15 years, with a right of prior repayment. These provisions have been of great assistance to this State as an incentive for industries to establish here, especially when other States are tending to promote greater inducements for industries to establish in those States. I believe it is a valuable Act, and I remember having taken advantage of it when in office. In the history of this Act there have been some unfortunate failures (one or two recently), but apart from those failures, this is an Act that should be continued. These amendments will extend the operation of the Act and the matters that can be referred to the committee to be examined. The committee must still report back to the Treasurer but, in the main, the Bill will enlarge the purposes for which borrowings may be guaranteed under this Act. It also widens the type of industries that may be assisted. The definition of "industry" is as follows:

. . . includes any sporting, cultural or social activity whether or not that activity is carried on for, or in the expectation of, profit or reward;

That is a major departure from the parent Act. By this change in outlook we are entering a new phase of activity. Not only will the committee be charged with the responsibility of examining industry in the normal way regarding financial backing, but the committee will also be expected to deal with applications referred to it by the Treasurer under the headings of "sporting", "cultural", or "social", whether they are profitable or not. Many of these activities could be most worth while, although I am not sure how sporting activities will be examined or what that category encompasses. I imagine there will be several activities covered by the cultural and social activity definition. I would appreciate it if the Premier, in his reply, would elaborate on these aspects to which I have just referred. I support the Bill but I would like more information on these matters.

Other amendments are introduced by the Bill. The committee will now be charged with investigating the matter and investigating whether or not the business concerned is capable of earning an income sufficient to meet its liabilities and commitments. That, too, is a departure from the present situation where businesses concerned are expected to be viable and profitable organizations. As a result of the amendments in this Bill, I can see that the committee could suddenly be busy. It was busy earlier in the year and it then went through a slack period. The committee carries out a most important function in this State by encouraging industries to come to South Australia, but I emphasize that one of its charters is to assist local industry. This was shown in the case of an application by David Shearer Limited about which the committee made three recommendations to assist that local industry. I support the Bill, but I should like further information on the matters to which I have referred as well as information on the assistance that the bodies now eligible for assistance can expect from the committee. I point out that the committee is not involved in bridging finance, because it simply makes a recommendation to the Treasurer and the applicants concerned must obtain their own finance.

Mr. RODDA (Victoria): Of special interest to me is the definition of "industry", which includes sporting, cultural and social activities and which also refers to the word "profit". As a result of this new definition, approaches will now be able to come from less traditional sources. Many country towns have worthwhile tourist facilities which, because of the lack of finance and the ability of those concerned to obtain guarantees for finance, are not being used to their full advantage to promote tourism. I refer especially to the many fine golf courses in the South-East, as well as to the much-needed international hotel project to lure world travellers, who are travelling between Melbourne and Perth, to visit Adelaide. This new provision may enable us to provide facilities to entice tourists to the South-East to take full advantage of our fine golf facilities. There are other fine golf facilities in Victoria.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: We will not be guaranteeing those.

Mr. RODDA: I think that the Premier is under-rating himself.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is an accusation of modesty that I appreciate—I appreciate its rareness.

Mr. RODDA: I am sure that, when the Premier looks at some such facilities and sees these tourists with bulging pockets descend on him, he will be only too pleased to guarantee a fine motel at Naracoorte or Lucindale, or to talk the Victorian Premier (Mr. Hamer) into building similar facilities at Hamilton so that we can fly tourists to the South-East.

This change in attitude augurs well for the future, and for that reason I support the Bill.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I, too, support the Bill. I realize that the committee assists industry in this State. I, too, am interested in clause 3, which defines "industry" and includes in that definition sporting, cultural or social activity on a profit basis. This is a wide definition and, like the member for Torrens, I am most interested to hear what the Premier will say regarding the bodies now encompassed by that definition. Does it include sporting clubs such as bowling clubs, boy scout organizations, and similar groups? There is a great need in this area, as I have seen over the years, and that has been catered for mainly by local government which has had to bear the brunt of appeals from football, cricket, bowling, and other sporting clubs, and the Boy Scouts.

Difficulty has arisen in some cases where, say, a youth club bought land in its early days, securing it for about $200, and eventually, when it tried to raise money on it, it took a long time, in normal circumstances, for the transaction to go through. By the time it tried to erect a building, it found that the equity was not there. So it then had to go to local government for assistance. Here, there was a stumbling block where local government could not possibly assist (or perhaps it could not until recently) because, if the land was defined for a specific purpose, the club was not able to use it as security for a loan. I knew of a case two years ago where there was some jiggery-pokery about whether money was to be made available to a certain club. So clause 3 is a good provision. I am happy to support it and I hope the Premier, when he comes to reply to this debate, will explain further the definition of "industry" in respect of sporting bodies, which must be able to meet their obligations. That is only natural. I support the Bill because it widens the scope of the committee. It is a step in the right direction.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): I appreciate the support offered to the Bill by members opposite. The member for Torrens has asked what is the nature of the applications that have been contemplated. Actually, the measure arose originally from the very sort of thing about which the member for Victoria was speaking. Some golf clubs in South Australia have sought to provide motel facilities, not only for club members but also for members of the public, as a tourist facility. They would be useful to the club, since the club would collect green fees from the people staying in the motel but at the same time the motel would be of general use to the public and an asset to the tourist industry, provided that additional employment, not only directly but in other ways. Some of these propositions seem to us to be sensible and within the terms originally intended when the Government specified to the committee that it considered the tourist industry to be an industry within the terms of the Act for which we would contemplate guarantees.

Mr. Coumbe: You referred to several motels.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: True. When it came to the question of a non-profit-making organization involving itself in such a development, while it may well have been open to the committee to find that it was well within the terms of the existing Act to process this application and to make a recommendation, doubt was raised by the Crown Solicitor, who thought the matter should be put beyond all doubt. That is why this measure has been introduced.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3—"Interpretation."

Mr. MATHWIN: Is the definition of "business" confined to golf clubs?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer): It concerns social, cultural and sporting matters. Facilities, particularly of a tourist kind, can be developed that will be advantageous to the tourist industry of this State, but they may not be carried on for profit. In these circumstances, if they are generating employment and in the public interest, we think we should be able to guarantee them. It is not confined to golf clubs.

Clause passed.

Clause 4—"Guarantees."

Mr COUMBE: Can the Premier assure me that the normal type of profitable business will not be interfered with?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is so.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9.41 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, October 10, at 2 p.m.