

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, June 27, 1973

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Appropriation (No. 1),
Supply (No. 1).

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: CONSTITUTIONAL BILLS

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) : I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Government wishes to again make clear its position on the constitutional measures before the Parliament. The Government will not accept amendments that place conditions on the achievement of universal adult suffrage for the Legislative Council. That measure must stand alone. It would appear that the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council does not believe that, if the Bill seeking full adult franchise for the Council is passed, the Government will proceed with the Bill establishing a system of proportional representation for that House.

There is no basis whatsoever for that fear. The Government's policy is to achieve one vote one value for Legislative Council elections. It will pursue that policy. It will press for the passage of the Bill establishing proportional representation and to this end gives the assurance that it is prepared to confer with the Legislative Council at a managers' conference at the earliest opportunity today.

It will not accept a position in which the Legislative Council sets, as the price of the people's right to an equal vote at its elections, agreement by the House of Assembly with the views of some Council members as to systems of proportional representation. The Government will not withdraw the proportional representation Bill. The Government believes that it must be clear (from the fact that it promptly replied by letter to Mr. DeGaris concerning his proposals on the proportional representation Bill) that it is serious in proceeding with that measure, and desires it to achieve agreement.

It believes that this public assurance ought to allay any fears in this regard, fears which it is claimed have given rise to the Legislative Council's attempt to attach conditions on the people's right to adult suffrage, and equal voting rights for the Houses of Parliament in this State.

PETITIONS: WATER AND SEWERAGE RATES

Mr. EVANS presented a petition signed by 265 residents of Crafers, Stirling, Bridgewater, Heathfield, Aidgate, and Upper Sturt Estate stating (1) that the assessing procedures for water and sewerage rates used by the Engineering and Water Supply Department were highly unjust; (2) that valuations of new houses were higher than those of established houses; (3) that water rates in the Stirling area were assessed at least 60 per cent higher than similar properties in the metropolitan area; (4) that the high rebate allowance encouraged excessive water use; (5) that personal hardship cases could not be adequately reviewed; and (6) that the reduction of water and sewerage charges by the voluntary decrease of consumption was not possible. The petitioners therefore prayed that the House would release the findings of the inquiry by the Sangster com-

mittee, and devise a more equitable water and sewerage rating system based on consumption.

Petition received and read.

Mr. EVANS presented three similar petitions signed by 593 persons.

Petitions received.

QUESTIONS**UNION BAN**

Dr. EASTICK: As my question relates to Government policy, I direct it to the Premier. Will he say what action he intends to take to end the illegal ban imposed by militant union leaders at Elizabeth to prevent General Motors- Holden's from implementing changes in its operational procedures in South Australia? I understand that a meeting of workers at Elizabeth a short time ago was discussing whether to maintain a ban on the removal of assembly machines and equipment from Elizabeth to Victoria. G.M.H. announced on Monday that it would transfer assembly work from Elizabeth to its Dandenong plant and, in turn, expand its fabrication plant in South Australia at Elizabeth and Woodville. This was announced as part of the reorganization programme to meet increased local and export demand. In fact, I understand from newspaper reports that the Premier was given first-hand information about the company's plans by the management before that information was given to anyone else. I should like to know whether the Premier accepts what he was told by the company to the effect that the changeover is designed to meet increased demand caused by expanding operations at Elizabeth. If the Premier accepts that, why is the Government doing nothing to prevent this attempt by a union to undermine expansion by a vital South Australian industry?

The union ban on the transfer of assembly-line machinery is a first-class example of a militant hard core within a union using the union membership to dictate to the employer how he shall run his company. It is not even as if the men will be put out of work by the decision, because it has been clearly stated that, in the long term, there will be an increase in the number of work opportunities provided by the company in this State. What, then, will the Premier do about these standover tactics? If he does not do something soon, before our industrial reputation goes further down the drain than it has gone already, South Australia will be in a critical industrial situation.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Let me make clear that I am neither happy nor satisfied with the statements made to the Government or the public by the management of G.M.H. The establishment of G.M.H. in South Australia has occurred with the support and assistance of public moneys. The reports to me by the company leave several questions as yet unanswered. I have written to the directorate of G.M.H. today to ask for further information on some of these scores. Apparently the company, in the course of its statement, has said there will be an expansion of fabrication to make up for the removal of the Torana assembly line. However, on further inquiry, the company apparently intends to transfer its supply branch to Victoria with the Torana assembly.

Originally, when I questioned representatives of management concerning the matter, they said there would be no difficulty for component manufacturers in South Australia: they would still have all the facilities they have now. However, I am not satisfied that this is so. True, fabrication will expand, but some alterations will be made in the classifications of people who are employed in the plant. I appreciate the economic need for a company to look

to reasonable rationalization of its plant operations. G.M.H. has said that the basis of this arrangement is that the major fabrication is in South Australia, so it will centre all that activity here, as it will take its assembly operations to Victoria because that is where those operations are concentrated. That is a reasonable rationalization, and I appreciate that it is what the company has said. However, I am by no means yet satisfied that we have the full story.

Mr. Hall: They probably like the Liberal Government in Victoria.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is interesting to hear that the honourable member likes a Liberal Government anywhere. I have said what is the present position and I have inquired of the company. I do not find it surprising that workers at the plant want more information on this score, nor do I find it surprising that they should say they want consultation with management before they agree to something that affects their future employment and remuneration. I think that is a perfectly reasonable stance. That is the position of the Government, and I hope that I have made it plain.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL (FRANCHISE)

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 1, line 12 (clause 2)—Leave out “This Act” and insert “(1) Subject to subsection (2) of this section, this Act.”

No. 2. Page 1 (clause 2)—After line 13 insert new paragraph (2) as follows:

“(2) A proclamation under subsection (1) of this section shall not be made unless the Governor is satisfied that an Act that makes provision for—

(a) the constitution of the State as a single Legislative Council electoral district;

and
(b) the election of members for the Legislative Council by a system of proportional representation,

has been passed and is in operation.”

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the Legislative Council’s amendments be disagreed to.

These amendments are similar to those which were moved in this Committee by the Leader of the Opposition and which would make the right of adults to vote for elections to the Legislative Council in this State dependent on another measure and on the achievement of agreement with the Legislative Council on that measure. That measure relates to systems of voting for the Legislative Council. The Government will not agree that a bargain can be made about the people’s right to suffrage. It matters not what system of voting there is for the Legislative Council, there can be no gainsaying the right of every citizen to exercise a vote for that House. That was made clear to this House when the measure was before it.

Citizens’ rights to vote are not negotiable. No bargain can be made about it, and we cannot have another place saying to members of this House or to the people of South Australia, “We want to exercise control over voting systems in South Australia and we will use our ability to refuse people’s right to vote as a lever to keep our minority control of the Upper House.” That is shabby. It is just not on. Every citizen has a right to vote. There can be no condition attaching to that and there can be no question of his right to vote. It is extraordinary that, in this part

of the 20th century, any House of Parliament in this country can say, “We will attach conditions to whether an adult can vote for a House of Parliament that must decide on the legislation that affects his life.”

That is the position in relation to this measure. We do not believe that in any circumstances there can be conditions attaching to the right of an adult to vote for the Legislative Council. That does not mean that we do not intend to proceed to press a measure for a reformed system of voting for the Upper House that will introduce one vote one value and proportional representation on a State-wide basis. We will do that; we will seek agreement on it; and we are willing to confer on it. I have said that many times and have made it obvious. In fact, it was made obvious yesterday and it has been made obvious today: it has always been made obvious.

The Hon. I. D. Corcoran: There’s never been any doubt about it.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If there is a doubt about our pressing on with the second measure, I point out that this Government introduced it: it is our measure and we intend to do everything we can to have it passed. However, we shall not be placed in a position where a condition of our getting what we believe to be the people’s right in respect of a voting system is then made a condition of the people’s right to vote, their right to cast a ballot, because, regardless of whether we get agreement in the Legislative Council, what then occurs on that measure does not matter.

It cannot be gainsaid that every citizen should have a right to vote for the Legislative Council, whether on a district system or on a proportional representation system. I cannot believe that the Legislative Council can maintain that it can tell the people of this State, “We are not satisfied with the proportional representation measure, so in future you will not have the right to vote for the Legislative Council.”

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That’s right. That’s what they are saying.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That is what they are saying, and we and the people of this State will not have that. I consider that, on this adult suffrage measure, disagreement to the amendments should be notified to the Legislative Council, and the Council must have made clear to it that there is no basis for conferring on this matter, because there is no basis of compromise. We cannot ask for a conference, because we cannot suggest an amendment and we cannot move from the position that every citizen should have the right to vote.

When returning these amendments to the Legislative Council, we should make clear that they are unacceptable because they place conditions on people’s votes, and also that the amendments are completely unnecessary because the Government has given a public assurance, which it will stand by, that it will proceed with the proportional representation measure and try to reach agreement on it. I consider that this is the stand that this place should take and that every member, having voted for this Bill at the third reading stage—

The Hon. I. D. Corcoran: Unamended!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN:—has the duty to maintain unanimity here in demanding the right of the people to vote in elections for both Houses in the Parliament of South Australia.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I consider that the matter being debated now could have been dealt with over a long period of time, and particularly in the past

48 hours, without the obvious drama that the Premier has been responsible for bringing into discussions on the Bill.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Mr. DeGaris had nothing to do with it?

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Speak to the measure.

Dr. EASTICK: I will speak to the measure.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Dr. EASTICK: The Premier said that the measure introduced in another place was similar to the measure introduced in this place. I thank him for saying that it was similar and that it was not identical, because there is an independence of thought in the two places.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: You're squirming on that one.

Dr. EASTICK: Not at all. This place passed the measure, as the Premier has said, the members here having shown clearly that they considered that there was not only a need for adult franchise (which we support) but also a need to show the people of the State, the minority groups and everyone else, that we recognized their right to have their votes considered in the final assessment or the final election of members to another place. Nothing that the Premier has said this afternoon has been more than a play on words in that regard. He has said that the Government will try to reach agreement. I thank him for the information that he has given us and the people of South Australia this afternoon. It shows that we can go to conference on another matter, but the important thing is that the Premier is asking this place, and the other place in particular, to pass a measure that could disfranchise more than 20 per cent of the people of this State.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Don't talk rubbish!

Members interjecting:

Dr. EASTICK: The Premier and the Minister know that, as the Constitution and Electoral Acts Amendment Bill (Council Elections) is proposed by the Government, the votes cast by many people would be lost.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know that's untrue.

Dr. EASTICK: It is not untrue.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You know it is completely untrue.

Dr. EASTICK: One evening recently the Minister was trying to tell me that something else I had said was not true, but subsequently he had the courtesy to tell me privately that he was wrong.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: I hope you will tell me privately that what you are saying now is untrue.

Dr. EASTICK: The Government's proposal sought to take from many people the exact number of which would be indeterminate until an election was held, the value of their votes. The Bill reduced the value of those votes to nothing except the value that the votes would have in determining whether candidates' deposits would be returned.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: That's got nothing to do with this Bill.

Dr. EASTICK: It is all very well for the Minister to try to lead me up the wrong railway track. I tell the Minister and the Premier that I have broadened this discussion in precisely the same way as the Premier has broadened it.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Although I have allowed some latitude, I do not intend to allow the honourable Leader to discuss the two Bills now. I ask him to keep to the matter under discussion.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have pointed out that, on this measure, the Premier is asking us to accept a situation that I and my colleagues accept, but he is asking us to accept it as a blank cheque that gives no guarantee to the people of this State that the advantage

he claims for them, as contained in another measure, will be given, and there is no guarantee that it will be of advantage to them. I consider it perfectly right for the other place to have sought the concurrence of this place in the way in which it has sought it, and I support the Council's amendment.

Mr. COUMBE: Earlier in the debate the Government suggested strongly that it wanted this legislation passed. My Party, too, has played a responsible part in expediting the passage of the Bill and has continued its support for the principle of adult franchise. If the Government is sincere in its desire to have this Bill passed, the best procedure would be to defer the measure at this stage until the Bill to amend the Constitution and Electoral Acts has been considered. The Premier has charged us with attaching conditions to the franchise Bill, but this is not so, because we accept adult franchise for the Council. When introducing the two Bills last week, the Premier said that he considered both were important, so that we could infer that they had some relation to each other.

About 30 minutes ago the Premier, in a Ministerial statement, the contents of which we had no previous knowledge of, purported to give the assurance that the Government was willing to confer on a proportional representation Bill and would not withdraw it. I accept the Premier's assurance, but reiterate that the franchise Bill could be passed if certain matters were resolved in another connection. The Government can do one of two things: either report progress on this Bill or defer consideration of the measure until later today.

Mr. HALL: Yesterday and last evening there were some amazing scenes in another place, but those who hold the majority of seats, although with minority support in the community, had their lesson and received a reply from members of the public who occupied the gallery. At every sally that had significance in relation to this Bill there were sounds of ridicule and laughter from the galleries, because of the antics of those who stand in the way of the democratic process in this State, and today we find the Liberal and Country League members in this Chamber echoing those same distressful arguments.

Mr. Coumbe: That's quite wrong.

Mr. HALL: It is not wrong: they are the same arguments supporting the same amendments, and this behaviour is a disgrace to the Party sitting in front of me. Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition in another place said, in honeyed words, that the Opposition had offered co-operation, yet all day he had taken the business out of the hands of the Government by refusing to follow the Government's programme. The Government would have been justified in going to an election on that basis alone. Opposition members were not willing to face the responsibility of following the Government's programme and making a decision on it. The Opposition's idea of co-operation was to put the Government in visual disgrace in the eyes of the public by taking the business of the Council out of the Government's hands. I have never heard so much twisting of words, so that the public of South Australia now find that black is white and white is black. All I can say is that Dr. Goebbels was an amateur!

We find the same sentiments expressed here today by the same Party, with the Deputy Leader resiling on his opinion that he had previously expressed in this House without conditions. Today, several years later, he places conditions on his opinion. Who rules the Liberal and Country League? From yesterday's proceedings it is obvious that it is not ruled from this Chamber but that the Liberal and Country League hierarchy is in the

other Chamber, and its policies have been repeated here today by its puppets. I am interested in some of the reconditioned members.

Mr. Rodda: When are you going to have a re-bore?

Mr. HALL: I think the term is production-line reconditioning, because there are quite a few. The publication *A Liberal Awakening, The LM Story* (a book that should be in every home) contains material that is relevant to this subject. Some of the players have changed, but the historical description is accurate. In a chapter written by a member of the Upper House (Mr. Hill), he states (when referring to my colleague on my left):

Millhouse has remained consistently liberal in his political life and has suffered great personal criticism from within his Party as a result. It is to his credit that he has borne this criticism well. Perhaps he was a little ahead of his time. Whether or not that is true, there is no doubt that he was a member of a Party that was behind his time. His belief in electoral reform not only from an idealistic viewpoint but as a basis for regaining our public popularity has now been vindicated.

Now I read from a chapter written by Mr. Potter, a member of another place (another reconditioned member), as follows:

I do not propose to go into the details of the measure but it is interesting, in retrospect, to see the voting in the House of Assembly on the matter.

Here, we are dealing with a somewhat historic occasion, on which for the first time there was agreement between a substantial part of the L.C.L. and the Labor Party on the issue of full adult franchise. Of course, there was a division within the L.C.L., and that is not unusual; there have been divisions and still are divisions within it. Mr. Potter continues:

At the second reading stage those voting in favour were Messrs. Arnold, Coumbe, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Pearson, Wardle, and Mrs. Steele. At the final third reading of the Bill the voting in favour was Messrs. Arnold, Coumbe, Edwards, Hall, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Pearson, Teusner, Wardle, and Mrs. Steele.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: Without conditions!

Mr. HALL: There were no conditions, because the then Leader of the Opposition, who is now Premier, under challenge (I believe the challenge was a surprise to him), agreed that his Party would accept an entrenchment provision in the Constitution to safeguard the existence of the Upper House so that it could not be abolished without a referendum of the people of South Australia. That challenge was met and there were no other conditions in the measure: franchise stood alone as a public right in South Australia. Yet the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who spoke so eloquently such a short while ago, was defending the democrats in another place who put conditions on the Bill. The member for Murray, who has a right to cross the floor and join the Government if there is a division on this Bill, also put conditions on the measure, as did the member for Heysen, who has always called himself a democrat.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HALL: This is recorded by a member of another place who wrote the chapter to which I have referred and who crossed the floor to vote against franchise last evening. No-one can deny that this is a blot on the political scene of South Australia, and it involves all those L.C.L. members who, in 1973, still put conditions on the people's right to vote. How on earth could these members go to an election? How could they face their electors and try to explain their position? At a time when their Party is deeply in debt, how could L.C.L. members defend the inconvenience of an election, let alone their ideology? That

is why the member for Mallee has been wandering white faced around this Chamber this afternoon.

Mr. Nankivell: Come outside and say that!

Mr. HALL: He is afraid of the challenge with which he will be confronted. A few members across North Terrace are combining with members in the Upper House on this matter. What is the basis for this election? One thing annoys me about the passage of this Bill so far: the Premier's twilight tactics with the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House. Yesterday, the Leader in that place, under challenge from one of the Government Ministers who asked how long ago he had discussed this matter with the Premier, said that it was 15 hours earlier, and that puts it at about 1.20 a.m. on Tuesday. I think the Premier stated 7.30 in the evening, but—

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: It was 8 o'clock.

Mr. HALL: I think it is disgraceful that, when we are again discussing this Bill, concerning which the Premier and his Party have been so idealistic, the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in another place have discussed it in twilight talks at the Premier's home.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: This Bill was not discussed.

Mr. HALL: We can see what is coming out of this. This challenge is a sham, and we know what will happen. The Premier has said that he will not go back and tell the other place to pass the franchise Bill or else! He will say, "Pass the franchise Bill after we have fixed up a face-saving measure for the proportional representation Bill." I will lay odds that there will be no election. It is all fixed! The L.C.L. can't afford an election.

Mr. Millhouse: Not in any sense.

Mr. HALL: It cannot afford it ideologically, financially, or by virtue of its membership, which in another place would be decimated.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HALL: Just what has the Premier agreed with the senior right-wing member of another place? I know that he and that member represent the extremes of South Australian politics and that neither is as democratic as he says he is. Of course, Opposition members in the Upper House, who deny suffrage, and the Premier will consider other legislation dealing with certain democratic processes. These two people, in the twilight of Monday evening, were discussing the future of this matter, although I do not think that the Chief Secretary knew much about it or, indeed, that his Ministers knew anything about it. However, the Leader of the Opposition had a full detailed written reply from the Premier so that he could inform the Chief Secretary what was in that document. It was a disgraceful situation, involving behind-the-scenes negotiations that should never have taken place in that way.

Mr. Jennings: You weren't in it this time.

Members interjecting:

Mr. HALL: I inform the humorist on the other side that the policy of the Liberal Movement is well known, and I refer him again to the article printed on its behalf on April 2 when it was indicated what would occur in this place and in another place. The Council has been deceitful in this matter, and there is no doubt that it was dripping with hypocrisy yesterday and last evening when its members expressed concern for one vote one value. As recently as three months ago, the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House was on the media debating with a well-known academic the merits of restricted franchise. As far as I am concerned, these people are the creepy-crawly creatures of South Australian politics. If this type of deceit had taken place in commerce, the people concerned would be behind bars but, because they deceive under

privilege, they can get away with deceiving the South Australian public.

There is no cause for the L.C.L. Party in this place to rejoice in following that argument here. They know that there will be no election, because in the end they will find a face-saving formula, and the Premier will have the opportunity to accept it. What will happen? It is not a matter involving a clash of wills in the Council or in this place, or involving the unknown factor of who will cross the floor. Either Party will decide whether or not to have an election and will act accordingly. If the Labor Party wanted an election, it could force one but, from the Premier's description of the way the Bill will be treated between the Houses, I believe that the A.L.P. does not want an election now. That is what I believe because of the way the Premier has organized a tactical response to the Council's amendments and to its rejection of the original measure.

But the matter now rests with the L.C.L. Does it want an election? If it does, the way it treats these Bills will not be purely accidental. It will decide on this matter and, finally, if it wants an election, it can put every obstacle in the Government's way and have it. That is the way the game is being played, and it is time the public knew about it. I have been a member here for a few years, and I have seen much hypocrisy and many different attitudes in that time, but yesterday I saw the most astounding performance of political puffery that has ever been exhibited in either House. All I can say is that the Liberal Movement in this place does not support the Leader of the Opposition in his disgraceful adherence to the attitude of the Upper House. We support full suffrage for South Australia, regardless of who brings it in.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We have been favoured with a fair show of histrionics this afternoon, starting with the Premier's rejection of the Legislative Council's amendment. It is not unusual for us to be favoured with this sort of histrionic performance; we have had held before us this shining light, the principle of everyone having a vote. It so happens that the principle has changed during the last week. The principle which the Labor Party put forward prior to the last election and which has been flaunted by the Attorney-General most eloquently is the principle of one vote one value; this was the shining principle from which we were told we must never resile. If we accept that as the principle by which we will adjust electoral affairs in this State, obviously this amendment is essential.

Principles change. Last week we had the principle of one vote one value. However, the Labor Party has brought in an obvious electoral fiddle that could deprive up to 20 per cent of the electors of any say whatever in the election of members to the Upper House. That situation would be far worse than the one applying at present. Here we have two principles; one is that we should give all the people a vote, but then the Labor Party says, "Let us forget the aspect of equal value." We will go along with one vote one value, but when did the Labor Party put forward a proposition for equal value? The first we knew of such a proposition was when we saw the front page of the *Advertiser* recently, where there was a cock and bull story about tying the number of members in the Upper House to the votes cast in House of Assembly elections. In other words, the Upper House vote would be meaningless. That proposal was laughed out of court. So, the principle of one value has changed.

The Labor Party gives no credence whatever to the principle of one vote one value. There is only one way in which this Parliament can give credence to the prin-

ciple of one vote one value, and that way is to consider the two Bills side by side; the Labor Party's sham tactics, which it is foisting on the public, are to deny this principle. The Labor Party went to the last election on the principle of one vote one value, but it now comes up with an obvious electoral fiddle that gives no value at all to up to 20 per cent of the votes cast in Legislative Council elections. We stick to the principle we put forward last week and, if the Government is genuine regarding the principle of one vote one value, it will consider the Bills side by side and stick to the principle of truly equal value. I oppose the motion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The present situation reminds me of the Latin tag *quem vult perdere Jupiter prius dementat*: whom Jupiter wishes to destroy, he first makes mad. That is just what is happening to the Liberal and Country League this afternoon. An amendment similar to the one we are now debating was moved by the Leader of the Opposition during the passage of this Bill through this place. At that time the L.C.L. was so unenthusiastic about it that it did not even push it to a division; it was lost on the voices. It did not have the courage even to be counted on it, yet now, because the Upper House has put it into this Bill, we are having a dogfight about it, and L.C.L. members here are willing to support the Upper House in what it wants to do.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Do you think the L.C.L. will be game to call for a division?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That will be interesting to see. Many L.C.L. members do not really like the idea of a full franchise for the Legislative Council, and they do not want a full franchise for that House. I have said "many of them" (I see the member for Mallee frowning at me, so I shall make an exception of him if he likes). However, many L.C.L. members do not want a full franchise for the Legislative Council.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What about the member for Rocky River?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I shall leave the Minister to speculate on that. Many L.C.L. members will do anything they can to try to block a full franchise for the Legislative Council. One of the most extraordinary aspects of this situation is that the L.C.L. is now complaining that the measure which is a twin to this measure (to use the words of the Leader of the Opposition in this place) could disfranchise more than 20 per cent of the people of this State. For decades the L.C.L. has been quite content with a system of electing members of the Upper House which, until a few years ago, disfranchised probably 50 per cent of the people of this State and which still disfranchises at least 15 per cent of the people. L.C.L. members were happy with that system for a long time but, now that it is to be changed, they are not content with a system that (as everyone can see, by the use of a little common sense) is tremendously much better than the present system, even though I do not like some aspects of it, as I said last week.

The word "hypocrisy" has been used several times today, and it could not be more accurately used than to describe the attitude I have referred to. When the Bill was before this place last week we had only one short speech in its support from the L.C.L.: from the Leader of the L.C.L. in this place. Not one other L.C.L. member on this side of the Chamber spoke in favour of full franchise, yet this was the greatest reversal of policy for the L.C.L. that has occurred during my time in Parliament. However, they were so unenthusiastic or so embarrassed or so ashamed that not one of them, except their Leader, got up to speak to it. I challenge them now (they have a second opportunity today) to get up individually and

say what they think about full franchise for the Legislative Council. If they accept my challenge, not only will their votes be recorded (we do not know whether they are for it or against it today) but also we and their constituents will know what they think about this major change in policy for their Party. I make that challenge, because L.C.L. members should remember that, if we have an election following the consideration of these Bills, each one of them will be going to that election, defending a limited franchise for the Legislative Council at the behest of the real Leader of the L.C.L., the Hon. Mr. DeGaris.

Mr. McAnaney: Oh, rubbish!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let the member for Heysen get up and say what he thinks about full franchise for the Legislative Council.

Mr. McAnaney: I've done it for years.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Let the honourable member, and the members for Davenport, Bragg, and Glenelg get up and say what they will tell their electors if we have an election on this issue. Whose side will they be on? Will they be on the side of full franchise, or will they be on the side of their colleagues in the Legislative Council, led by the nose by Mr. DeGaris? Let them let us know where they stand, because that is what the issue at the election will be. They will have to declare themselves then. Do they support a vote for every citizen of this State for both Houses of Parliament, because it is through both Houses that the laws that govern us all must pass?

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: I don't think they will get up, though.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It will be interesting to see whether they do. I am finding it interesting to see the process of political suicide being enacted in front of us.

Members interjecting:

Mr. Gunn: So are we.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In spite of their hollow laughs, L.C.L. members know that this is what is happening to their Party. If that Party wants to commit political suicide, it will throw out this Bill. Those whom the Gods wish to destroy, they first make mad; that is absolutely true.

Mr. McAnaney: How will you go yourself?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I invite the honourable member to come to my district and canvass against me. However, I promise him that he will be busy in his own district. I have stated the issues involved, and I challenge members on this side who still belong to the L.C.L. to get up and declare themselves.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable Premier.

Mr. Millhouse: They haven't got the guts.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: L.C.L. members who have spoken in this debate have suggested that they somehow agree with adult franchise but think that it should be tied up with something else. Let me put this to them clearly: if this measure is defeated, the question is not proportional representation or redistricting but is adult franchise or limited franchise. In supporting the conditions imposed by the Legislative Council in its amendment, members opposite are supporting limited franchise unless agreement is obtained with the Legislative Council on something else. Why should this be done? The present districting system for the Legislative Council was produced and defended by the L.C.L. over decades. The L.C.L. is responsible for it. How can those members say that that districting system, which is their responsibility, which is based on their principle, and which they have defended, should not now include all the voters of the State under adult suffrage? In this matter, the issue is simply whether everyone should

have a vote; we are not concerned with what the voting system should be.

Mr. Chapman: What's the point if you don't count all the votes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As has been pointed out by the member for Mitcham, the L.C.L., which is the honourable member's Party, persistently defended publicly a system under which effectively 50 per cent of the people of the State were disfranchised. L.C.L. members in this House have voted again and again against giving people the right to vote for the Upper House, against proportional representation, and in favour of maintaining the present districting system. Those who have been here for a while have received a few lessons that have been handed out by the conservatives of the L.C.L. It makes us a little cynical to see this new-found enthusiasm for democracy: this pretence by Mr. DeGaris, who previously said that a minority control of this State in the Legislative Council was preferable to having the whims of the people decided on by a majority vote, because the gentlemen up there led by him knew the permanent will of the people, despite their votes.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: And he meant what he said!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: That was said by this great democrat! The member for Goyder has raised the question of the talks at this meeting.

Mr. Mathwin: The twilight meeting.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It was not twilight; it was a little darker than that. I have noted that the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House said that I issued an invitation to him to come and see me. I did nothing of the kind. In fact, I was about to go to the Festival Theatre on Monday evening when I got a telephone call from an officer of this Parliament who, under Standing Orders, is not supposed to be referred to but who is sitting here at present. He said that he had with him the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, that he had just finished some amendments, and that it would be a good idea if they came and talked to me. In fact, they had already telephoned the Minister of Transport, who had said they should speak to me and not to him.

Mr. Mathwin: Did they want a dial-a-bus?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. At any rate, the Leader was rerouted in the proper direction. Consequently, I waited for him to arrive. When the Leader and the other gentleman did arrive, they had some amendments that the Leader had prepared, but not to this measure. I assure the member for Goyder that there was no discussion on this measure at all. The Leader produced some amendments that he asked me to look at in relation to the other matter. I looked at them and told him that certain of the amendments were obviously not on, even on the first examination, because they were clearly designed to retain minority control of the Upper House against the majority vote. I then said that we would look at the rest of the amendments and give him a reply the first thing in the morning. As we are seeking to get somewhere on the other measure, we are naturally willing to talk about it, just as we would talk to the member for Goyder about matters.

Mr. Hall: That's if he would talk to you.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There have been occasions when that has happened, but not many. It has happened recently. I saw no reason for any concealment about the measure. After consulting with my colleagues, I wrote to the Leader of the Legislative Council setting forth our views on his proposals on another measure. He did not say anything about that, but just publicly rejected anything out of hand. When that happened I simply said, "This is

what happened," and I announced it publicly. It was at that stage that the Leader announced an invitation. I found it a curious interpretation of what had occurred, namely, his saying that I had invited him to come to see me.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: I suppose that, technically, it represented an invitation. He asked whether he could come to see you, and you said "Yes".

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN : I suppose it is. That is what happened, and I assure the member for Goyder that there will be no discussion about this measure. The Government's stand on this measure is clear, and it remains: if the Legislative Council is not willing to agree, without conditions, to adult suffrage and creates the constitutional position where we are able to advise His Excellency, in consequence, then the consequences to members opposite and perhaps to some others (as forecast by the member for Goyder and the member for Mitcham) will take place.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement was adopted:

Because the amendments impose conditions on the granting of adult suffrage, and, as the Government intends to proceed with the measure for proportional representation voting for the Legislative Council, the amendments are unnecessary.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it did not insist on its amendments to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

CONSTITUTION AND ELECTORAL ACTS AMENDMENT BILL (COUNCIL ELECTIONS)

Returned from the Legislative Council with the following amendments:

No. 1. Page 5, lines 28 to 35 (clause 12)—Leave out the clause.

No. 2. Page 5, lines 36 to 40, and page 6, lines 1 to 3 (clause 13)—Leave out the clause.

No. 3. Page 7—After line 10 insert new clauses as follows:—

"16a. *Amendment of principal Act s. 26—Public inspection of rolls*—Section 26 of the principal Act is amended by striking out from subsection (2) the passage and for the Council district of which that Assembly district forms part,"

16b. *Amendment of principal Act, s. 28—Enrolment*—Section 28 of the principal Act is amended—

- (a) by inserting in subsection (1) after the passage "placed upon" the word "Assembly"; and
- (b) by inserting after subsection (1) the following subsection:

(1a) Where a name has been placed upon an Assembly roll that name shall be placed upon a Council roll.

16c. *Repeal of s. 30 of principal Act*—Section 30 of the principal Act is repealed.

16d. *Repeal of ss. 33 and 34 of principal Act*—Sections 33 and 34 of the principal Act are repealed.

16e. *Repeal of s. 35 of principal Act and enactment of section in its place*—Section 35 of the principal Act is repealed and the following section is enacted and inserted in its place:

35. *Enrolment on Council roll*—(1) The Returning Officer for the State, on receipt of notice from a registrar of an enrolment of an elector on an Assembly roll, shall forthwith enrol the elector on the roll for the subdivision of the Council that corresponds to the subdivision of the Assembly roll on which the elector is enrolled.

(2) The Returning Officer for the State on receipt of notice from a registrar of a transfer of enrolment from one subdivision of an Assembly roll to another subdivision of an Assembly roll shall forthwith make such consequential alterations to the Council roll as may be necessary."

No. 4. Page 7, lines 34 to 36 (clause 19)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert "four per centum of the number of first preference votes cast at the elections."

No. 5. Page 9—After line 22 insert new clause 20a as follows:

"20a. *Amendment of principal Act, s. 106—Errors not to forfeit vote*—Section 106 of the principal Act is amended by striking out subsection (2)."

No. 6. Page 9, line 40 (clause 22)—After "group" insert "and consecutive preferences for all the remaining groups: Provided that where the voter has indicated preferences for all the groups except one and the square opposite the name of the one group has been left blank, it shall be deemed that the voter's preference for that group is his last and that accordingly he has indicated his preference for all the groups".

No. 7. Page 12, lines 10 to 26 (clause 23)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 8. Page 12, line 27 (clause 23)—Leave out "(c)" and insert "(a)".

No. 9. Page 12, line 28 (clause 23)—Leave out "then".

No. 10. Page 12, lines 31 to 33 (clause 23)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 11. Page 12 (clause 23)—After line 38 insert—

"(b) The ballot-papers relating to any group that did not obtain a number of first preference votes at least equal to the number of first preference votes represented by one quota determined pursuant to subparagraph (a) of this paragraph shall be attributed to such of the groups that obtained a number of first preference votes greater than a number of first preference votes represented by that quota in the manner provided for by subparagraph (c) of this paragraph:

(c) The group to which a ballot-paper shall be attributed pursuant to subparagraph (b) of this paragraph shall be the group, that obtained a number of first preference votes greater than the number of first preference votes represented by one quota, first indicated in the order of the voters' preferences on that ballot-paper and thereafter for the purposes of the scrutiny each ballot-paper so attributed shall be deemed to represent a first preference vote received by the group to which it was so attributed."

No. 12. Page 12, line 43 (clause 23)—Leave out "(c)" and insert "(a)".

No. 13. Page 12, line 44 (clause 23)—Leave out "a fraction of a".

No. 14. Page 13, line 1 (clause 23)—Leave out "quota," first occurring.

No. 15. Page 14, line 44 (clause 23)—Leave out ", as the case requires,".

No. 16. Page 15, lines 1 to 4 (clause 23)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 17. Page 15, lines 9 and 10 (clause 23)—Leave out "or which were so excluded from further consideration at the scrutiny".

Consideration in Committee.

Amendment No. 1:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be disagreed to.

The amendment removes from the Bill the provision that provided for the concurrence of the President in the passing of the second or third reading of a Bill; this matter was explained fully here. The provision of the concurrence of the President in the passing of a Bill is essential to this measure: without it, the Government would not consider the measure further. Members must know that the institution of a proportional representation system on an 11-member basis each election would almost inevitably produce, given the voting patterns of the State, an eventual division in the Legislative Council of 12 to 10; that is, there would be 12 Labor Party members under a proportional representation system, given what has been the historic voting pattern in the State with a majority Labor vote, and 10 others, be they Liberal and Country League or some additions.

If the Labor Party had to find a President, it would leave 11 votes on the floor of the Legislative Council, and that would not be a constitutional majority. Therefore, unless the President is able to concur, it would be impossible for the majority of the citizens of this State to vote at an

election and produce future constitutional change. This would give, by the proportional representation system, a permanent right to veto to the minority, regardless of the votes of the majority of the people, so that a Bill would never pass allowing for a referendum, for instance, about entrenching one vote one value for this House or for another place. It could never go to a vote on the question of what are the delaying or veto powers of another place, although those have been matters between Houses in bicameral Legislatures elsewhere. The people of the State would be prevented from deciding by majority vote even to present to the people a referendum to decide what the future Constitution should be. We cannot accept that rigidity in the Constitution. It is a provision of democracy not only that minorities should properly be represented but that the majority should be able to put into effect the policies on which that majority has been elected.

Without the concurrence of the President, that is impossible. Agreement for the proportional representation system for the Upper House that minimizes differences between majorities and minorities, as members know, mathematically produces this result. Therefore, it is an absolute condition that, where a majority is elected in the Upper House on a 12 to 10 basis, that majority be effective. That is the basis on which we are operating and the reason why I have made it clear previously that this Bill could not be proceeded with further by the Government if it meant the writing into the Constitution of a permanent minority veto. That is not democracy: democracy means people's rule and that the majority is able to obtain the policies for which it votes.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I support the amendment, despite the Premier's arguments, which are Party-political arguments in this context. This matter was canvassed during the second reading debate, when two major arguments were advanced. The first argument was that in any democratic system, or in a system such as ours, the impartiality of the Chair is significant. The second argument concerns the majority necessary to alter the Constitution of the State. I believe it is essential that the independence of the Chair be preserved. The Premier and members opposite do not accept this, yet the concept of the Speaker of this House and the President in another place is that they be completely impartial. Indeed, this position obtains throughout the world, with the exception of the Republic of West Germany. The Westminster system is based on this principle, and that is my first argument.

The Premier has referred to the working out of the democratic principle concerning what majority is needed to change a Constitution. What sort of pressure is there to change the fundamental basis on which the democratic system works? In many of the organizations of which I am a member a two-thirds majority of votes is required before a Constitution can be changed, yet I have never seen people jump to their feet on this matter. Indeed, these are the very ground rules by which society operates and organizations operate, and people do not get excited about this. Under the Constitution by which the Legislative Council is to be structured, a constitutional change will require more than just minimal Party-political support. The Labor Party does not like the position obtaining in the Senate but, in circumstances approaching a deadlock, compromise provisions must be found to satisfy the majority. It is not undesirable that a constitutional majority should obtain before the Constitution is altered. True, this proportional representation system will give some advantage to minority groups. The Premier says, about this principle, that minorities must be given a chance but the will of the

majority must prevail. Obviously the will of the minority can never prevail. The Premier has said that, when there is a slender majority, the minority might have the power of veto. What other power has the minority? What other power could it have? Obviously the minority's will for change cannot prevail. I cannot see that a substantial majority, that preserving the independence of the Chair as required in terms of this amendment, would be undemocratic, and I believe it has desirable features.

The Premier seeks to advance Party-political argument for political expediency regarding this amendment. This clause is part of a Bill, which I believe to be part of a complete electoral fiddle. It will lead to a situation worse than that currently obtaining. We hear that 15 per cent of the public is disfranchised, but this Bill conceivably could disfranchise 20 per cent. I consider that, if we passed it in the terms of the Labor Government's proposal (and those terms seem to have changed since last week), this Bill would lead to a situation worse than obtains at present.

No wonder we attach some importance to the question of one value. I support the amendment. I consider that the Bill has been fairly cleverly devised by the Labor Party and that Labor members are arguing in relation to this clause, as in relation to others, in terms of political expediency, completely negating the concept of the impartiality of the Chair and the majority that should be required to change the Constitution.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support the rejection of this amendment. I should like to say one thing about the championing of the amendment we have heard from the member for Kavel. If his argument were based on fact, superficially at least it might have some appeal to some people, but it is not based on fact. He argued, as I understood him, that nowhere except in one overseas country does the presiding officer have a deliberative vote. He said that, if we gave the presiding officer of a Parliamentary Assembly a deliberative vote, we would rob him of his impartiality.

I do not follow that, anyway, because the presiding officer in all our Parliamentary Assemblies is a Party man, and there is a difference between, on the one hand, a sense of fairness in controlling debate and what goes on in the House and, on the other, the exercising of one's right to express one's opinion. They are two separate things and most of us do not have much difficulty in divorcing them, so that argument is patently absurd.

I remind the member for Kavel, who after all is one of the representatives from this place at the coming Constitution Convention, that what he has said is quite wrong, because the President of the Senate, a House that now is elected by proportional representation, has on all occasions, under the Commonwealth Constitution, a deliberative vote. The member for Kavel must make himself well versed in the Australian Constitution if he is to pull his weight (if he has any) at the Constitution Convention. Let me remind him of what section 23 of the Commonwealth Constitution states. It provides:

Questions arising in the Senate shall be determined by a majority of votes, and each Senator shall have one vote.

So far so good for the member for Kavel, but let me read for him the next sentence in that section, as follows:

The President shall in all cases be entitled to a vote; and when the votes are equal the question shall pass in the negative.

That is the position in the Senate. The President of the Senate has, and always has had, a deliberative vote in that House. Does the member for Kavel suggest that no President of the Senate has been able to be impartial

because he exercises a vote as a Senator? That argument, too, is, on our experience of more than 70 years of operation of the Commonwealth Parliament, patently absurd, so the only two arguments that the honourable member has advanced, on behalf of his silent colleagues, falls to the ground. Of course, the real reason for the opposition to this popular proposal is the one that the Premier has given, because, if one works through the mechanics of it, one sees that what the Premier has said is correct.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I was aware of the position in the Senate. I would recommend that the member for Mitcham read a book entitled *An Encyclopedia of Parliament*, which he can obtain from the Parliamentary Library and which I have read. He will also find that there are particular reasons for the position that obtains. Let me assure him that I was aware of that.

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't you canvass it?

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: It didn't suit his argument.

Mr. Millhouse: No.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: If the honourable member cares to obtain that book, if he can overcome the obvious spite with which most of his remarks are directed to this Chamber, and if he operates rationally and less spitefully, he may even learn something.

Mr. EVANS: For a long time I have been concerned about the method of operation of Parliament and about the presiding officer, not because I have any bias or discontent in general with presiding officers but because I consider that there is a solution to this problem, and the Premier may wish to adopt it. I suggest that each person elected to Parliament be given the opportunity to vote on the floor of the Houses. The change that I suggest would prevent the presiding officer in either place from having the opportunity to vote, and each and every member would have the opportunity to vote.

I put it to the Premier (and this could be considered at a conference) that we should appoint a person from outside political Parties to preside over Parliament so that he can be completely impartial, and so that he does not attend Parliamentary Party meetings, hear the debates there, and then come into the Chamber and try to be impartial, and impartiality is what we are trying to have accepted and what we are continuing to promote throughout our society. As much as Parliamentarians will not accept at this stage that the presiding officer should not be a member of Parliament, in future a sufficient number of persons who enter Parliament will have sufficient democratic thought to say, "Yes, he should be independent from a political Party."

There is no doubt that that is the only way to resolve that difficulty. There could never be a deadlock on the floor of the Chamber when all members were present and when the number of members in the Parliament was an odd number. It is as simple as that, and there can never be any discontent with the presiding officer in those circumstances, because he will not have or need a vote. Our political Parties want the best of both worlds. We want the presiding officer, as a member of a political Party, to be impartial, and we also want to give him the opportunity to vote when it suits the Party to have him vote. If we want the people to be represented, let the member be on floor of the Chamber at all times so that he may speak and vote if he so desires.

The Premier has said that he considers that, on past voting trends, the Australian Labor Party would have 12 members in the Council and the Oppositions, if we may call them that, would have 10 members. Not even the Premier can predict what will happen in future. For example, there could be 12 Opposition members or 14

Australian Labor Party members. That depends on the wishes of the people at the particular time. If we are to put into the Chair a person who is supposed to be impartial and if we are to select him or her from amongst our Parliamentary colleagues, let us do that and let that person be impartial. For that reason, I support the amendment, but I would prefer that the conference discussed the proposition of reaching agreement to have the major political Parties appoint the President and the Speaker, and not have these officers selected from Parliamentary Party ranks.

Mr. HALL: It is a strange argument that the Speaker must be without political belief. The Speaker must superintend the good conduct of the House and be impartial in administering Standing Orders: he normally does not use his position (at least blatantly) to the advantage of one Party. No-one is saying that he should be a political neuter. Experience in this House has proved that we need the Speaker to be able to express his viewpoint occasionally. The last thing I want to see is a deadlock in the Council against the Government of the day. However, the L.C.L. is not considering the suggested change from a Government's point of view but from an Opposition's point of view, as it desires circumstances that will prevent a Labor Government from governing properly. It seems that members of the L.C.L. do not have enough optimism to think that the Party could govern.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the amendment, because I consider that the President and the Speaker should be impartial and that they should not have a deliberative vote. I think either person should be above politics, the same as we expect the Ombudsman to be above politics. In some circumstances of voting a two-thirds majority is required, but this may be difficult to obtain in any assembly with only a few members. I believe that the other place should be a House of Review, and that the Speaker and the President should be completely impartial.

Mr. COUMBE: We are considering an alteration to section 8 of the Constitution, but I believe that this clause has been included in order to deny the rights of minorities, particularly in the Upper House. This is a clear case of expediency. Before an alteration can be made to the Commonwealth Constitution (apart from the yielding of powers by the States), a referendum of the people must be held. Many times in this Chamber New Zealand has been cited as a shining example of what happens when the Upper House is abolished, and New Zealand has been described as a wonderful Utopia. However, the position in that country is that, before a constitutional alteration can be made, a majority of 75 per cent of members is required. This makes a sham of what the Government is now suggesting about providing the President with a deliberative vote in a Council of 22 members. The Premier should be more convincing and be consistent in this regard. I suggest that section 8 of the Constitution is of immense importance. A measure can easily be carried, of course, if one Party or the other gains a sufficient majority. The Premier and his Party are not entirely blameless on this matter, because I remember an occasion in this place when at least one member of the Australian Labor Party walked out to avoid the Party becoming involved in a constitutional vote. As I believe that the Government is treating this as a matter of expediency, I support the amendment.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (26)—Messrs. Broomhill and Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Hall, Harrison, Hoppgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick, Evans, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment No. 2:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be disagreed to.

This amendment provides for the same position in the House of Assembly as the amendment just dealt with in relation to the Legislative Council.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 3:

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

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

This provides that there should be automatic enrolment for the Legislative Council of persons enrolled for the House of Assembly. As that is not a matter with which the Government disagrees, we think it a proper amendment.

Mr. HALL: I find this somewhat surprising, as the amendment is opposed to the position that L.C.L. members in the Upper House have been striving for years to maintain, that is, the keeping of separate rolls. The innovation of introducing one roll and marking the Legislative Council voters with a cross or asterisk was greatly resisted by L.C.L. members of the Upper House.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: They said it was a socialistic plot.

Mr. HALL: Yes. However, we suddenly find that that idea is scrapped and this provision has been thrown in as bait by the Upper House to make its members look like democrats. Although I will not try to divide the Committee on this matter, I point out that the amendment merely supports the view that the Upper House is a mirror image, a view against which members in another place have argued on other occasions.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hesitated to see whether any member of the L.C.L. would get to his feet to defend the amendment, but none did. I support the member for Goyder. I have always supported a separate roll and voluntary enrolment on it. I suppose that L.C.L. members in another place have decided that the policy should be changed; evidently that is sufficient for L.C.L. members in this place to follow their lead. It shows the lack of intelligence of the majority in the Upper House that they thought their move would succeed; evidently they thought that the Government would be so anxious to have a common roll that it would swallow all the amendments in order to get this one. I well remember that, when we started to use an asterisk or the letters "L.C." against names on the computer roll (it happened when I was Attorney-General; I authorized it on the advice of the Returning Officer for the State, Mr. Douglass, after I had examined the matter) I was criticized on the ground that it was the first step toward a common roll. It was claimed by some that it meant that everyone would automatically be given a ballot-paper for the Legislative Council.

The Hon. G. R. Broomhill: What were they frightened of?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister can easily answer that question. Now, those same people have written this amendment into the Bill. Like the member for Goyder, I believe that the two major Parties will vote together on this amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 4:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be agreed to.

This amendment reveals the deep motivations that are evident in the Legislative Council's discussion on measures of this kind! The original Bill provided for the loss of a deposit if a candidate did not obtain 4½ per cent of the votes. The Legislative Council's amendment changes that to 4 per cent. In all the circumstances, we shall not argue with the honourable gentlemen on this matter. It is obviously important to honourable members in the Upper House that this major change should be made!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not like this provision at all. There is no point whatever in it, except to block smaller Parties, and the Premier admitted as much earlier. If there is one place where it does not matter two hoots how many Parties there are or whether there are no Parties at all, it is the Legislative Council, which is a House of Review where Governments do not rise or fall. This very bad amendment is an example of the Labor Party's trying to get an advantage for itself by stopping minor groups in the community from having any chance of getting a seat in the Upper House.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 5:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 5 be agreed to.

This amendment repeals a redundant provision of the Electoral Act dealing with property qualifications.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 6:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 6 be disagreed to.

This provision follows on the Council's trying to sprinkle a proportional representation system with the preferential voting system. I stress that there are values to all votes under the system we have introduced: it is simply a question of whether one voted for people who got sufficient votes to reach a quota. I certainly believe in equality of votes; my Party has stood for it constantly. It amazes me that members opposite should talk about equality of votes when the whole history of the Legislative Council has revealed a stand against equality of votes. Since the inception of the Labor Party it has fought for equality of votes. The errant hypocrisy of people who come here and talk about equality of votes when they have fought against it all their lives amazes me.

The Legislative Council proposes to introduce a preferential voting system. As I shall show when I get to the appropriate amendment, the Council's proposals do not give effect to the expressed preferences of people voting for small Parties; the Legislative Council very carefully insists on the transference of those preferences to a major Party, ruling out the small Parties. The Legislative Council proposes to bring in a limited preference system within proportional representation voting. In order to get agreement, although we do not agree with it in principle, we will go along with bringing in a preference system so that the votes of people voting for minor Parties in very small groups are brought into the final count to determine, as between the people close to a quota, who shall be the final person elected.

What amazes me is that the Legislative Council then proposes that the preferences be compulsory. I have always heard that Legislative Council members on the Liberal side believe in voluntary voting, yet they will compel people

to mark preferences, even where they do not have them. I do not believe that that is right. If there is going to be a preference system, it should be an optional system. If an elector simply wants to vote for one candidate and not to express any further preference, he should not be compelled to express a preference.

Mr. Coumbe: Is it a formal vote?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, so long as he votes "1" on the ballot-paper. If he wants to mark his ballot-paper to cover all candidates, that is his right, too. L.C.L. members have often said that there should be no compulsion in voting. We have always believed that it is the duty of every citizen to go to the poll. However, when he gets there, surely he should not have imposed upon him the marking of preferences that he does not have. He should have the right to go one way or the other—to mark his ballot-paper with preferences, or not to do so. Why should someone have to cast a preference for the Democratic Labor Party, the Communist Party, or even the Nazi Party? The rejection of this amendment will mean that, with the importation of the counting of preferences in the later clause, the Bill will provide an optional preference system, and I believe that is proper.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 7:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 7 be disagreed to and the following alternative amendment made in lieu thereof:

Page 12, lines 10 to 38 (clause 23)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert—

- (a) The group that received the lowest number of first preference votes, being less than the prescribed number of votes shall be excluded from the count and the ballot-papers relating to that group (including ballot-papers previously attributed to that group) shall be attributed to the group indicated by the next available preference, if any, of the voter and following that attribution the group, if any, that received the next lowest number of first preference votes (including any votes represented by ballot-papers previously so attributed) being less than the prescribed number of votes shall be excluded from the count and the ballot-papers relating to that group (including ballot-papers attributed to that group) shall be attributed to the continuing group indicated by the next available preference, if any, of the voter and so on until there is no group remaining that has received a number of first preference votes (including votes represented by ballot-papers previously so attributed) less than the prescribed number of votes, and for the purposes of this paragraph votes represented by ballot-papers so attributed shall be deemed to be first preference votes received by the group to which they were attributed:
- (b) For the purposes of subparagraph (a) of this paragraph, the prescribed number of votes is one-third of the number obtained by dividing the number of first preference votes cast at the election for the district by one more than the number of candidates required to be elected for the district and by increasing the quotient so obtained (disregarding any remainder) by one:
- (c) The returning officer for the district shall then determine the quota for that election by dividing the total number of first preference votes that have been received by all the continuing groups by one more than the number of candidates to be elected for the district and by increasing the quotient so obtained (disregarding any remainder) by one:

The Legislative Council's amendment provides for balloting to occur in such a way that the preferences of minor Parties shall be transferred only to the Party lists of those who have achieved more than the prescribed number. In

other words, they cannot be transferred to the small Parties or used to assist a small Party to get above the prescribed number. Therefore, the Legislative Council's proposal eliminates small Parties from the final vote. We do not think that is right, as we believe that, if the proposal is to bring, by preference, the votes of small Parties into the final count, they must be able to be distributed to those with more than the prescribed number and those with less. The vote should be distributed all the way through until those in the final count all have more than the prescribed number. At that stage, the quota is struck and the final decision made. The Government's amendment gives effect to this proposition. I stress that this provision will not eliminate anyone and will bring every vote into the final count. By this provision, the preferences are covered until everyone is above the prescribed number or excluded because they have not reached that number.

I emphasize that the Government has moved away from the classic proportional representation system, which it first brought in, to the importation of a preference system to meet the objection that has been constantly raised by members opposite that in some way small Parties will be excluded. This provision will help everyone to get above the prescribed number if there are fractions below that number with regard to other groups or individuals. There can be no question but that the preferences will be properly counted where they have been expressed optionally, and this will bring the votes to the final count. Every one above the prescribed number will be in the final determination of whether or not a group or individual reaches a quota. As I do not think that anything can be fairer than that, I urge members to accept our amendment.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): In the time we have had available to consider the Government's amendment, it appears to us to put into effect what we advocated during the second reading debate on the Bill. It will make certain that every vote has an influence in the final election of members of the Upper House. I believe the Government has acceded to our request to provide for this equality of voting. I note that people will not be compelled to cast a preferential vote. The significant words with regard to preferences are "if any"; the individual will decide voluntarily what course he will take. However, I think that, like other Parties, the Labor Party at future elections will hand out how-to-vote cards for the Upper House indicating a recommended distribution of preferences. I support the Government's amendment. An opportunity will exist in the Upper House for further discussion, if that is needed.

Mr. COUMBE: Many of the representations made by Opposition members in Committee have been taken note of. Some valid points were put, particularly regarding the rights of some people who would be disfranchised. We said that that was not fair and reasonable, because a certain number of voters should not be disregarded. Although generally supporting the rule, I ask the Premier to say how he arrived at the fraction of one-third, to which he referred? As the one-third could have a significant bearing on the whole operation of this clause, I ask the Premier what its effect will be.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The purpose of taking one-third is to ensure that a candidate finally elected is not elected on the fraction of a group that is excluded.

Mr. EVANS: I thank the Government for making a change and for recognizing minorities more so than it did in the earlier proposal and I accept the argument that

the Upper House's amendment was no better than the original provision. The alternative amendment is more in line with what I was asking, because it gives minority Parties some chance of membership in the Upper House.

Mr. HALL: I am sure that this amendment played a large part in Government tactics, because it obviously removes much of the criticism made by Opposition members of the proportional representation provision. The member for Mitcham and I were committed to a preference system. I noticed in another place yesterday that much of the criticism concerned this point. I think it was the Hon. Mr. Cameron who referred to optional preferences, and I discussed that matter with him. It seems to me that the Government has drawn the teeth from the basic opposition to the Bill. It also appears to me that the likelihood of an election soon, if the amendment is accepted, is nil.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 8 to 14:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 8 to 14 be disagreed to.

These amendments are all consequential on the Legislative Council's original voting proposal. As a result of the change resulting from amendment No. 7 to which we have agreed, I ask that these consequential amendments be disagreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 15 to 17:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 15 to 17 be agreed to.

These amendments, which are consequential on the introduction of a preferential system, are consistent with both the Legislative Council's original amendments and the alternative amendment that has already been adopted by the Committee.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 18:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I move to insert in clause 22 (13) the following definition:

"continuing group" means a group not already excluded from the count:

This is a necessary consequential amendment on the acceptance of the preferential system.

Motion carried.

The following reasons for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1, 2, 6, and 8 to 14 were adopted:

(1) Because amendments Nos. 1 and 2 negate the principle that a majority of elected representatives should be able to obtain constitutional change;

(2) Because amendment No. 6 provides for compulsory preferential voting and, as voters may well not have preferences, they should not be compelled to mark them but should be given the option of doing so; and

(3) Because amendments Nos. 8 to 14 are consequential on amendment No. 7, which for self-explanatory reasons has been disagreed to.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 6 to 14, to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

Consideration in Committee.

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

That the House of Assembly insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

Motion carried.

A message was sent to the Legislative Council requesting a conference at which the House of Assembly would be

represented by Messrs. Coumbe, Dunstan, Eastick, Hudson, and King.

Later:

A message was received from the Legislative Council agreeing to a conference to be held in the Legislative Council committee room at 8.15 p.m.

At 8.1 p.m. the managers proceeded to the conference, the sitting of the House being suspended. They returned at 1.49 a.m. on Thursday, June 28. The recommendations were as follows:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments to which the House of Assembly has disagreed, but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Page 12, lines 10 to 38 (clause 23)—Leave out all words in these lines and insert:

- "(a) Each group that received a number of first preference votes, being less than the prescribed number of votes, shall be excluded from the count and each ballot-paper relating to each such group shall be attributed to the group, that has received a number of first preference votes equal to or greater than the prescribed number, indicated by the next available preference, if any, of the voter and for the purposes of this paragraph votes represented by ballot-papers so attributed shall be deemed to be first preference votes received by the group to which they were attributed:
- (b) For the purposes of subparagraph (a) of this paragraph, the prescribed number of votes is one half of the number obtained by dividing the number of first preference votes cast at the election for the district by one more than the number of candidates required to be elected for the district and by increasing the quotient so obtained (disregarding any remainder) by one:
- (c) The returning officer for the district shall then determine the quota for that election by dividing the total number of first preference votes that have been received by all the continuing groups by one more than the number of candidates to be elected for the district and by increasing the quotient so obtained (disregarding any remainder) by one:"

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

That the House of Assembly do not insist on its alternative amendment to amendment No. 7.

That the Legislative Council agree to the consequential amendment made by the House of Assembly to the Bill with the following amendment:

Leave out the word "already".

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

Later:

The Legislative Council intimated that it had agreed to the recommendations of the conference.

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

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

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The effect of the conference has been to maintain the position that this Chamber put during the moving of the amendments following the Legislative Council's original amendments. As members know, at that stage all matters that had come to us from the Legislative Council were not agreed to: the three provisions were rejected, but this Chamber put forward an alternative preferential voting system. The Council at the conference proposed not its original proposals for preferential voting but an alternative to the preferential voting proposals advanced by this Chamber and agreed to unanimously here. The difference in the preferential voting was reached as a matter of compromise. In eventual effect the difference in the two proposals is marginal, but the position now is that there will be a single transference of votes from those with less than half a quota to those with more than half a quota, and that is the only

difference in the system of voting under the provisions of the Bill from the position that originally obtained.

The Hon. L. J. King: It is half a quota.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, it is half a quota instead of a third of a quota for the elimination of people from consideration for the final count. Therefore, the effect of the measure, as it will now pass, is that there is proportional representation; that there is effective representation for minorities; that the majority can be elected and be effective in the Upper House; and that there can be a constitutional majority. Two further matters have been dealt with: there is automatic enrolment for the Legislative Council, and the amendment of the member for Goyder has also been agreed to. Consequently, the position that has been constantly advanced by this side (in relation to one vote one value and in relation to achieving majority rule, representation of minorities, and an effective constitutional majority in the Upper House) has been obtained. There can be no deadlocking of the Upper House by a minority in these circumstances. I think that this is an entirely satisfactory result and that this Chamber can congratulate itself that this has been achieved. Certainly, we on this side are satisfied that our policy has been carried into effect in legislation.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Accepting the greater part of what the Premier has said, I believe that persons here and in another place should be congratulated on the result achieved, because there was an amicable discussion of several measures which, to that point, had not been acceptable. More important, the arrangement reached this evening fulfils the request made earlier in this Chamber by my colleagues to ensure that all votes cast have an equality of value in the final election of members of the Upper House. The Premier has said that minorities will be given the chance of representation and that those who fail to make a quota will see, subject to their vote being cast in a preferential manner, the value of their second, third, or fifth votes going to the eventual election of a person to the Upper House. I believe, and I reiterate, that all Parties can be satisfied with the end result, but the ultimate winner will undoubtedly be the community of South Australia.

Mr. HALL: It seems strange that the end of the long road to achieve full adult franchise for South Australians should be a quiet one at 2.10 a.m. I should have thought that the band that played for the opening of this Parliamentary session would have been better employed playing now to celebrate this rather historic occasion. Congratulations are due, not to those gentlemen who have finally been brought to heel at the recent conference but to those who have fought for so long against them to have this measure introduced. The shock troops of the 19th century have broken through to the 20th century, and we see the result this evening when there has been utter capitulation by those who have stood against full adult franchise. There have been some face-saving measures, but it is utter capitulation, and no amount of words or any other cover will hide that fact from those who have studied the slow progress along this road. The collapse is complete, and the member for Mallee can now resume his normal colour because he has been saved for another 2½ years in this place.

Mr. Gunn: You should worry: you're in the same boat!

Mr. HALL: How far the opposing team has collapsed is shown by the additional benefit the L.C.L. gave the Premier and his team (I do not know why), but yesterday I saw the Premier and his Ministers when they were offered this, and they were nearly beside themselves with glee at the thought that they would receive this extra provision—

compulsory enrolment for the Council. I think that the Government must have done much double talking with people here who have fought all their political lives to have two rolls and to have voluntary enrolment (which I support), but the only two people in this House who spoke in favour of continued voluntary enrolment were the Liberal Movement members.

Mr. Gunn: Where's your mate?

Mr. HALL: My friend believes the victory has been achieved, and the member for Eyre will be forced to accept that fact when this vote is taken. As much as he does not want it to happen, he will be forced to accept it, and my colleague is confident that this Chamber will force the honourable member into that situation. The confrontation was on and, as I have stated right through, the members of the Upper House knew that they would have to give in; but in giving in they have gone so far in their collapse that they have given the Premier automatic enrolment without having been asked for that. It is incredible.

The long history of dissension and disruption in the L.C.L. is apparent to everyone, but one can read about it in a book costing only \$2. The great so-called compromise occurred last year. Members opposite know how much work it took to achieve that compromise, but the apex of it was the special annual general meeting of the L.C.L. The constitution of the L.C.L. was said to be sacrosanct. One could not change a preposition unless one had a general meeting, yet this evening L.C.L. members have flagrantly breached the constitution of their Party, without reference to the head office and hierarchy of the L.C.L. I ask who is in control of the L.C.L.

Mr. Nankivell: We are.

Mr. HALL: It is not the member for Mallee, who has been wandering around this Chamber wondering what his colleagues in another place will do. Without reference to the hierarchy of the Party, the L.C.L. members have this evening given away their Party's principle of voluntary enrolment. This shows how far the collapse has gone. We have people here who do not give a fig for their Party platform, although in the past they have made other people go to extreme lengths to change a minor part of that constitution.

The Premier has gained so much in this Bill that I wonder whether he will not seize the tattered white flag of the L.C.L. and put it on the Trades Hall. It would be a good trophy for him. I am pleased that at last the amendment that I moved here (and I thank members for their support of that amendment) to reduce from 30 years to 18 years the age at which members might serve in the Upper House was accepted. I remember the remarks that greeted a similar amendment in the Upper House last year. It is pleasing to me that members of the Upper House have changed their mind on that issue also. The Liberal Movement has been pleased to give the lead by means of the report published on April 2.

Motion carried.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

FILM INDUSTRY

Mr. HALL (on notice): What proportion of the \$10,000,000 film industry announced in September, 1970, has so far been established in South Australia?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is assumed that the honourable member is referring to a newspaper item which reported a preliminary approach by a Sydney group which was contemplating (not "announcing") the building of a \$10,000,000 movie and television film studio south of Adelaide. In that same news item I referred to a study

which was then being made into the feasibility of establishing a State film centre. Last year, as a result of that study, this Parliament enacted legislation to establish the South Australian Film Corporation for the purpose of encouraging the development of a film industry here. The corporation will not enter into the role of a film maker but will contract out film work to appropriate makers. A small but expert staff has been appointed, and last March it occupied offices on the second floor of Edmund Wright House. Negotiations are at present in hand with local, interstate and international companies regarding the expansion of existing facilities and the establishment of new facilities within Adelaide to assist the production of films in South Australia. No large studio complex is envisaged at this stage. The corporation intends to continue to research the market for Australian films and verify the extent of the demand before encouraging major investment by commercial companies.

HOUSE BUILDING

Mr. HALL (on notice): Will the land to be provided by the Government to the Australian Council of Trade Unions for the purposes of its house-building scheme be obtained from presently held property, or will it be newly acquired from private owners?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The land offered to the A.C.T.U. for the purposes of its house-building scheme is already owned by the South Australian Housing Trust.

LAND SALES

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. How many parcels of land, owned by the Government or its instrumentalities, have been auctioned this financial year?

2. What were the individual prices obtained?

3. How much profit was made on each transaction?

4. For what period had the land been owned by the Government?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: These questions involve considerable research, so I would ask the honourable member to ask his questions again on Tuesday next or whenever would be a suitable occasion.

FRUIT SALES

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. What precise arrangements have been made with representatives of the Japan Consumers Co-operative Association and the Japan Co-operative Trading Company Proprietary Limited for the sale of canned and dried fruit products in Japan?

2. What is the value of the sales that have been arranged?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Representatives of the Japan Consumers Co-operative Association and the Japan Co-operative Trading Company Proprietary Limited visited the Riverland districts under the sponsorship of the Department of Overseas Trade in March of this year. The Japanese were on a preliminary fact-finding survey of the canned and dried fruit industry in Australia. They were shown the South Australian expertise in this field and indicated that it was probable that further investigations and visits would be made after their report was submitted to their principals.

2. Not applicable.

GAS

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. What types of petroleum gas would be used by the proposed petro-chemical works at Redcliffs?

2. What percentage will this usage eventually be of the total known reserves in the South Australian gas fields?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The types of petroleum gas to be used by the proposed petro-chemical works at Redcliffs are methane and ethane. Methane would be used as a fuel gas for electricity generation and ethane as a feedstock.

2. The amount of methane required for the 20-year life of the plant would represent about 20 per cent of proven reserves in that portion of the basin, excluding the fields of Moomba and Gidgealpa, which are specifically reserved for the South Australian market. The ethane requirement for the plant will represent 100 per cent of the known and yet to be proven reserves of the entire Cooper Basin. It will be understood that ethane is more valuable as a petro-chemical feedstock than as a fuel, and is, in fact, unacceptable because of its calorific value if it represents more than a small percentage of the total gas supply. The ethane content of the present gas delivered to Adelaide is about 7 per cent.

PRESS SECRETARIES

Mr. HALL (on notice):

1. What new appointments have been made or are about to be made to the group of Ministerial press secretaries?

2. What will be the salary of any such new appointee?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. An appointment is about to be made of press secretary to the Minister of Labour and Industry; otherwise, no decision has yet been made to make new appointments to the group of Ministerial press secretaries.

2. The salary of any new appointee would depend on the appointee's qualifications. Salaries are based on the Journalists Award.

LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION

Mr. HALL (on notice): What facilities are made available by the Government to the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The following facilities are available to the Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council:

- (a) Car and chauffeur unrestricted within the State.
- (b) Office accommodation and the services of a stenographer.
- (c) Payment of telephone account.
- (d) Ten single air fares each year in lieu of the six available to other members.
- (e) Salary allowance of \$1,500 a year and travelling expenses of \$400 a year. This is awarded by the Parliamentary Salaries Tribunal.

CONCRETE SLEEPERS

Mr. HALL (on notice): Has the Premier been successful in obtaining an undertaking from the Commonwealth Government that concrete sleepers will be used in future Commonwealth Railways construction work in this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: This matter has been the subject of discussion between the Commonwealth Minister for Transport and the State Minister of Transport, and an assurance has been given that the Commonwealth will call tenders for both concrete and timber sleepers for future Commonwealth Railways construction work in South Australia. The tenders will be evaluated by the Bureau of Transport Economics before contracts are awarded.

MARGARINE

Mr. HALL (on notice): What is the Government's policy in relation to South Australian margarine quotas?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The State Government holds the view that margarine should be freely available

to the public, provided adequate labelling requirements are laid down to ensure that consumers are fully informed of the nature and content of the product they purchase. At meetings of the Australian Agricultural Council (which determines State margarine quotas) South Australia has repeatedly advocated the removal of quotas on poly-unsaturated margarine.

GARBAGE DISPOSAL

Mr. HALL (on notice): Has the Environment and Conservation Department been successful in formulating any practical proposals for the co-ordinated disposal of Adelaide's garbage?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: On the advice of the Environmental Protection Council, and following acceptance in principle of the recommendations of the Committee on Environment in South Australia, the Government has agreed to the establishment of a waste disposal authority. This was announced by the Premier in his policy speech earlier this year. It is proposed that legislation to implement this measure will be before Parliament later this year.

PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the nature of the work being done on Parliament House?
2. How much has it cost so far?
3. What is the total estimated cost?
4. When will it be finished?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. The work comprises necessary maintenance, including replacement of air-conditioning, electrical wiring and plumbing system, which was deferred pending consideration of a broader development plan for Parliament House, together with restoration work designed to provide a minimal standard of acceptable accommodation.

2. \$80,000, including design fees.
3. \$1,720,000.
4. Present planning provides for completion of this project by late 1974.

GLENSIDE HOSPITAL

Mr. Coumbe, for Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. When does the Government intend to proceed with the complete replacement of old, outmoded buildings at Glenside Hospital?
2. Will the sum of nearly \$1,000,000, which the Minister recently announced would be spent on upgrading facilities, be spent instead on the initial stages of a redevelopment plan for the hospital?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The replies are as follows:

1. Preliminary sketch plans have been prepared for the progressive replacement of the older ward buildings at Glenside Hospital. Further detailed planning and phasing of this major redevelopment project is awaiting final determination of the overall amounts of Loan funds which are likely to be available to the State during 1973-74 and onwards.

2. The sum of nearly \$1,000,000 announced recently by the Minister of Health referred to the level of Government expenditure already committed during the current year for projects directly related to the Glenside redevelopment plan. The bulk of this expenditure involves the relocation of Z ward patients in new facilities at Yatala Labour Prison and the construction of a new psychogeriatric ward and new outpatients clinics. The redevelopment plan includes

both progressive replacement of older, outmoded wards and the upgrading of newer wards such as Cleland and Paterson Houses.

GUN SHOPS

Mr. Coumbe, for Mr. BECKER (on notice): Does the Government intend to introduce legislation for gun shops to keep firearms from public view outside trading hours?

The Hon. L. J. KING: No.

BEACHES

Mr. Coumbe, for Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. When will foreshore reconstruction at Glenelg North be completed?
2. What is the total cost of completed works, including replenishment of beach sand?
3. How many steps to the beach will be constructed and at what locations?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The replies are as follows:

1. The work at Glenelg North is scheduled for final completion in or before October. However, the majority of the work is now done.
2. The total cost of the completed work, including replenishment of beach sand, is expected to be \$154,000.
3. Two sets of steps will be constructed in this present contract, one located near Anderson Avenue and the other near Burns Street, although it is likely that others may be required. Discussions are proceeding in this regard.

RAILWAYS RATES

Mr. Coumbe, for Mr. BECKER (on notice):

1. Has the South Australian Railways Advisory Board recommended any increases in fares and freight rates?
2. What is the amount of the increases recommended?
3. When will the increases be implemented?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. No.
2. Not applicable.
3. Not applicable.

PORT AUGUSTA BRIDGE

Mr. GUNN (on notice): When will all the roadworks associated with the new Port Augusta bridge be completed?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The works will be completed during the 1973-74 financial year.

EYRE DISTRICT SCHOOLS

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When will tenders be called for the proposed new schools at Karcultaby and Miltaburra?
2. What is the expected completion date of these schools?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The replies are as follows:

1. It is proposed that tenders will be called for both schools in June, 1974.
2. It is hoped that both schools will be completed by about September, 1975, provided that no unexpected delays occur.

KIMBA-POLDA MAIN

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When will all the branch mains on the Kimba-Polda main be completed?
2. How many men are now employed on this project?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The replies are as follows:

1. All approved branch mains are expected to be completed by June, 1974.
2. 53.

RAILWAYS COMMITTEE

Mr. NANKIVELL (on notice):

1. Who are the members of the South Australian Railways Advisory Committee?
2. Whom do they advise?
3. Does the committee have any statutory authority?
4. What is their remuneration?
5. How often does the committee meet?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The replies are as follows:

1. D. Scrafton, J. E. Shannon, R. H. Fidock, H. B. Young, J. D. Rump.
2. The Minister of Transport.
3. No.
4. \$3,000 a year.
5. Weekly.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry say whether he knows that the latest figures produced by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics show that the number of working days lost owing to industrial disputes in South Australia for the January to March quarter in 1972 was 4,400 and that that figure had jumped alarmingly to 32,500 in the same period during the present year? I ignore the fact that 1972 was a Commonwealth election year, but I ask the Minister what explanation he can give for this sudden and disturbing upsurge this year in the number of industrial disputes in this State. In view of the concern in the community at present on this aspect, can he say what action, if any, he and his Government are taking to rectify this position, which seems to have worsened since these latest figures were issued?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The honourable member should have taken notice of the press report last week in which I replied to the former Commonwealth Minister for Labour and National Service (Mr. Lynch), who had been spreading his tale of woe in this State about the industrial unrest that he not only expected but hoped would occur. It seems that now the honourable member, following what Mr. Lynch has said, is hoping to incite further industrial trouble in South Australia.

Mr. Coumbe: That's completely untrue.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: If the honourable member wants to study industrial unrest, he ought to go to some of the States that have Liberal Governments. We have had a reasonable amount of industrial calm in this State. I hope that continues and I hope that the honourable member will use his good offices to assist us.

BERRI PUMPING STATION

Mr. ARNOLD: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Works, will the Minister of Education ask his colleague to request the Minister of Irrigation seriously to consider increasing the pumping capacity at the Berri pumping station by an additional 4,000gall. a minute? During the height of summer, especially in heatwave conditions, a period of more than three weeks can elapse between the times when growers at the beginning or end of irrigation rosters receive irrigation. This length of time is far too great, and the additional 4,000gall. a minute could reduce this time considerably. The present position affects peachgrowers severely, inasmuch as during the height of summer, if the trees are affected by drought, the fruit will stop growing and will not start growing again when they receive additional water and tend to split. If the fruit is undersize, it is not acceptable to canneries. I ask that the Minister of Irrigation seriously consider increasing the pumping capacity at Berri before the coming summer to try to solve this

problem and reduce the enormous loss of fruit that has occurred in the past.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will refer this matter to my colleague and ask him to look into it for the honourable member.

BANKSIA PARK HIGH SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education obtain for me a progress report regarding the construction of the Banksia Park High School, which the Minister knows is well advanced?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Speaking from memory, I think the original planning provided for stage 1 to be completed for the beginning of the 1974 school year. However, as the honourable member will know, work on this project is well ahead of schedule. The builders expect that virtually the whole school will be completed by August or September this year and that we will be able to move in completely at that date. However, I will check the facts for the honourable member and obtain the latest information on the work.

FLAMMABLE CLOTHING

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the Minister of Labour and Industry inquire whether an advertisement regarding no-burn dressing gowns is correct, whether the garment has been tested by the Standards Association of Australia, and whether it was passed as suitable by that association? An advertisement in *Fashion Week*, headed "No-burn dressing gowns for the young", states:

A range of non-flammable children's dressing gowns which meet the new requirements of the Standards Association of Australia has been developed by Sutex Industries Ltd. The dressing gowns, in a corded velour, are made of a treated bri-nylon with cotton backing, and look similar to the company's popular chenille lines. Sutex had decided to investigate the possibilities of a non-flammable chenille type dressing gown following the enormous amount of publicity regarding safety in children's nightwear.

As this garment has a backing of cotton it is obviously a hazard, and I ask the Minister to make inquiries.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I shall seek a report for the honourable member.

ENFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. WELLS: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question concerning the Enfield Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Mobile coat storage units have been ordered for the Enfield Primary and Infants Schools, but because of the shortage of supply all orders have not been filled. It has been possible, though, to supply a limited number of such racks to Enfield. These should meet all but peak requirements. The number of units asked for the Enfield Infants School was excessive and would only create a storage problem for the racks themselves. To obviate this situation the possibility of placing fixed coat racks on the outdoor walls of cupboard areas is being investigated by the Public Buildings Department.

DISTRICT OFFICE INSURANCE

Mr. MILLHOUSE: My question would have been to the Minister of Works if he were here but, as he is not, I address it to the Premier: I think the Premier can deal with it better than the Minister of Education can do. If the Premier is listening, will he give an undertaking that the Government will meet any claim for damages arising out of injuries sustained by a member of the public at a member's electorate office? When I took possession of my electorate office I raised with the Government the question of public risk cover, and in the course of a reply to me

dated June 21 dealing with several matters the Minister of Works said:

It is not normal policy for the Government to provide public risk insurance, and any claim that is made would be considered on the facts of each case.

That, of course, leaves it quite open whether the Government would meet every claim or whether in certain circumstances, or in all circumstances, the member would be expected to meet claims. If there is not to be a full Government indemnity for these things it will be necessary for me (and presumably for other members) to take out a separate public risk policy. Because the earlier answer is so equivocal, I therefore put the question to the Premier for, I hope, a straight-out answer on where we stand.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member, as a former Attorney-General, must know that in the present circumstance of the law there is not a straight-out answer to this. After all, the Government normally carries its own insurance risks on its buildings: it does not pay insurance but covers the claims. I appreciate the difficulty he has raised, and I will discuss the matter with the Attorney-General.

Mr. Millhouse: And in the meantime?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot give the honourable member an assurance about the situation in the meantime, but I think in the locality in which the honourable member has his office the likelihood of any claim is remote.

GOODWOOD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. LANGLEY: Will the Minister of Education obtain an up-to-date report on the progress in resiting the Goodwood Primary School? This is one of the oldest metropolitan schools, and teachers and scholars alike have been working under adverse conditions. I understand tenders have been called, and parents and scholars are waiting for the day when this school will be one of the best in the State.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to obtain a report for the honourable member.

AMERICAN RIVER WATER SUPPLY

Mr. CHAPMAN: I intended my question to be directed to the Minister of Works, but in his absence, and as the question is of extreme importance, I shall direct it to the Premier. Will the Premier assure members that he will arrange an early connection of an adequate water supply to the township of American River on Kangaroo Island? The township was one of the first established tourist towns in South Australia and is an asset to this State in that regard. To date, residents, tourists, tourist promoters and motel keepers have been denied a fair go in relation to any form of water supply. Members no doubt would have heard of the beautiful place to which I so proudly refer; in fact, the extensive development in that area over the past 20 years has been recognized on several occasions by the Premier on his visits to the island. On his last visit the Premier said he would support the development of the tourist industry in that area, but how can the industry expand without a reasonable supply of water? For some years at the height of the summer months the community has been faced with two alternatives—either using seawater through the public facilities at the various lodges and motels, or mixing seawater with rainwater.

The SPEAKER: Order! I realize that the member for Alexandra is a new member, but I point out that during Question Time members are entitled to ask a direct question concerning matters of importance to the State. They are entitled to ask a question of a Minister or any member

of the House, but they cannot offer any personal comment on the question being asked, nor can they make a second reading speech on the subject matter relevant to the question. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will confer with my colleague and bring down a reply.

CHRISTIES EAST SCHOOL

Mr. HOPGOOD: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my recent question about the Christies East Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: In keeping with a number of similar projects, no boundary fencing has been provided at the new Christies East Primary School. However, plans are in hand for the planting of shrubs and trees to define the boundary, though these will not provide a barrier. At specific points some fencing will be provided. The matter of fencing, planting and general development of the school has again been discussed by officers of the Public Buildings Department. In addition, the Secretary of the Road Safety Council has undertaken to have an officer from that board attend the Christies East school site to discuss with the Headmaster the problems caused by the absence of fencing and also to look into the matter of providing safety warnings. In other schools where fencing has been omitted the plans made by the Headmaster and his staff for the entry of children to the schoolgrounds have proved workable and effective.

BELAIR GOLF COURSE

Mr. EVANS: Can the Minister of Environment and Conservation say what type of water is to be used for irrigating the public golf course in the Belair Recreation Park? During the last Parliament I asked the Minister whether property adjoining the national park could be acquired so that a water supply could be obtained to irrigate the public golf course. I support the move by the Minister's department to make greater use of the golf course but I fear that a connection may be made to the E. & W.S. Department main. Already, there is an inadequate supply for local residents; and if a large demand is placed on the supply by the recreation park, the lives of people living nearby could be affected. The source from which this water will come should be known to the people and to the department so that they can be aware of requirements should any catastrophe occur.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I understand that sufficient underground water is available to be used on the golf course, and I am almost certain that the total supply will be made available from this source. However, I will obtain the necessary information for the honourable member.

WILD LIFE SANCTUARIES

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation detail the suggested plans to establish private sanctuaries, which were abolished by legislation last year? Many constituents wish to know the Government's plans, because they appreciate the value of sanctuaries in maintaining wild life.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: We are most anxious to resolve the situation and determine the areas that can be dedicated as sanctuaries. One of the difficulties confronting the National Parks and Wildlife Service is the tremendous increase in the activities of the department. Many pressures have been placed on that service but, when speaking to the Director recently, I told him that I was anxious for a proper assessment to be made of sanctuaries throughout the State. I have asked him to correct staff difficulties so

that an assessment can be made before the end of the year. I am aware that some difficulty exists in this service, but I am anxious that sanctuaries should be declared as soon as possible.

SHOPPING CENTRES

Mr. OLSON: Can the Premier say whether the Government has any plans concerning shopping centres in the Port Adelaide district?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. As honourable members will know, the 1962 development plan provided for the development of regional shopping centres in the Port Adelaide shopping area. Subsequently, this House has approved the development of the West Lakes area under indenture, and in that area two shopping centres were approved by legislation. The Myer organization purchased an area at Queenstown that was then, under the 1962 plan, zoned as residential. When the organization began its purchases, and during the period that most of the purchases were made, land-use regulations had not been completed: although they had been agreed to by the Port Adelaide council they had not been approved by the State Planning Authority.

Before the gazettal of the land-use regulations, after approval by the State Planning Authority, the Myer organization tried to obtain from the Port Adelaide council approval to depart from the 1962 plan by a consent under section 41 of the Act. As the council had interim development control, which was aimed to maintain the existing situation until such time as land-use regulations were adopted in accordance with planning procedures, the Myer organization tried to obtain that consent in circumstances that would have torn up the existing plan without going through the normal planning processes, that is, without exhibiting a supplementary development plan, without hearing objections, and without the State Planning Authority, the council, and the Government considering those objections. In consequence of that move the Government then gazetted the land-use regulations that had been approved by the State Planning Authority.

After that occurred, the Myer organization still tried to proceed with the section 41 approval, and the nature of that matter is now *sub judice*. After this happened, the Myer organization asked the Government what was to be done, because it had invested a large sum in the area. I pointed out what I had pointed out throughout the whole of the transaction from the time when the company first mentioned it to me and before it started to purchase land in the area, that it would have to comply with normal planning procedures. As a result of consultations with the Directors of the Myer organization, I was told that the company would proceed to put forward a supplementary development plan and comply with development procedures. The Government said that, in those circumstances, it was not playing favourites regarding the development of shopping centres, that the matter would have to go through the normal processes, and that no decision would be made by the Government before that was done.

Instead of promulgating the supplementary development plan and going through the normal planning processes, the Myer organization, without notice to the Government, proceeded to bring an action to claim in court that the purported approval under section 41 by the Port Adelaide council was a valid approval, and that approval had been obtained that way, despite the announced Government policy on planning procedures. It is now apparent that that action will take a considerable time to dispose of,

but in the meantime all investment in the existing planned centres is held up.

Mr. Coumbe: What about West Lakes?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Not only there but also at Port Adelaide. Both are approved centres under legislation of this House. After representations had already started with the Port Adelaide council for a joint operation with the Government, Port Plaza Development Limited, and the council for development in Port Adelaide, it was apparent that the planning decision would have to be made. Since there has been nothing alternative before us, I have written to the Group Managing Director of Myer Emporium Limited in the following terms:

Dear Mr. Steele,

I refer to previous correspondence and discussions concerning the desire of your company to develop a shopping complex at Queenstown. At a meeting in my office on October 26, 1972, you stated that you hoped to have a supplementary development application completed within 10 days at the outside, but no such plan has been submitted. Instead your company has brought a legal action seeking to establish that a previous decision taken at a meeting of the Port Adelaide council was a valid authority to proceed without a supplementary development plan. The Government considers that a final planning decision must now be taken on the whole matter. It therefore proposes to proceed on the basis of the existing plan. If the legal action commenced by your company should succeed in the courts eventually, the Government would introduce an amendment to the Planning and Development Act to support its planning decision.

Mr. Millhouse: Why? That's very tough.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have to do that in order to support the planning processes.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT PREMISES

Mr. RODDA: Will the Premier ask the Minister of Agriculture when the Agriculture Department will move from its present inadequate offices in the South-East to the newly-renovated premises at Struan House and whether Struan House will be set up as a regional agricultural centre covering the whole of the South-East? I understand that it is proposed to make Struan House the major regional agricultural centre for the South-East, and this will be a distinct advantage to many people in the area. However, understandably, some time has elapsed since work on the renovations, etc., was commenced, and, as it now appears to be near fruition, I shall be pleased if the Premier can say when the move will take place.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know offhand, but I will inquire for the honourable member.

MEAT INDUSTRY COMMITTEE

Mr. NANKIVELL: Will the Minister of Education ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he intends to appoint a meat industry advisory committee to advise the South Australian Meat Corporation and, if he does, when that committee will be appointed? I understand that when the corporation was set up as a management board no representatives of producer organizations were included but that the Minister indicated to those organizations that this would be offset by the later appointment of a meat industry advisory committee, on which other interests, including the producer organizations, would be represented. I should be pleased to know whether the Minister agreed to establish the committee and, if he did, when the proposed appointments would be made.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I shall be pleased to refer that matter to the Minister of Agriculture, and I have no doubt that he will treat the matter as urgent and give the honourable member a prompt reply.

TEACHERS' SUPERANNUATION

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Minister of Education say what stage discussions and negotiations have reached regarding the superannuation provisions of women teachers under 45 years of age who, as a result of a previous election, are required by the regulations to retire at the age of 60 rather than at the age of 55? Although I think this matter was raised in a grievance debate last week by the member for Mitcham, it has not been raised as a question, and an approach has been made to members of the Liberal and Country League independent of any approach made to the member for Mitcham. If I quote briefly from a letter received, I think that will explain the question sufficiently. The letter states, in part:

I am writing to ask for any assistance you may be able to give to a group of women, of which I am one, who, being under the age of 45 years on August 27, 1973, will suffer injustices because of the terms of section 25 of the 1972 Education Act, which relates to the retirement of teachers. (This section was published on pages 1 and 2 of the S.A. *Education Gazette* of May 23, 1973.) Part of this section states:

These teachers . . . will not be permitted to reduce fortnightly contributions by reversion to a lower scale commensurate with longer teaching service but will be required to continue contributions at the higher rate until they attain the age of 55. Their contributions would then cease but their pension would not commence until their retirement became effective at age 60 or thereafter as required by section 25 (1) of the Education Act.

This woman comes into that category. Although it seems that this matter is being considered, I ask whether the Minister can indicate what stage the negotiations or deliberations have reached.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: When the Education Act was passed last year it was certainly not intended to remove an option that had already existed for teachers to retire at the age of 55. However, we have been informed that the wording of the Act, as we passed it, has that effect. As a consequence, Cabinet has approved a recommendation I have made to it that appropriate amendments should be introduced so that those who have opted to retire at the age of 55, even though they may have been under the age of 45 at the time, should be permitted to do so and to continue with that option. In addition, should people who have opted to retire at the age of 55 wish to transfer that option and retire when they are 60, we will see whether we can provide that they will be able to continue at a lower rate for the remainder of their service to the age of 60.

However, that will be as far as the option to retire at the age of 55 continues. It is not intended to give a woman teacher under the age of 45, who has not previously exercised an option to retire at 55, an option to do so; only those who are over the age of 45 will be given that option. However, it was never intended that a teacher who had previously exercised an option before the Education Act was passed should be deprived of that option.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Are men in the same group?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: No men are in the same group. No men have the right to retire at 55; it is age 60, and that is not altered in any way under the new provisions of the Education Act. Women have the right to retire at the age of 60, 61, 62, 63, 64 or 65 in exactly the same way as do men. The whole problem arose in an attempt to provide complete equality of treatment as between men and women concerning their superannuation provisions.

PETERBOROUGH PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. ALLEN: Can the Minister of Education say whether the recent announcement by the Commonwealth Minister for Education (Mr. Beazley) that grants worth \$40,000,000 would be made to the States for urgently required improvements in schools in 1973-74 will have the effect of expediting the commencement of work on upgrading the Peterborough Primary School?

Mr. Evans: Hear, Hear!

Mr. ALLEN: I agree. The *Advertiser* of Tuesday, June 26, which reported this statement by the Commonwealth Minister, states that South Australian Government schools will receive \$3,342,000 and non-Government schools will receive \$563,000 under the Act that was introduced by the Commonwealth Liberal and Country Party Government last year. The report adds that the grants are for urgently needed new classrooms and facilities. The Minister knows the condition of the Peterborough Primary School, as he used it as an example when he was speaking to a deputation that I introduced to him recently.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member knows that I visited Peterborough Primary School soon after I became Minister, as I happened to be passing through the town and dropped in. On my return to Adelaide at that time, I started to press for replacing the temporary buildings at the school with solid-construction buildings. Plans are in an advanced stage, and I believe that tenders will be called soon. I will obtain an up-to-date report for the honourable member about the reconstruction of this school. The announcement of these funds for the financial year 1973-74 was giving publicity to a situation of which we were well aware. We received part of those funds during the current financial year (1972-73). In 1972-73, we have over-spent on school buildings well above the original provisions made, so it is unlikely that there will be significant further expansion in 1973-74. Nevertheless, the over-spending has meant that some projects have been completed sooner than had been expected. This, in turn, has enabled other projects to come forward more quickly than would otherwise have been the case. Our overall planning has not been affected by that announcement, because that planning was undertaken some considerable time previously. I assure the honourable member that I will always give a high priority to the Peterborough Primary School project; I think the honourable member would be well aware of the extent to which I have pushed it.

DENTAL THERAPY

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Education say what is the present position of, and what are the plans for, dental therapy schools in South Australia? Early in May, I read with much interest a newspaper report that the Victorian Minister of Health (Mr. Rossiter) had said that two \$1,500,000 dental therapy schools were planned for Melbourne, to be operating within two years. The Victorian Minister also said that a third school in a country area in Victoria was expected to be opened in 1977. One reads with much interest the developments taking place in other parts of the Commonwealth.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The honourable member has put his foot in his mouth once again. As he will probably not know, a previous South Australian Labor Government started the first school of dental therapy in Australia.

Mr. Venning: I know. I'm just asking you a question. Answer it!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am answering it. That school was established while the Hon. A. J. Shard was Minister of Health in the 1965-68 Walsh Government.

The dental therapy training introduced was modelled on the New Zealand pattern. After December 2 last, when the Commonwealth Labor Government was elected, that Government desired extensive development of dental therapy schools so that a reasonable coverage of Australian school students could be achieved within a relatively short time. Consequently, special grants have been made to this State for expanding dental therapy training, and grants have also been made to Victoria. The only reason why the Victorian Minister of Health was able to announce anything was that grants were made by the Commonwealth Labor Government. The honourable member is probably not aware that the school of dental therapy comes under the control of our Minister of Health, although the dental therapy units for the training of students are located in the schools. I shall be pleased to contact the Minister of Health and obtain for the honourable member the latest details on the expansion in dental therapy training that will take place in South Australia as a result of the decisions taken by the Commonwealth Labor Government, decisions that have benefited not only this State but also the other States, including Victoria.

MONARTO

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of June 19 about expediting a reply to my correspondence of January 26 last regarding the position of people living on the boundary of the proposed new city of Monarto but within the area prescribed?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The honourable member has asked for information in relation to two properties in the designated site of Monarto and sought an assurance from the Government that it would not be requiring these properties during the life of the two people concerned. The Government cannot give such an assurance because no detailed planning in the designated site has yet been done. When the authority which will be dealing with the planning of Monarto is set up, the honourable member may be assured that cases such as the one to which he has referred will be given full consideration during planning stages. The honourable member is probably aware that one of the persons he referred to has already offered his property to the Government, and the State Planning Authority has almost completed the transaction. However, no offer has been received from the other person.

DRILLING REGULATIONS

Mr. GUNN: As Minister assisting the Premier, can the Minister of Environment and Conservation spell out what the Government intended when it announced the restriction on property holders in the South-East and on Eyre Peninsula before they could carry out drilling operations? Some of my constituents have told me that they are concerned that they may be affected by this restriction. Several misleading statements have been made and Mr. Martin Cameron has made several statements that have only confused people. In view of Mr. Cameron's irresponsible statements, I should appreciate the Minister's clearly outlining the Government's policy and saying just what it has in mind.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member may not refer to another honourable member.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I know that the Minister of Works has clearly pointed out to people in the South-East what is the exact position in relation to the new regulations. However, as the honourable member has said that confusion has been created, I will discuss the matter with the Premier and provide information about it.

COMMUNITY WELFARE CENTRES

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say how many community welfare centres it is expected will be operating by the end of June, and how many more it is intended to establish during the next 12 months? The Minister may remember that, during the course of the debate on the community welfare legislation, he assured me that it was unlikely that more than two or three centres would be established soon, and he had difficulty in explaining what would be the exact functions of the centres. I am not criticizing him in any way, but it seems that the functions of a community welfare centre have been far more clearly defined since then, as the Minister seems to be pressing on with them.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not recall the difficulty to which the honourable member refers, but I do recall the honourable member's experiencing some difficulty in grasping what I was saying. Although I said it several times over, he still seemed to fail to grasp it at the end of the debate. I assure the honourable member that there is no lack of clarity in the functions of the community welfare centres, although a greater degree of definition will be arrived at with experience. I hope that the department will continue to give effective latitude to the centres' functions so that the functions can be adjusted as experience dictates. I cannot say precisely how many centres will be constructed and in operation during the next year. As certain decisions are still to be made, I expect that, by the end of July or mid-August, I shall be able to supply that information. I cannot give it now, because this is the time of the year when plans, including financial plans, are made.

LONG SERVICE LEAVE

Mr. RUSSACK: Can the Minister of Transport say what effort the Government is making to provide the same long service leave provisions for South Australian Railways employees as those that apply to the private sector of the community? Recently, a railways employee (and I think that this would apply to other branches of the Public Service), who terminated his services with the Railways Department after 10 years, received no long service leave payment, even though he left of his own accord and with a good record. State legislation provides that in the private sector every worker who lawfully terminates his service or dies or who has his service terminated by the employer for any cause other than serious and wilful misconduct after completing seven years but less than 10 years continuous service is entitled to a pro rata payment in lieu of his long service leave entitlement. As I believe an inconsistency exists between the two provisions, will the Minister clarify this matter for me?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I shall be interested to read the *Hansard* pull of the honourable member's question to see whether it makes a little more sense than it made when he asked it. As I heard the honourable member, he said that he was speaking on behalf of an employee who, although he had served for more than 10 years with the South Australian Railways, had been denied long service leave. The honourable member should know that the Government pays for long service leave (and this applies to the Railways Department) at the rate of three months leave after 10 years service, so there is obviously something more to the case than either the honourable member has told me or the employee has told him. As the honourable member was speaking on the employee's behalf, he no doubt knows the employee's name. I shall be delighted to investigate this case to ascertain what the skulduggery is all about, because there seems to be something fishy somewhere. I

should have thought that the ex-employee would prefer to go to his union to have his case handled.

Mr. Gunn: He may not have been a member.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I should expect —

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister is out of order in replying to an interjection during Question Time.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I would not expect that an employee of the South Australian Railways would be anything other than a good honest and loyal Australian trade unionist.

GLENELG JETTY

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation ask the Coast Protection Board to examine sketch plans incorporating an extension to the Glenelg jetty to provide a boat and harbor anchorage? I understand that a sketch plan of the proposed new Glenelg jetty boat anchorage and harbor was presented to the Government on April 12, 1967, for investigation. The first stage of the plan of the present jetty, costing \$128,500, was opened on May 18, 1969, by the then Minister of Works (the present member for Torrens). I also understand that a developer from another State who has substantial interests in this State is keen to investigate the feasibility of the original proposal, provided that the Government and the Glenelg council approve such a scheme, which would be of benefit to all boat owners and which would provide a safe shelter in the event of storms. I believe that such a plan would need the board's approval before final approval could be given.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I well recall, under the previous Dunstan Government, the activities of the Minister of Education (then the member for Glenelg) in obtaining the jetty to which the honourable member has referred. Be that as it may, I point out that, under the Coast Protection Act, the board is obliged, in respect of proposals of this nature, to ensure that they will not create any difficulty in relation to the foreshore. I assure the honourable member that this matter will be investigated.

MODBURY WEST SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Education a reply to my question of June 20 about the accommodation and facilities, either temporary or permanent, that have been planned for the Modbury West Primary School?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Modbury West Primary School has already been provided with three transportable rooms. It is intended to allocate three additional temporary rooms which, if the present programme is maintained, will be made available during the remainder of 1973. The school's further accommodation needs can be met only if a new 10-room separate infants department can be erected, and this possibility is now being considered.

COMPANIES LEGISLATION

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Attorney-General say whether any discussions have taken place between the Commonwealth Attorney-General and State Attorneys-General regarding a Commonwealth Companies Act to supersede the Companies Acts now applying in each State? There has been some conjecture on this matter, and the passing of such Commonwealth legislation would be in line with the action of the present Commonwealth Government in legislating on a number of other activities or of passing complementary legislation on such matters as transportation and education.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I welcome the Leader's question, because it is the first one I have had from him as legal spokesman for the Opposition.

Mr. Millhouse: For the L.C.L. section only!

The Hon. L. J. KING: The member for Mitcham corrects me by saying that it is the L.C.L. section of the Opposition. Discussions have been held between the Commonwealth Attorney-General and State Attorneys-General on the matter of a national Companies Act. As a consequence of the High Court decision in the Rocla pipes case, it is now clear that the Commonwealth Parliament has a far more extensive constitutional power to legislate in the company law field than was hitherto thought to be the case. The Commonwealth Attorney-General has indicated that it is the Commonwealth Government's policy to exercise that constitutional power with a view to legislating for a national Companies Act. It is clear, I think, that the Commonwealth's power does not extend over the whole field of company law and that, if there is to be a national Companies Act covering the whole field, it will involve either some powers being referred by the State Parliaments to the Commonwealth to enable it to cover the whole field or, alternatively, a constitutional alteration by way of referendum.

The other alternative is for the Commonwealth Government to legislate as far as it constitutionally can, leaving State law to fill in the gaps. The matter will be discussed further at the conference of Attorneys-General in Perth next week. However, I think there is general agreement at present that it is not possible to discuss the matter in concrete form until the Commonwealth Government produces a draft of its proposed national Companies Act. Therefore, the reply is that the matter has been discussed extensively. It will be discussed further, and I may say that the South Australian Government's attitude is that it is extremely desirable that there should be a national Companies Act.

Dr. Eastick: Do any other States have that same attitude?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes, certainly Tasmania and Western Australia have it. The other States have not indicated a definite view of the topic, but the importance of a national Companies Act stems from the fact that all attempts to obtain uniform companies legislation by co-operation among the States have failed for several reasons, mainly because of amendments made by the State Parliaments to what set out to be uniform legislation, resulting in substantial divergence, considerable inconvenience to the commercial community, and considerable disadvantages to the national interest. The South Australian Government is satisfied that there ought to be a national Companies Act and we will do all in our power to co-operate to bring that about.

MOTOR CYCLE REPAIRS

Mr. HOPGOOD: Will the Attorney-General investigate a restrictive trade practice that seems to be rife in the motor cycle crash repair industry? About a week ago a vehicle was brought for repair to one of my constituents who operates a motor cycle crash repair business. Before he could effect these repairs, Claridge Motors Proprietary Limited sent down a truck, and asked that the motor cycle be loaded on to the truck because the company had an agreement with Lombard Australia Limited that Claridge Motors should repair this vehicle. When my constituent complained about this to the Commissioner for Prices and Consumer Affairs, the Commissioner claimed that he had no power in the matter. It seems that the Lombard company and Claridge Motors have an agreement in respect of vehicles sold by Claridge Motors and financed by the Lombard company. This position appears to be rife, being by no means confined to these two companies,

and there seems to be nothing that my constituent can do about the matter, even though the V.A.C.C. Insurance Company Limited comprehensive insurance policy, in paragraph 2, regarding special conditions, states:

The insured may elect to have the damaged motor cycle or sidecar repaired by any particular repairers, provided the company's liability shall not exceed the cost of repairs estimated as aforesaid and approved by the company.

Despite what is in that policy, it will be necessary for my constituent to lose this business and return the motor cycle to Claridge Motors. Further, the Lombard company is claiming that it, and not the young lad, legally owns the vehicle because the loan has not been repaid.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I assure the honourable member that the last matter that he has mentioned, namely, that ownership is with the finance company, will not be the position regarding consumer transactions that take place when the legislation to be passed in this Parliament in the next session has been passed, because ownership of the property will be with the owner, the person who in ordinary parlance is regarded as being the owner, and he will become a mortgagor under a chattel mortgage. I will examine the circumstances of this case to find out whether there is a problem here that can be solved by legislation, because, as the honourable member will be aware, we have provided in our legislation a wide range of protections for consumers in consumer credit transactions. If there is a case for extending that protection to preserve to people the freedom to choose their own repairer in cases of this kind, we will take legislative action.

GOVERNMENT PRODUCE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BLACKER: In the temporary absence of the Minister of Works, will the Minister of Education ask his colleague to inquire of the Minister of Agriculture whether the Government intends to place the operations of the Government Produce Department in Port Lincoln under the control of the South Australian Meat Corporation and, if the Government so intends, when this will take place?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will inquire of my colleague and bring down a reply for the honourable member.

ADJOURNMENT

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

That the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, July 10, 1973, at 2 p.m.

Motion carried.

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

That the House do now adjourn.

This has been a historic session of this Parliament. It has achieved complete victory, as the member for Goyder has pointed out, in respect of a policy for which this Party has

been fighting since its inception. At last we have achieved, against the bastions of entrenched privilege in this State, a Constitution for the State's Upper House providing for adult suffrage, majority rule, minority representation, and effective rights for the people of the State, and we have achieved an Upper House that has been transformed at one stroke, in the two measures that have passed this Parliament today, from the most conservative and non-representative Chamber in any Parliament in the British-speaking world into one which, after a transitional period, will become truly representative of the people of this State. I do not suggest (and members know this) that this fight has not been hard and long, and, over the past few days, it has been fairly heated.

Mr. Mathwin: But you've enjoyed it, haven't you?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I enjoy the result all right, and there are extremely cheerful faces on this side of the House.

Mr. Jennings: And on the other side.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Well, that is for a different reason.

Mr. Venning: You're quite an actor. You should go down to the Festival Theatre.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I thank the honourable member. I always like him to be in the audience. In one or two other places in this Parliament some faces are looking a little lugubrious, because the rearguard action that those people have fought over the years has now been proved unsuccessful. They have had to go into complete retreat.

Dr. Eastick: Who is retreating?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable Leader not only needs to take some advice in his own surgery: he also needs to see an optician. I am sure that his so-called reconditioned member will be able to give him the necessary information and provide him with the necessary spectacles. This is a great day for South Australia. I assure the member for Goyder that I will not be hoisting the Legislative Council's white flag over the Trades Hall, but we will keep the red flag flying there.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier has moved that the House do now adjourn. In accordance with Standing Order 57, I call for a seconder. Is the motion seconded?

Mr. JENNINGS: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER: In accordance with Standing Orders, I cannot permit a further debate. The question is "That the House do now adjourn".

Motion carried.

At 2.26 a.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, July 10, at 2 p.m.