HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, October 23, 1973

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

PETITIONS: CASINO

Mr. GUNN presented a petition signed by 29 persons who expressed concern at the probable harmful impact of a casino on the community at large and prayed that the House of Assembly would not permit a casino to be established in South Australia.

Mr. OLSON presented a similar petition signed by 39 persons.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO presented a similar petition signed by 30 persons.

Mr. COUMBE presented a similar petition signed by 516 persons.

Mr. Evans, for Mr. MATHWIN, presented a similar petition signed by 28 persons.

Mr. DEAN BROWN presented a similar petition signed by 47 persons.

Mr. BECKER presented a similar petition signed by 850 persons.

Mr. WARDLE presented a similar petition signed by 33 persons.

Dr. EASTICK presented a similar petition signed by 43 persons.

Petitions received.

Mr. BECKER presented a petition signed by 58 persons, who prayed that the House of Assembly would support any legislation introduced by the Government to permit the establishment of a casino in South Australia.

Petition received and read.

PETITION: MINISTRY

Mr. BECKER presented a petition signed by 1 453 persons, who prayed that the House of Assembly would support the appointment of a Minister of Recreation and Sport.

Petition received and read.

QUESTIONS

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier say whether he can confirm that newspaper reports that the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy is demanding a 51 per cent Australian equity in the Redcliffs project are factual and whether he believes that such a requirement is likely to be acceptable to the two major consortia currently negotiating for the project? Further can he say what other barriers exist that could prevent our reaching a satisfactory conclusion to the establishment of this petro-chemical industry? Today's press contains a report of a statement about Redcliffs made yesterday in Canberra by the Commonwealth Minister, as follows:

Naturally, in accordance with the federal policy of my Party, I also wish to see at least 51 per cent Australian equity.

Last week, when this House unanimously carried an Opposition motion expressing deep concern at Mr. Connor's action over Redcliffs, the Premier touched on the matter of Australian equity during the debate when he said, "Naturally, the more Australian interest there is—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Leader should not refer to a previous debate in this House during this session.

Dr. EASTICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On that occasion indications were given to the House of the decisions, and the Minister of Development and Mines also explained various aspects of this project. Therefore, it is important that this House be assured without any doubts that this is the last of the barriers that will prevent the building of Redcliffs. If it is not the last of the barriers, I ask what other barriers are known to the Premier, so that the House may consider them.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Problems facing the development at Redcliffs at present are twofold concerning the Commonwealth Government's requirements. I do not think there are any other barriers—

Dr. Eastick: Heaven forbid!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The announcement by the Minister in the House of Representatives yesterday that he would be seeking a minimum 51 per cent Australian equity was the first time I have heard a figure from him of what he considered the minimum requirement. Questions asked previously on the attitude about the minimum requirement in the total consortium had not received any specific replies. Now that we have a specific reply, that the minimum requirement is 51 per cent, I do not see any difficulty in reaching that figure. Naturally, there will be necessary negotiations with the consortia, but I have been discussing for some time with Ampol Australia Limited the involvement of that company in whatever consortium is chosen to build the Redcliffs complex. As it is, with the South Australian Government's involvement in the ownership of the pipeline, the total equity proportion reached in existing proposals exceeds 40 per cent, so that it is merely a marginal matter to reach 51 per cent.

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't you tell us all this last week?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. Millhouse: You were very cagey then.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham knows the requirements applying during Question Time. He must not interject. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have informed the House fully and frankly of the matters which I was able to put before the House when there have been debates on this matter. I appreciate that members of the Liberal and Country League in this House have treated this project responsibly and seriously for the benefit of the people of this State. Obviously, however, some other members only want to play politics, nothing more.

Mr. Hall: It's clear—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The member for Goyder and the member for Mitcham have done nothing but play politics about this whole project from its first announcement—

Mr. Hall: We'll see about that.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —and they have tried to use any political means they can to pull it apart at any time for the simple reason that they never want anything to be done by this Government which they can praise: whatever we do, they never suggest that it is any good.

Mr. Hall: Only the L.C.L. does that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The L.C.L. has acted responsibly in this matter in Opposition, just as the Labor Party has acted responsibly in Opposition in support of projects for the benefit of this State.

Mr. Hall: Shades of Dartmouth!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In relation to the other matter of concern, the Commonwealth Government has laid down a policy, which I believe is of benefit to Australia, that there should be no export of liquid petroleum gas. However, the requirement that liquid petroleum gas be then reconstituted to gasoline does present economic difficulties in respect of the whole Redcliffs situation. A whole series of studies has been done on this matter. Alternative proposals for the use of liquid petroleum gas with varying proportions in respect- of the conversion of liquid petroleum to gasoline have been presented to the Government. These are now a matter of continuing study and negotiation. These are the only two areas in which there is difficulty about coming to a conclusion. I believe that both of these matters can now be resolved rapidly and that before Parliament rises we shall be able to have signed an indenture that can be examined by Parliament this session.

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say what new factors have emerged to make him and his Government change their minds in relation to the equity that will be required in relation to the Redcliffs project and the export of liquid petroleum and gas from it? Members of the Liberal Movement in this House have advocated that a majority ownership, residing in the hands of Australian equity, should result from negotiations on Redcliffs and that no liquid petroleum should be permitted to be exported from that plant. Last week in this House, the Premier and other members of his Government voted against an amendment requiring that stipulation—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot allude to a debate or vote in this House during this session.

Mr. HALL: I accept that, but may I refer to what has been publicly stated by the Premier and his Government? The fact that they did not adopt the policy of the Liberal Movement until today (and their previous stand was supported by the Liberal and Country League) has been widely publicized. Until this week the only two members of this House who advocated this policy have been members of the Liberal Movement in the House of Assembly. I may say some people in the community find it difficult to understand why the Premier could not read the Commonwealth policy of his own Party.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is commenting, and that is not permitted.

Mr. HALL: What new factors have emerged to cause the Premier to make the turnabout that he has made?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: None at all: there has been no turnabout. The honourable member has said that the Government has adopted Liberal Movement policy. Considering what the honourable member has said about this proposal since I first announced it in March this year. I believe it would be impossible to follow the twists, mazes, turnings, somersaults, and mutually contradictory statements that he has made. Therefore, what policy is it that we are supposed to have adopted? Having regard to the things that the honourable member and his cohort have said, heaven only knows what their policy is, except to try to bedevil anything put forward by the Government, no matter what.

Mr. Venning: Or by the Liberal and Country League.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. Everyone but them is out of step, and it does not matter how often they change their step.

Mr. Hall: That's no answer.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There have been no new factors at all in the matter. I have told the House that I have tried to get from the Commonwealth Government an indication as to its views on the equity content involved in this development. The policy of the Australian Labor Party is for Australian control of our natural resources, and in all propositions put to the Commonwealth Government that was ensured. The suggestion that in the treatment plant (not in the exploitation of the field, the ownership of the gas, the delivery to treatment plants, or the control of export: the treatment plant is all that is involved here) there be 51 per cent equity is the first time we have heard this figure from the Commonwealth Minister. Although I had asked him for it previously, I was not told.

Mr. Hall: We suggested—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: As to the honourable member's suggestions made publicly, I point out that he did not make only suggestions as to some form of equity somewhere, in whatever form, in this complex, as he was able to understand it (I have not yet been able to appreciate that the honourable member knows what it is all about, because his public statements have not indicated that he knows what is involved; the motions that have previously come before the House show that he does not know what it is all about) but, as he well knows, he has tied in as well condemnations of the attitude of the Government.

Mr. Hall: Deservedly so, too.

The Hon. D. A DUNSTAN: In these circumstances, the House overwhelmingly and rightly put the honourable member and his cohort (and I will admit they got Country Party support from Port Lincoln) into the tiny minority that they deserved to be in.

ENFIELD HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Works have expedited as a matter of urgency the installation of fire-escape stairs in a building at Enfield High School? The library complex at the school is housed on the first floor of a building with only one entrance. As the library is situated on the eastern side of the building, if a fire occurred and emergency action was required students could not get to the existing exit. Although a fire-escape door has been provided on the first floor of the eastern side building, stairs have not been built to enable children to reach the ground.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I shall be happy to take this matter up with the Director of the Public Buildings Department and do as the honourable member has suggested.

ADULT WAGE

Mr. COUMBE: In view of the stated intention of the Minister of Labour and Industry to introduce legislation soon to provide for adult wages to be paid under State awards to people in the 18-year-old to 20-year-old age group (a provision that was specifically excluded from the age of majority legislation that was considered by this House), will the Minister say what action, if any, he intends to take to preserve and, in fact, expand the apprenticeship system, which could almost be wiped out as a result of this proposal? Does the Minister realize that this action could lead to discontent between skilled tradesmen, who have served a training period, and workmen in the group to which I have referred? Can the Minister say what will be the likely additional cost of this proposal to the Government, to industry, and to commerce?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I noticed that this announcement caused some criticism from members opposite, and it apparently caused some severe hip-pocket haemorrhages. Members opposite and many other people believe that it is in order for 18-year-olds to shoulder a gun, to go overseas in battle, and to fight and even to die to protect others' interests, but, when they perform adult work, the people concerned believe that 18-year-olds should be exploited. It is as simple as this. The industrial committee believes that when a young man between 18 years and 20 years performs the work of an adult—

Mr. Coumbe: What industrial committee?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: The Labor Party Industrial Committee knows that many young men today are performing adult work but receiving junior rates, and we believe that this is outright exploitation Wherever a man between 18 years and 20 years is performing adult work, we believe he should be paid the adult rate for his production because he is doing adult work. I do not think anyone could deny that. Indeed, some industries today are advertising that they will pay adult rates to people of 17 years of age. I do not think that this proposal will greatly affect the Apprenticeship Commission or, indeed, the Apprentices Act, because people will want to be tradesmen, for there is a great advantage in taking on a trade. Advanced apprentices in some areas are today being paid adult rates. It will probably necessitate intensive training, probably in a technical college, for from six to 12 months; these people will then go out into industry, and there will probably be a need for a revision of the apprentice training scheme.

Mr. Coumbe: Only probably?

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: We frequently see advertisements in the newspaper for a strong young junior ("Strong lad required"): if a man is lumping wheat or shearing sheep when he is 18, surely—

Mr. Coumbe: That wasn't my question.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: Provision for this already exists in the pastoral award and in certain council awards, anyhow. I doubt whether the Apprenticeship Commission will be greatly affected, and I do not think that the cost of the scheme will be anything like the estimate some people have made, but that exercise can be done in due course. The courts would probably decide what would and would not be adult work. I merely said that where adult work was being carried out, if anyone employed juniors and paid the adult rate he would certainly want adult production and he would see that he got it.

SMART ROAD

Mrs. BYRNE: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to my question of October 11 regarding Smart Road at Tea Tree Gully?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Corporation of the City of Tea Tree Gully sought assistance on the current year's grant applications for the reconstruction and sealing of Smart Road, between Radar Street and Tolley Road. This work was listed as second priority in the council's application and the amount sought was $21 000, being half the total estimated cost of the work. It was not possible to allocate any grant moneys to the city of Tea Tree Gully for 1973-74.

HILLS CATCHMENT AREA

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Premier investigate a report on the lack of uniformity in the control of development of all types in the Hills catchment area, particularly in the District of Heysen? The hill east of Mount Barker, in the catchment area, has been set aside for an open-space area in the proposed Outer Metropolitan Development Plan. Yet a hill in a relative position to the freeway and township of Hahndorf has been levelled and large-scale development will take place, apparently with the consent of the Government, to the understandable dismay of adjoining landholders who have not been permitted to subdivide even one block for their children to build a house on. Large scale developers appear, once again, to have an advantage over the so-called little people.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not know what consent of the Government the honourable member is referring to. If the honourable member is referring to a caravan park development in his district—

Mr. McAnaney: That is on the hill, actually.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The only matter that has arisen is whether the requirements of the Engineering and Water Supply Department have been met in relation to water pollution. My information is that the requirements laid down by the department in all similar cases have been met in this case.

Mr. McAnaney: What about the lack of uniformity?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I am not aware of any lack of uniformity, but if the honourable member can show where there is a lack of uniformity I shall be glad to have a look at it.

Mr. EVANS: Does the Minister of Works realize that, in giving permission for the caravan park to be established in the Hahndorf area, his department has created double standards? House owners who live close to reticulated water supplies are not permitted to have water connected to their houses, because of the possible pollution content that may be carried into the river. A regulation was introduced in 1970, before the present Government took office, preventing subdivision of areas smaller than 20 acres, because it was thought that any extra human activity in the area would create a pollution problem. Farmers in the area were asked, in many cases, to cut down the number of their stock and, in other cases, were bought out by the department in order to decrease the potential for pollution of the Adelaide water supply. Now, the department has given permission for a project that will encourage human beings by the thousand to move into the area and camp there, and this must be considered as additional human activity. We are told that the fast run-off from the paved areas, which will be provided in this project for cars and caravans, will take all the material from the area into the streams. In this way, a double standard has been created, with the confidence of many people, who have tried to abide by the requirements of the Minister's department, being destroyed. Does the Minister realize that this double standard exists, and will he have the matter investigated?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Although the honourable member sounds convincing, I am afraid that his facts are astray.

Mr. McAnaney: They're not—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: First, the department has not given permission to anyone to develop a caravan park. As the honourable member knows, the department does not give this sort of permission. Would the honourable member care to say who gave permission for this complex to be developed? The council gave permission. It did not object to the matter going forward, as it has no powers yet under the Planning and Development Act to stop it. I may tell the honourable member that I understand that

interim development control powers will be available to the council in about a month's time.

Mr. McAnaney: No. This area isn't mentioned.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The council, not the Engineering and Water Supply Department, gave permission to these people to develop the complex. The department was asked whether it objected, not from the land use point of view but from the point of view of water pollution.

Mr. McAnaney: What's that—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the honourable member listens, Iwill tell him what the developers are willing to do. First, they are willing to connect to any sewer or common effluent disposal scheme that may service the area soon. Before then, they are willing to tanker any effluent that might emanate from a septic system in the watershed area. They are willing to control to our standards any contaminated run-off from the area. Consistent with the regulations laid down to control the watershed areas, they are willing to do everything we tell them to do, so how can we stop them if they are willing to do this? We are not the authority that decides on land use. If these developers comply with the Health Act, the Waterworks Act and the Building Act, I ask how we can stop them.

Mr. McAnaney: You've stopped other people.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member for Heysen persists in ignoring the authority of the Chair, I will have to deal with him.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Fisher has accused the department of giving permission for this development to go ahead, but we had nothing to do with this until it was referred to us. I am pleased that the honourable member now signifies that at least he recognizes that the Government did not give permission for this to go ahead: the council gave permission. As far as I know, the council is not unhappy about the development.

Mr. Evans: That doesn't matter.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: What does the honourable member mean?

Mr. Evans: Well—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member knows full well the requirements applying to members during Question Time. Like all other members, he must comply with those requirements.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: If the member for Fisher thinks the Waterworks Act is not stringent enough to control the activity in this area, if he is really talking about land use (and I think he is, because I cannot stop people if they comply with my Act or regulations, any more than local government can do it if the people comply with the Building Act regulations, or any more than the Minister of Health can do it if they comply with the Health Act)—

Mr. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, under Standing Order 125, any Minister or other member answering a question may not debate the issue. I believe the Minister is now debating the issue.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Fisher asked the honourable Minister a question and the honourable Minister has the right and authority to reply to that question without debating it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am taking the points that have been raised by the honourable member in explaining his question and I am answering them. There is no doubt about that, and I do not understand why the honourable member cannot follow it. He does not like it when the truth is getting home.

Mr. McAnaney: What truth?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The truth as I have just described it, and the honourable member has been in this House long enough to know that we cannot, out of hand, prevent that development unless we have legislative authority to do so, and we just have not that authority. I am no happier about the development than is anyone else. Nevertheless, I have no power to stop it if these people comply with the directions laid down by my department, and they have assured us that they will do that. If they do not comply, I will have the authority to stop the development, but not otherwise.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Minister say what precise requirements the Engineering and Water Supply Department laid down before approving the development of the caravan and recreation park? I express appreciation to the members for Heysen and Fisher—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —for anticipating me—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —on the matter. I was approached during the weekend regarding this matter.

Mr. Jennings: You always are, aren't you?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, people know to whom to come to get satisfaction. I was approached during the weekend by the owner of land adjoining the proposed development and I promised him, as was announced in the newspaper this morning, that I would inquire about this matter. The Premier has referred to the requirements laid down by the Engineering and Water Supply Department but, of course, because the matter is not in his specific field, he did not enlarge on the requirements. Again, the Minister of Works, in replying to the question asked by the member for Fisher, has touched on them, but also in the most general way. For that reason, I follow up those questions by asking precisely what are the requirements.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: First, let me put the honourable member straight, if that is possible. In his question or in his explanation of it, he said that we had granted approval. I want to correct that: we did not grant approval for this project. Does the honourable member understand that?

Mr. Millhouse: Yes, indeed.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I also understood that the member for Fisher and the member for Heysen would ask questions, because I read that in the newspaper; but when I read of the intention of the member for Mitcham, I trembled when I thought about how I would handle the matter.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: You've been awake all night!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: No, but I read it this morning and I have been awake ever since. I do not intend to state precisely the controls laid down by the department, other than to say that they will be extremely stringent and in conformity with the by-laws and the Waterworks Act.

Mr. McANANEY: Can the Minister say when it will be decided whether Hahndorf will be serviced by a full sewerage scheme or by an effluent drain; when work will commence on this urgent project; and whether groups of houses just outside the proclaimed township area will be serviced, as they must be considered a pollution risk?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A sewerage scheme is planned for Hahndorf, to commence possibly in 1974-75. I will ask the department for the details sought by the honourable member, and let him have them.

RHODESIA

Mr. DUNCAN: Has the Premier seen an advertisement in the *Advertiser* of last Friday, headed "Rhodesia Welcomes You", which seeks to encourage citizens and residents of this State to emigrate to Rhodesia? Is the Premier aware that this advertisement contravenes the United Nations sanction against Rhodesia and that it also contravenes the policy laid down by the Federal Conference of the Australian Labor Party? As newspapers and their contents come within the constitutional power and control of this State Government, what action will the Government take to ensure that such advertisements do not appear again in newspapers and other publications in this State?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I did not see the advertisement, but I will examine the matter.

NURSES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General ask the Minister of Health to investigate the terms of employment of trained nurses in outback areas, particularly on Aboriginal reserves, with a view to improving their conditions? Trained nurses under the control of the Community Welfare Department are employed on the reserves in South Australia and are paid a locality allowance of about $800 a year, whilst an overtime allowance of $750 a year is to be divided among all sisters on the reserve. It has been pointed out to me that one sister on a two-sister post may be on duty for the 24 hours of the day for days at a time when patients are in the reserve hospital. Sisters employed in county hospitals receive a bonus at the end of 12 months employment, but sisters on reserves do not receive that. Annual leave now amounts to five weeks but no travel allowance is available, other than the value of a bus ticket to the nearest bus depot and, as members know, the nearest bus depot to many of these reserves is more than 100 miles (160 km) away. It has been suggested to me that an air ticket should be made available for each 12 months of completed service. It has also been put to me that, as there is a shortage of nurses in the community, particularly in these posts where they bear heavy responsibility, these people should be helped as much as possible.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I will discuss the matter with my colleague.

TEACHERS' SALARIES

Mr. BECKER: My question is supplementary to one I asked on August 9 about teachers' salaries. Can the Minister of Education say what progress has been made in resolving the anomalies in the Secondary School Assistants Salary Award? The Minister, in his reply to my earlier question, stated:

> Perhaps a consequential change should have been made in the award. Alternatively, perhaps a mistake has been made in the salary paid to teacher B. I will have the matter examined.

My constituent has told me that he knows of another teacher who completed his training al teachers college at the same lime as the teacher to whom I have referred, yet the second teacher is receiving an additional year's salary. As there seems to be a serious anomaly through the interpretation of this award, can the Minister report to the House on what progress has been made?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At this stage, I cannot say what progress has been made on this matter. The honourable member's original question, as well as other matters relating to the award, have been examined by officers of the Education Department and the Industrial Officer of the Public Service Board. There are some circumstances in which an anomaly is claimed to exist, when it can be argued that no anomaly exists. However, there is still an area of dispute in the matter and until that has been resolved I cannot make any statement that would give any worthwhile information. If the honourable member has additional information, I should appreciate his giving me the details of it, particularly about the period of training and qualifications of the teacher to whom he has referred. I want full details, because sometimes certain situations are claimed to be identical but it is found that they are not. If the honourable member would be so good as to give that information, I shall see that that instance is also included in the whole matter.

MURRAY RIVER LEVELS

Mr. WARDLE: Has the Minister of Works further information about Murray River levels as a result of the meeting of Mr. Ligertwood with members of the River Murray Commission? Last week the Minister was kind enough to give some information, but he indicated that a meeting was to be held. The Minister is aware that further publicity given this morning to the rise in river levels would increase the interest of all people living along the Murray River, and I would appreciate any information that the Minister might have following the meeting.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: From inquiries of my department, I can say that heavy rains over the catchments of the Murray River and tributaries a few days ago have swollen the river still further, and this factor, coupled with releases from Menindee Lakes, will provide a flow in South Australia equivalent to a minor flood. A further 11in. (27.9 cm) rise is expected at Renmark by the first week in November. Roadworks are currently being carried out to ensure access to Grimshaws Caravan Park at Renmark. About 20 per cent of the lawned area only may be inundated, but all buildings within the area are on high ground. It is expected that the Renmark Caravan Park will be safe after the construction of a levee bank presently under construction. At Barmera Caravan Park 31 sites only, of a total of 265, will not be available for the summer holiday period. Berri Caravan Park will not be affected, but Loxton Caravan Park is already inundated.

Regarding Purnong and Bowhill, it is estimated that these two stations will rise a further 3ft. 6in. (106.7 cm) and 3ft. 4in. (101.7 cm) respectively by the end of November. With expected further rises at Murray Bridge of 1ft. 8in. (50.8 cm), Mannum 2ft. 3in. (68.6 cm), Swan Reach 4ft. 4in. (132.1 cm), Morgan 3ft. l0in. (116.9 cm) and Waikerie 3ft. 6in. (106.7 cm), no specific comment can be made regarding pumps or shacks without knowledge of the height of the pump or structure, and it is for the individual user concerned to assess the danger. The forecasts of heights are only published for specified points along the river, but further information on specific sites can be obtained by direct inquiry to the Engineer for Irrigation and Drainage at the Engineering and Water Supply Department.

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister say what is the water level at the Goolwa barrages and whether that level will be altered immediately or in the next few weeks? Several constituents of mine living on the lower part of the Murray River believe that the water level at the barrages can profitably be lowered now, and I should like to hear the Minister's opinion.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will have this important matter examined for the honourable member. I do not think the information will be difficult to obtain and I will probably be able to obtain it tomorrow, or by Thursday at the latest. My officers will be only too pleased to provide that information (as they always are) and I will ensure that it is made available.

HILLBANK LAND

Mr. McRAE: My question to the Minister of Development and Mines, as Minister in charge of housing, concerns a statement made by the member for Davenport in a recent debate that "the South Australian Government is the greatest land speculator in the State". Can the Minister say whether there is any truth in that statement? The debating point made by the member for Davenport—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member cannot refer to a previous debate. .

Mr. McRAE: The point made by the member for Davenport related to land at Hillbank in my district. I gathered he was saying that the Housing Trust had artificially created a situation in which it would sell, at better than a normal profit, land it had acquired at fair valuation. The situation I want to get clear is this: is there any doubt at all in this matter, or is the Housing Trust, whether in the acquisition of and the disposal of land at Hill bank, or anywhere else, acting on proper authority from the Valuer-General?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I saw the statement made by the member for Davenport in the House, and I understand that his point was taken up by the member for Florey later in the debate. I have obtained further information, which I consider the House could hear with profit to itself.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister ot Development and Mines.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The property at Hillbank was offered for sale by the trust in order to make land available to the private sector at a reasonable price. For this reason it was decided not to sell at auction or by tender and, instead, the land was advertised at a fixed price of $4 500 an acre, this being the figure contained in the formal valuation provided by the Valuer-General's Department. Adjoining land to the north and north-east was sold at a price of $3 600 an acre, but several aspects of this sale need to be taken into account: (*a)* the 59 acres (23.9 ha) owned by the trust has a frontage of 1 250 feet (381m) to Main North Road; (*b)* the adjoining land has no main road frontage and, in fact, lies behind the trust area and is therefore substantially farther from sewers and water and from existing residential development; and (*c*) the purchasers obtained an option over the land in November, 1972, since when land prices have shown a significant increase. As the purchase was not completed until some months ago, the Valuer-General's Department would have had no knowledge of the transaction when valuing the trust land but, in the circumstances, it is doubtful whether the sale would have affected the valuation figure. A director of the purchasing company has recently told the trust that, in his opinion, the trust's land is more valuable than that bought by his company and that he would consider seriously offering $5 000 an acre if the trust were to advertise the land again.

HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

Mr. MATHWIN: The Minister of Education has indicated that he has a reply to a question I asked concerning the reduction of the number of taxi-cabs used to transport crippled children to and from their school, causing them great discomfort that could possibly worsen, particularly as the summer with its higher temperatures is approaching. Will the Minister give that reply?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: On Monday, October 1, a complete reshuffle was made of the taxis conveying children to and from the Somerton Crippled Children's Home. Continuous alterations to routes throughout the year can make certain runs uneconomical, unless some adjustments are made periodically. On examination of the eight taxis transporting children to the Somerton Crippled Children's Home, it was decided that the routes could be altered and one service dispensed with. This reduced the services to seven: five taxis with six children and two taxis with five children. Since these alterations were made one child has died, and there are now three taxis with five children. No complaints regarding the alterations were received by the Headmaster of the Somerton school or the transport officer.

The taxis are licensed to carry five adults or seven children, and with all schools within the transport of handicapped children's scheme an attempt is made, where possible, to have seven children travelling in a cab. Although many Somerton children wear special gear, it is considered that six children, and in some cases seven children, can travel comfortably in one cab. Before the reorganization referred to by the honourable member, one taxi did convey seven children to Somerton. Mr. Endine (Headmaster of the Somerton school) has indicated that, in his opinion, the cabs are not overloaded. As the honourable member stated, the last child in one taxi-cab is collected at 9.20 a.m., although school commences at 9 a.m. (school lessons in fact start at 9.15 a.m.). This taxi is late getting children to school, as it has to collect a child from Concordia. This child, Theresa Veith,' travels from Aldgate on the Concordia College bus, which does not arrive at the college until 8.55 a.m.

Students have no firm starting time, as, on arrival at school, many receive physiotherapy, occupational therapy or hydro-therapy treatment. Mr. Endine does not believe the children travelling in the same cab as Theresa suffer any disadvantage because of the arrival time. If Mr. Endine requested that this taxi arrive at Somerton at 9 a.m., transport assistance for Theresa would have to be discontinued. Arrangements arc, however, being made for Theresa to attend a normal school in 1974. Again, no complaint regarding this situation has been made either to the Headmaster of the Somerton school or the transport section. If individual parents are not satisfied with transport arrangements, they may contact either the Head of the Somerton school or the Transport Officer of the Education Department, and an investigation will be made.

AGRICULTURE, DEPARTMENT

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In view of the Premier's announcement last Friday that sections of the Agriculture Department are to be moved to Monarto, will the Premier indicate what the recommendations of Sir Allan Callaghan, the Director of Agriculture and the Minister of Agriculture were in relation to the transfer of the department to Monarto? On June 21, I was assured by a Minister that no decision on this matter would be made until the Callaghan report bad been considered by Cabinet. In reply to a question on June 26 in another place, the Minister of Agriculture stated:

The matter of the transfer of the headquarters of the Agriculture Department to Monarto has been undertaken by the Department of the Premier and of Development.

Clearly, we see a transfer from the Minister of Agriculture to the Premier. In reply to a subsequent question on August 1, 1973, in respect of the Callaghan report and the purposes of that report, the reply referred to the fact that Sir Allan Callaghan was given the terms of reference to review functions and organizations of the Agriculture Department and that would include any move to Monarto by the department. At this stage there are several conflicting reports about who will make the decision and when

that decision will be made. An agricultural expert told me over the weekend that the future of the whole Agriculture Department has now been placed under the politics of Monarto, and clearly the people of South Australia have at this stage a Galston airport issue on their hands.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member is not only an acquisition to this House from the Agriculture Department: he is also a comedian.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Decisions on the movement of Government departments to Monarto have been made after investigation by Cabinet. They were made because of the need to ensure that an orderly transfer of departments to Monarto would take place. I have heard members opposite urge in this House over many years (some for about 20 years) the need to ensure that there be adequate decentralization within the State. If decentralization is to take place (and I always believed from what members opposite said that it was their policy that it should) that will involve the decentralization of Government departments as well as inducement to other people to go into these areas.

Mr. Dean Brown: I am not disputing that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member, immediately an announcement is made, says that we have a Galston issue on our hands. Apparently he is trying to exploit the position as far as some departmental officers are concerned on this score, regardless of the necessary decisions relating to the decentralisation of Government departments. The Callaghan report on the reorganization of the Agriculture Department has not been completed. I know of no proposals from that investigation in relation to this. There have been discussions with the Director of Agriculture and the Deputy Director concerning the matter, and expression has been given to satisfaction in the department that a decision should have been made so that they could get on with the job. It was necessary for us to make a public statement as to which departments would be immediately considered for transfer so that the relocation committee set up by the Government, which would include representatives from each department and from the Public Service Association in relation to discussions with each department, could get on with the job, and it could not get on with the job until a decision had been made as to which departments were involved. The decisions concerning the Environment and Conservation Department, the Lands Department and the Agriculture Department have been made and other departments will be considered subsequently.

There is no difficulty now in getting planning work done as a result; in fact, it has been going on and the honourable member may, of course, talk to various people who are associated with his former employment and who may have the sort of dissatisfaction about any move which was the case with Commonwealth public servants moving from Melbourne to Canberra. I am satisfied, however, that this matter can be resolved satisfactorily and will be so resolved.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will the Premier say what sections of the Agriculture Department will be moved to Monarto and what assurances there are that such a move will not nullify the recommendations of the Callaghan report? The Premier, when dodging my previous question about the Agriculture Department—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What did you say?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: He clearly—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What did you say?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: He indicated clearly that the announcement last Friday was made to enable planning at Monarto to proceed. There are three alternatives regarding what sections of the department can be shifted to Monarto. The first is to move the head office, the second is to move the research laboratories and farm section, and the third is to move both sections or parts of both. As the requirements are different for the three alternatives, it is obvious that, because of the Premier's previous statement, Cabinet must have decided which sections would be shifted. Furthermore, if Sir Allan Callaghan has yet to report on the future role and organization of the department (as the Premier indicated in his earlier reply), the people of South Australia deserve the assurance that that report will not be a waste of public funds.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: If the honourable member had listened to my previous reply instead of trying to make up some further political statements to slip into a further question, he would have been better informed. I pointed out to the honourable mem,ber that the decision in principle as to which department would be dealt with on this matter was requisite before the relocation committee operated and discussed in detail with officers and sections of the department what activities of the department would be moved, what officers would be affected, and what the provisions for the move would be. That undertaking is now operating, and no decision has been made by Cabinet as to which sections of the department should be moved, because it was necessary to have a full investigation at all levels of the department before a final decision was made. That investigation could not be made until a decision had been made as to which departments would be investigated in that way. The question of the move to Monarto was discussed with Sir Allan Callaghan, and he will consider those measures in reporting to Cabinet.

WATER FOWL

Mr. ARNOLD: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of September 11 regarding the water fowl population in this State?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: Officers of the National Parks and Wildlife Service have not undertaken, up to the present, a survey of water fowl in north-eastern areas of the State. However, it is intended within the next week that inspectorial and fauna staff will survey the area by ground and by boat to determine the importance of the area to water fowl.

GAUGE STANDARDIZATION

Mr. VENNING: Will the Minister of Transport say what stage negotiations have reached, or have not reached, in respect of the standardization of the Port Pirie to Adelaide railway line? Although I ask this question every three weeks, this matter seems to be a dead issue. As the Minister has not reported any progress at all in respect of the stage reached in negotiation, will he now report on any progress that has been made?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am not sure which of the two questions I should answer: whether progress has been made, or whether progress has not been made. However, I will tell the honourable member about the progress that has been made.

Mr. Mathwin: That will make him laugh.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I am sure it will. The consultants, Maunsell and Partners, have been directed by the Commonwealth Minister, with my approval, to proceed with the final drafting of the proposal. They are currently engaged in that task and, when they have completed it,

the report will be considered by the Commonwealth Minister and by me before an agreement is prepared for signing by the Prime Minister and by the Premier of South Australia. Progress is being made at this stage, and it is a matter of waiting on the report from the consultants.

STUART HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN: Will the Minister of Transport reconsider the reply he gave me last Thursday to the question I asked in respect of Stuart Highway, when he said he would not ask his Commonwealth colleague for special assistance to upgrade this most important road, which is now in a shocking condition? The Minister may recall, if his memory allows him and if he is prepared to put politics—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. GUNN: I wish to explain my question by referring to the 1972-73 Budget speech of the Rt. Hon. Mr. Snedden, when on that occasion he announced to the Australian people that the then Commonwealth Government was willing to make available to the South Australian Government, by way of a special assistance grant, the sum of $2 500 000 to guarantee the sealing of Eyre Highway. Is the Minister of Transport willing to make a similar approach to the present Commonwealth Labor Government to see whether it will provide funds to upgrade this important road?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Obviously the member for Eyre has been in hibernation for nearly 11 months because, in case the honourable member does not know, Mr. Snedden was not successful at the last Commonwealth election—

Mr. Gunn: You didn't listen to my question properly.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: —and, in fact, the policies he enunciated were rejected by the people of Australia. I am not greatly interested in what Mr. Snedden said prior to the election because he, like many people who know they are not going to be elected, can be completely irresponsible.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The honourable member last Thursday asked me whether we would make approaches to the Commonwealth Government for the sealing of Stuart Highway: I remind the honourable member of the long negotiations that took place between the Premier of this State and the then Prime Minister, and between the then Commonwealth Minister of Transport and me, in an endeavour to get something finalized regarding Eyre Highway. We finally wore them down: we have already commenced negotiations in connection with Stuart Highway, and I expect that the next Commonwealth Aid Roads Act will contain a reference to this matter. However, I expect that some time next month the various State Ministers will be meeting with the Commonwealth Minister for Transport, who administers this Act, and I hope that at that stage we will obtain an indication on this. The last time we discussed this matter in depth with the former Commonwealth Minister (Mr. Nixon) we were able to get absolutely nowhere.

WATER AND SEWER SERVICES

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Minister of Works say whether any decisions made at the meeting of the Australian Government Workers Union last Tuesday (October 16) will affect implementation of the Government's policy in respect of contract sewerage and water connections? The House will be aware that, preceding this meeting, questions were asked of the Minister about the result of discussions he had had with the Secretary of this union (Mr. Thomson), and on October 11, at page 1211 of *Hansard,* the Minister indicated to the House the results of his discussion with both the Secretary and other union officials. Subsequently, a meeting has been held and the results of that meeting will be important in relation to implementing Government policy in this vital area of water and sewerage connections and making more housing blocks available to the South Australian public.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I do not know what was the result or the outcome of the meeting referred to. To the best of my knowledge, I have had no correspondence from the union relating to that meeting. Whether or not the Minister of Labour and Industry has had any communication I do not know, but I point out that, following the discussion I had with union representatives, who were fearful that the Government's use of contractors would jeopardize the jobs of people employed on the permanent gangs by the department, I have given to the union representatives (and I give to the men) a categorical assurance that their jobs will not be jeopardized. In fact, I desire, if possible, to establish more gangs, but that is easier said than done. To cater for the peaks in demand and to provide the building blocks we want, the obvious answer is to use contractors where possible, and that is still the Government's policy; it has not changed. I offered to the union—

Mr. Dean Brown: If it hasn't—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I cannot hear the member for Davenport, but no doubt he would be making an inane interjection. I offered to the union Secretary (Mr. Thomson) that every second Saturday overtime would be worked by the sewerage gangs in the Engineering and Water Supply Department to ensure that these men were not being deprived of any increase in the work load and that they would be given an opportunity to participate in the work resulting from an increase in the number of allotments which, with services attached, would become available. To the best of my knowledge, that was acceptable, and I have not as yet heard any more about it. I heard that negotiation was taking place with the department in which the union required departmental drivers and trucks in each maintenance gang to be transferred to the sewerage gang, where contract trucks and drivers operate on Saturdays or on a day on which that overtime was being worked. As far as I know, that matter is still unresolved, but it is the subject of negotiation between departmental officers and the union. The current situation is that, although because of bad weather the men could not work last Saturday, the scheme was proposed to commence as from that day, and this overtime would be worked every second Saturday thereafter, the matter to be reviewed in three months time. In addition, negotiations involving the department, subdividers and contractors will continue.

NORTHFIELD WATER SUPPLY

Mr. WELLS: Will the Minister of Works have investigated the position concerning the water supply to properties in Stewart Avenue, Northfield? I was recently visited at my office by some residents of this street who complained that the water supply was very poor.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Quality or pressure?

Mr. WELLS: It related to pressure; there was no complaint at all about the quality of the water, and I can readily understand that. This area has over many years been plagued with main bursts, and about six months ago the residents concerned were visited by an Engineering and

Water Supply Department messenger, who explained that the water supply would be reduced to half pressure. These people find now that they have difficulty in obtaining sufficient water pressure to fill toilet cisterns and that, if a sprinkler is operating in the yard, they cannot use the shower or get any water from other taps. I am sure that if the Minister investigated this matter it would alleviate the situation.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will certainly do the best that I can for the honourable member and get someone on to it straight away. Although it could involve a major problem, I will see what I can do.

HAMLEY BRIDGE SCHOOL

Mr. RUSSACK: Will the Minister of Education explain why essential and urgent work has not been carried out to replace the inadequate toilet facilities for students and install staff toilets at Hamley Bridge Primary School? Negotiations in this matter commenced in May, 1970, and since then much correspondence has been exchanged and many telephone calls have been made about the situation. I understand that in August, 1971, it was indicated that action would be taken, but on August 24 the local medical officer inspected the site and in a report he stated:

> There are no separate toilet facilities for staff. Facilities for washing are somewhat primitive in both boys and girls toilets. The toilets in their present unreliable condition could well provide an outbreak of hepatitis. In short, it appears that renovations and replacements are overdue.

In February, 1972, advice was passed on by telephone that work would commence in mid-April, 1972. In June, 1972, advice was received by letter that tenders had been called for the work. A letter dated July 24, 1973, from the Hamley Bridge School Council has not been answered. I have been told that student toilets are inadequate both in efficiency and in number and should be replaced; there are no staff toilets at all, and the matter is urgent. After my attention was drawn to this matter I inspected the toilets, and I agree regarding the details and the urgency expressed.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I am not familiar with the position, but I will get an urgent report on it and bring it down as soon as possible.

FAR NORTHERN ROADS

Mr. ALLEN: Will the Minister of Transport consider the length and condition of roads in the Far Northern division of this State when negotiating with the Commonwealth Government for a new Commonwealth Aid Roads Act to commence in July, 1974? If additional money is obtained for this State, will extra money be made available for the Far Northern division in the next financial year? The Far Northern division includes all areas outside local government jurisdiction in South Australia. I understand that there is 6 500 miles (10 458 km) of roads in this area, and this division receives about the same allocation of money as do the other divisions in the State. For this financial year about $1 300 000 is to be spent on roads near Port Augusta, which leaves only a small amount for the rest of the area. Owing to the heavy rainfall this year, which is more than double the annual average, roads in the Far North of this State are in a bad condition; for instance, the road to Oodnadatta has not been patrolled for about four months, and the stock transporters are threatening to carry stock to Brisbane rather than bring it down over the bad roads; the Marree to Oodnadatta road has been out of commission half the time since January; and in today's *Advertiser* it is reported that the Manager of Pioneer Tours has stated that his firm will not operate in the area because of the poor condition of the roads.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: For a considerable time officers of the Highways Department and Commonwealth officers have been engaged in studies to determine the needs in relation to road finance. I expect that the next Commonwealth Aid Roads Act will be based on the work that has been done by these officers and that the money will be allocated on a needs basis. Although no clear indication has been given, it would appear that we could have at least one, if not more, additional category in the next Commonwealth Aid Roads Act than applies under the current Act, but until the Commonwealth Minister can discuss this with the States, I cannot give any assurance on this.

I think the honourable member suggests that perhaps the northern areas of South Australia should be treated somewhat differently and even apart from the rest of the State. That is not possible. If the honourable member had thought that through he would not have advocated it, because, obviously, if we did treat that area as separate and apart from South Australia, we would have to regard the expenditure in that area as being related to the revenues collected. In this financial year a large sum is being spent in the area. Although the honourable member says that most of it is being spent in the Port Augusta area, I suggest that per capita much more money is being spent in those areas than is being spent in the metropolitan area. I think it is just another one of those cases where the metropolitan roads tax is supporting the country roads. I am fully aware of the difficulties in relation to the conditions of roads in the North but I do not think that the people in that area can really have it both ways: they have had good rains to give them a bumper season and they cannot have that and good roads at the same time. However, whatever can be done will be done.

ELIZABETH TRANSPORT

Mr. DUNCAN: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to my question of October 4 regarding the railway service to the Elizabeth East area?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I have asked the Director-General of Transport to include consideration of the suggestion for a spur railway to the Elizabeth East area in planning for the electrification of the Adelaide to North Gawler railway. When the line is electrified, travel time by rail to the city will be substantially less, and several bus routes presently running to the city could well become feeder services to the railway. This could also, apply to bus services in the area to which the honourable member refers. If the honourable member has a specific route in mind, I suggest that he contact Mr. Thompson of the Director-General's office, who will be pleased to discuss the matter with him.

PETROL STRIKE

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Premier say what is the present position regarding the strike at the Port Stanvac refinery and what are the present storage reserves? I appreciate that the union concerned operates under a Commonwealth award, but I wonder whether the Government has tried to bring about a settlement of this dispute, as we certainly do not want a repetition of the critical situation that occurred last year. Can the Premier say what was the outcome of the meetings held yesterday or this morning?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Inquiries have been made by the Minister of Labour and Industry, but negotiations regarding this dispute are taking place in Melbourne, and it is impossible for the South Australian Government to affect them from here. We have no position in this dispute which we can exercise to obtain a settlement.

Dr. Eastick: Have you found it too difficult.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Honourable members opposite are determined to exacerbate the dispute; that is something that is not new to some of them. I am trying to give the honourable member a clear reply about the position we are faced with. With regard to storages of petroleum and fuel, the position is that stockholding figures are being obtained from oil companies as to the present situation at Birkenhead (the final figures will be available to me at 4 o'clock this afternoon) and at country installations. Companies are also advising industry representatives of service station holdings in the metropolitan and country areas. As I have said, the figures for the metropolitan area will be available later today, but figures for country areas will take a little longer to obtain. It appears from preliminary investigations that have been undertaken since Saturday morning that sufficient regular motor spirit is held at Birkenhead, country installations, and service stations to last about three weeks with normal buying. However, premium motor spirit could run out sooner than this, but in this case the *Mobil Australis* is due at Birkenhead on Saturday morning with premium motor spirit, while the *BP Enterprise* is due by October 30. If these vessels are unloaded and the fuel is available for distribution, premium motor spirit should be at a satisfactory level for a further three weeks, that is, three weeks after Friday of this week, or until November 16.

Mr. Coumbe: If they are allowed to discharge.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes. There are some reservations about the quantity of fuel oil being held, and it appears that this product held by industry could run out next week. There are large quantities of this product at the refinery, but not at Birkenhead. Holdings of power kerosene and distillate are as yet unknown, but checks are being made on them currently. This work of getting the exact figures has been going on now for some time. The Secretary for Labour and Industry is keeping in close contact with the oil industry and obtaining all figures. He is also looking at the resource situation should it be necessary to introduce some sort of control. The Director of my department has the situation under review and is keeping me informed. At this stage, there is no further information I can give the House. I expect to have additional information later this afternoon.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HALL: Can the Premier say what additional projects are at the early planning stage with regard to Government industrial promotion, and whether they will be affected by the statement of the Commonwealth Minister for Minerals and Energy (Mr. Connor) in the Commonwealth Parliament about half an hour ago that in future no State Premiers will go overseas making contracts in relation to their assets? In explaining the difficulties in establishing Redcliffs, at times the Premier has been highly critical of the Commonwealth Minister. Today, in the House of Representatives Mr. Connor has made the statement to which I have referred (a statement of great import), that the Commonwealth Government will restrict the freedom of individual State Premiers to enter into contracts concerning the disposal of Australian assets. In view of the obvious disagreement in the first place between the Premier and the Commonwealth Minister, I ask the Premier what projects at the long-term planning stage are likely to be affected by this new Ministerial attitude in Canberra.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have not seen a report of the Commonwealth Minister's statement, nor do I know to what he was referring. Further, I cannot conceive of anything in South Australia to which he was referring.

Mr. Millhouse: It sounds embarrassing—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: It was a stupid question. Do you expect him—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg.

PHYSIOTHERAPISTS ACT

Dr. TONKIN: Has the Attorney-General obtained from the Chief Secretary a reply to the following questions I asked during the debate on the Physiotherapists Act Amendment Bill: (1) Is it competent for a chiropractor to become a licensed physiotherapist while undergoing further studies to qualify him to become a registered physiotherapist in terms of this new legislation? (2) Is it allowable for graduates of some chiropractic schools to be given status for the study undertaken in obtaining their chiropractic qualifications?

The Hon. L. J. KING: My colleague has supplied the following replies:

(1) Yes, provided that the holder of the qualification could satisfy the board of his good character and of his competence to practise physiotherapy under supervision and/or other conditions.

(2) No "status" is given by the Physiotherapy Board. The admission to the South Australian Institute of Technology for studies or training purposes is of course dependent upon assessment made by the Institute.

SHEOAK ROAD

Mr. EVANS: Has the Minister of Environment and Conservation a reply to my question of September 25 whether permission had been given for survey work to be undertaken in Belair Recreation Park with a view to moving Sheoak Road?

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The Highways Department has neither asked for nor received permission to carry out survey work in Belair Recreation Park.

ANZAC HIGHWAY

Mr. BECKER: Has the Minister of Transport a reply to my question of October 11 about trees on Anzac Highway?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO; The trees on the Anzac Highway median strip have contracted canker and would eventually die regardless of any treatment carried out. Some have died already from this disease. It is intended to replace all existing trees with species native to Australia and New Zealand and these are not subject to canker. The design of a landscaping and replanting scheme is well advanced and will be completed in time to permit replanting to commence in 1974. This work will be undertaken over a period of four to five years, the concept being that at no stage would there be any large area devoid of growth of some substance. Test borings carried out along the median strip have not shown any indication of an old road pavement beneath the soil, but care will be taken at planting to ensure that the trees have every chance of healthy and rapid growth.

DOCUMENT PRINTING

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Can the Attorney-General say whether it is intended to amend that part of regulation 13, under the Consumer Transactions Act, that deals with the size of print to be used in documents? Only over the weekend was it brought to my notice that the regulations made in Executive Council on August 2 last under the Consumer Transactions Act (which is to come into operation on November 1) provide, in regulation 13, as follows:

. . . every provision and every portion of every provision of a written consumer contract, consumer credit contract or a consumer mortgage shall be printed in type the dimensions of which comply with the appropriate requirements for such provision or portion thereof set out in the twenty-second schedule thereto.

If one turns to the twenty-second schedule, which is about 20 pages further on in the regulations, one finds, in paragraph 3 of that schedule, the following:

Any printing not falling within paragraphs 1 or 2 of this schedule shall be in the type the dimensions of the face measurements of which are not less than the dimensions of the type face known as 11 point Times.

I have been told by people in commerce and industry who use the forms that will be required under this Act (some of them have been used previously) that 11 point Times is a most unusual print size. The Government Printer in South Australia uses it and I understand only one commercial printer uses it, and many forms that have been used in the past will be no good, because they are not of 11 point Times but are either 10 point Times or 12 point Times. Firms will not be able to have their printing work done in South Australia, certainly without inconvenience. I understand that the matter has been put to the Attorney and that he, as it was put to me, rather shrugged the matter off, saying that they could get their work done in other States, or something like that. That is not a helpful attitude. I remind the Attorney that there is a world-wide paper shortage, and any forms already printed that do not comply with this requirement will be wasted, thus wasting the paper also. Therefore, I put the question to the Attorney, because it seems that 11 point probably has been provided for by inadvertence and it would not matter if 10 point or 12 point was used.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member is terribly wrong: I really cannot describe just how wrong he is when he says that the provision for 11 point Times got in by inadvertence. I cannot think of anything that caused more discussion, consultation and heartburning than the size of the print to be used in the documents. The truth is that 10 point does not produce an appearance that is adequate, in my opinion, and in the opinion of those advising me, to bring home to consumers the contents of a document in a way in which I consider they should be brought home. It is matter of deliberate policy that we should get away from binding people by documents containing fine print and so set out that it is extremely unlikely that they will read it. It is important that documents should be so set out that people would be likely to adopt the habit of reading them, and 10 point was ruled out on that ground. The use of 12 point, of course, was a possibility, but some people who are concerned with these documents consider that a mandatory requirement for a 12 point print in documents would mean that some documents would be extremely long, because some institutions use mortgage documents that are very long. I must say that I think they are far too long, and perhaps this legislation will have the effect of the advisers to these people looking a little more closely at the documents to find out whether all the words used are strictly necessary. Nonetheless, some establishments consider that a mandatory requirement of 12 point would cause documents to be extremely long and, therefore, the 11 point mandatory size was settled on as a matter of deliberate decision after much consideration.

It is true that this size of print is not readily available in South Australia at present. However, I do not doubt that the demand that will be created by the existence of these regulations will soon bring about a situation in which South Australian printers will satisfy that demand. Print of that size is not available readily in South Australia at present, because there has been no demand for it hitherto, but I think that almost certainly the printing trade in South Australia will quickly adjust to meeting the new demand. There is no real problem about the matter. Credit providers may use 12 point print if they so desire: there is no obligation to use 11 point print. That is the minimum requirement, so if they wish to have their documents printed by a printer who cannot supply this minimum requirement, they can use the larger print. If they really want to use the 11 point size and if it is not available in South Australia, they can get the first batch of documents printed in another State. There is no critical problem in this regard. I am certain that in future there will be a gradual swing over to the 11 point size for documents and that these documents will be printed in South Australia.

Regarding the waste of existing stocks of documents, I think honourable members will realize that those connected with the finance industry and the retail store industry have known, or should have known, for several months that this requirement would operate from November 1. There has been much discussion about it over a period of months, the target date initially having been July 1. There have been two postponements, to meet the convenience of the industry, so industry has not been taken unawares and ought to have had ample opportunity to use up the documents and to prepare for a smooth transition to the use of the new type of documents on November 1.

SUCCESSION DUTIES

Mr. GUNN: In view of the serious effects that State succession duties are having on small commercial businesses and rural properties in South Australia, will the Premier follow the example set by the former Commonwealth Government and the Governments of Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland, all of whom, in their most recent Budgets, greatly reduced the effect of these duties on small businesses, rural properties, and matrimonial home transactions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I point out to the honourable member that the estate duty in the other States is based on a different duty from succession duties here. With the estate duty in the other States, the tax raisings per capita are higher than raisings here; that is, the amount charged overall to the community in succession duties in South Australia is lower per capita than in the standard States. Already we have a provision in succession duties that in many ways is more generous than the duty in some other parts of Australia, particularly to the smaller people. I do not expect any further remissions in succession duties to be made in the foreseeable future.

COBDOGLA SCHOOL CROSSING

Mr. ARNOLD: Does the Minister of Education support a reported statement on the television programme *This Day Tonight* on October 18 that teachers, instead of children, should be used to monitor a school crossing, if, in the opinion of the headmaster, the crossing is dangerous? I quote from a letter I have received from the Headmaster of Cobdogla Primary School, in which he states:

In a recent television programme *This Day Tonight* on October 18, 1973, a Mr. J. D. Crinion was reported as making a statement to the effect that if I, as Headmaster of the school, felt that the school crossing was too dangerous to allow children to cross under the present system, then I should use a teacher to monitor the crossing each morning and evening. This would mean that a staff member (we have three) would need to be on traffic duty from 8.30 a.m. until 9 a.m. and again from 3.40 p.m. until 4 p.m.

Also, I refer to a report in the *News* of October 22 concerning a similar situation that exists at a small school at Wangaratta, in Victoria, which has a problem similar to that at Cobdogla. The report states:

Children at a small school at Wangaratta have to run for their lives every day to get to school. There is a school crossing, but it crosses Hume Highway in an unrestricted speed zone. Wangaratta South Primary School Headmaster, Mr. Ross Wood, said cars often did 80 m.p.h. (128.7 km/h) over the crossing. A school bus arrives with children from the surrounding countryside between 8.15 and 8.30 in the morning. It drops them at the roadside, then they have to cross the highway to the school. Parents want the school bus to be allowed to drive into an area in front of the school. Wangaratta shire council president Councillor Colson told his council that "for some reason" the bus was not allowed to turn across the highway in front of the speeding traffic. But children were asked to run the gauntlet of Australia's busiest highway.

Does the Minister consider that teachers should be used to monitor school crossings, or should adequate safety measures be provided?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I do not intend to have investigated the conditions applying at Wangaratta.

Mr. Arnold: That was an example.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: Victoria is a very peculiar place: conditions and circumstances may be entirely different from those in South Australia, so I prefer to leave it well and truly alone. Let us concern ourselves with conditions in our State and the safety, or otherwise, of school crossings here. Concerning this matter, it is necessary to take the advice of experts in road safety, and particularly to take the advice of the Road Traffic Board in regard to the condition of the crossing at Cobdogla. Although I have not previously thought about using teachers to monitor school crossings, my initial reaction would be to say that I do not support that system. Generally, children who monitor crossings do a conscientious job and wear distinctive clothing that teachers may refuse to wear, and I can think of circumstances in which children would do a better job of monitoring school crossings than some teachers would do. To give such an instruction may not necessarily produce an improvement in conditions at the crossing. That would be the position I would adopt on the matter.

Mr. Arnold: With an unrestricted speed zone?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: We have had difficulty with that question, but the speed zone in any part of the State should be determined by the Road Traffic Board. It would take into account the distance of the school from the road, the amount of traffic that used the road, and the number of children crossing the road at a certain time. I am sure the honourable member would appreciate that that is the situation, and that the board, generally, does an excellent job in making those kinds of assessment. I am not an expert in the matter and I suggest that the honourable member is not, either. I will certainly ensure that the board provides, through the Minister of Transport, the necessary reports concerning this crossing.

RURAL YOUTH MOVEMENT

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Has the Government any plans to reorganize the Rural Youth Movement and, if so, what are those plans?

2. Has any consideration been given to allowing the Rural Youth Movement to become an autonomous organization receiving a grant from the State Government?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The replies are as follows:

1. Whilst no alteration of the structure of the movement itself is foreseen, approval in principle has been given to the reorganization of the departmental services available to assist the Rural Youth Movement. It is intended to integrate the advisory services of the Extension Branch of the department to provide a more flexible service to the three organizations with which the Agriculture Department is closely involved, namely, the Agricultural Bureau, the Women's Agricultural Bureau and the Rural Youth Movement. For this purpose a new position of Senior Extension Officer is foreseen, the functions of which would' be to co-ordinate the activities of these organizations.

2. No.

MARDEN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What plans has the Housing Trust for building in River Street, Marden?

2. Do these plans include the erection of multi-storey flats for aged persons?

3. If so, why, and what are the details of such plans?

4. If these flats are to be erected, when will they be built and at what estimated cost?

5. How many persons will be accommodated in any such flats?

6. Has the trust any similar plans for building at Elizabeth?

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The replies are as follows:

1. The Housing Trust development in River Street, Marden, has been progressing for a number of years. Originally, nine single-unit sale houses were built there and then a group of 15 pensioner flats. More recently the trust has undertaken a medium density development on the site which includes 65 villa flats, which have been completed, and five blocks of three-storey walk-up flats (36 units), which are at present under construction. Consideration is at present being given to a proposal to complete the project with a nine-storey lifted block of flats for aged persons.

2. Yes. The block comprises eight floors, making 84 units of accommodation.

3. The Housing Trust has given much thought and planning to this concept and it is felt that applicants should be given a choice of accommodation. Extensive research has shown that many old people find certain advantages in a lifted block. Many feel more secure above street level; privacy is allowed for; a certain sense of independence can be maintained without isolation; good lighting and heating, both very important items for older people, would be available. The ground floor would provide community facilities, namely, a delicatessen type of shop and meeting rooms. The block has been designed so that the residents will have additional community facilities on each floor.

4. No decision has been made, nor has an estimated final cost been determined.

5. It is expected that between 85 and 90 aged persons will be accommodated in the block.

6. The Housing Trust has plans for a similar lifted block at Elizabeth, and these are at present the subject of negotiation between the trust and the Corporation of the City of Elizabeth.

POLICY SECRETARIAT

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How many persons are employed in the Premier's Policy Secretariat?

2. What was the cost of the operations of this secretariat in 1972-73 and what is the estimated cost for 1973-74?

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

1. Seven.

2. The cost of operations of the Policy Secretariat is not recorded separately. It is a section of the Administration Division. Salaries paid to employees in the Policy Secretariat in 1972-73 amounted to $55 690; $54 694 has been provided for this purpose in 1973-74.

RESEARCH FACILITIES

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. What research facilities are available to the Premier and to other Ministers respectively?

2. Are these research facilities available to other members of the Parliamentary Labor Party?

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

1. The Premier and other Ministers, in common with their predecessors in office, are able to use the resources of the Public Service and Ministerial employees for research.

2. These research facilities are not available to other members of the Parliamentary Labor Party, although readily available information may be given to them as to other inquirers from time to time. Members of the Opposition may seek assistance from the Leader of the Opposition, who has been provided with a research officer, refused to the Opposition by the previous L.C.L. Government.

PRESS SECRETARIES

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. How, many Ministers' press secretaries are employed by the Government?

2. What was the cost of salaries paid to these employees in 1972-73 and what is the estimated cost for 1973-74?

3. Are these press secretaries available to undertake work for other members of the Parliamentary Labor Party?

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

1. There are seven at present.

2. The sum of $61 489 in 1972-73; about $77 350 in 1973-74.

3. No.

CASINO BILL

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN (Premier and Treasurer) obtained leave and introduced a Bill for an Act to provide for the consideration of applications for the grant of a casino licence; to authorize the holding of a referendum and subject to the result of that referendum to authorize the granting of such a licence; to provide for the regulation and control of the casino; to provide for matters incidental thereto and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this Bill be now read a second time.

The proposal for the granting of a single casino licence in South Australia stems from two matters. First, it is necessary for us constantly to seek to gain a balance of employment in the State, a diversity of employment, and a security of employment to ensure that those people employed are to the least extent possible dependent on fluctuations in the markets of consumer durable products, because it is on that basis that this State has previously faced real difficulties in maintaining security of employment at a level to which all sections of political Parties, I believe, would subscribe.

Secondly, it is desirable to ensure that in country areas we use tourist development to obtain security of employment, that we ensure effective decentralization by making certain that there are stable employment opportunities available in developing country areas, and that country areas which have a tourist potential do not constantly lose their natural increase in population from the birth rate to the cities in the constant drift into more and more central urbanization within Australia.

Clearly, from a project of a casino type, it would be possible to get a large tourist complex, and that tourist complex would provide considerable employment in a developing tourist area and provide far more stability in that area. Therefore, it is not surprising in relation to certain areas in South Australia with a tourist development potential and with inadequate employment in the local area for people of all kinds, especially women and school leavers, that there should be many suggestions for the provision of a casino and associated facilities.

I point out that the casino is merely a generating factor in the provision of much more than a casino itself. In relation to most of the proposals made on this score in South Australia, the projected investment in the total complexes will be from $10 000 000 to $15 000 000, whereas the casino itself would not require much more of an investment than $500 000 for the provision of its facilities. The provision of such large complexes in a country area can be of great value to tourist development within the State. I do believe that this should not be minimized.

I do know that certain people have expressed fear in respect of a casino and that statements have been made in respect of the social disabilities within the community arising from the establishment of casinos. These have come from people drawing an analogy between the establishment of a single casino licensed here, with no allowed competition in the area, and the provision of casinos in places such as Las Vegas, where there are multi-gambling facilities under poor control and in private hands. The proper contrast is not with places like Las Vegas but with the casinos that exist in very many towns and cities in Europe, where they are long established, a natural part of the local scene, properly controlled, and where there is absolutely no evidence whatever of adverse social consequences. It is on the basis of the kind of licence and control that exists in those places that we are seeking to introduce a measure to this House. In these places great benefit for the tourist industry has been derived from the provision of a properly controlled licence. Later, I shall circulate to members the information I have obtained about casinos in Europe, and I suggest that, in considering this Bill, they should read that material and also the report on the only casino so far operating in Australia, that at Wrest Point.

The Bill sets out the legislative framework within which it will be possible to grant a single licence to operate a casino in this State. In the Government's view, the development of a casino complex of appropriate standard would provide a number of wide-ranging benefits to the people of this State, and it is also of the view that with some foresight and careful planning the attendant disadvantages associated with such a project (and there will be some) can be minimized. Obviously, the establishment of a casino will be of direct benefit to the tourist industry in this State and indirectly to the tourist support industries. It will clearly be another factor in making South Australia attractive to the tourist.

Wherever it is established (and in terms of the measure here proposed it must be in, broadly speaking, a rural area), it will generate employment and give real meaning

to our policy of decentralization. Further, it will have an immediate and direct beneficial effect on this State's finances. Although this measure is quite a substantial one, containing as it does 88 clauses, it falls fairly naturally into a number of segments each dealing with a different aspect of the proposal envisaged. Part I deals with a number of formal and preliminary matters. Part II provides for the making of applications for the grant of the casino licence and deals with the consideration of those applications by the Industries Development Committee. Finally, this Part provides for the possible recommendation of one applicant.

Part III gives to the people of the State the right directly to determine whether or not the recommended applicant should be granted a licence. The means by which their views will be made known is the referendum provided for by this Part. Part IV comes into effect only if the majority of the voters at the referendum express their approval to the grant of a licence and this Part sets out the conditions under which a licence may be granted. Part V evidences the Government's firm intention that the control of the casino shall, substantially, be in the hands of residents of Australia. Part VI deals with a number of miscellaneous matters.

Clauses 1 to 3 are formal. Clause 4 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of the Act. I draw members' special attention to the definition of "prescribed area" and the somewhat limited meaning attributed to the expression "company". Clause 5 provides that any natural person or company, that is, a company incorporated in this State, may make application for the grant of the single licence to operate a casino envisaged by this Act. I draw members' attention to the fact that a fee of $5 000 must accompany an application and that this fee is not recoverable. The purpose of this provision is to ensure that applicants for the licence are quite serious in their application and they are people of substance. Subclause (4) of this clause provides that the committee shall give suitable publicity to the applications it receives.

Clause 6 provides that the committee, which is the Industries Development Committee for the time being in office under the Industries Development Act, shall consider each application. Paragraphs (a) to *(i)* of subclause (1) set out the criteria to which the committee shall have regard in considering the applications, and it is important that these criteria be noted. In general, these criteria reflect the Government's intention in the matter of the grant of the proposed licence. I particularly draw members' attention to clause 6 (1), which provides:

The committee shall consider every application lodged under and in accordance with section 5 of this Act and in the consideration of each such application the committee shall have regard to—

(*a*) the material and other resources available to the applicant for the construction and operation of the proposed casino;

(*b*) the prospects of the commercial success of the proposed casino;

(*c*) the revenue that may accrue to the State as a consequence of the operation of the proposed casino;

(*d*) the likelihood that substantial control over the operations of the proposed casino will be exercised by persons resident in Australia;

(*e*) the likely effect that the establishment of the proposed casino will have on the physical and social environment of the area in which it is proposed the casino will be established;

(*f*) the attraction that the proposed casino will have for persons not usually resident in the area in which it is proposed to be situated;

(*g*) the employment likely to be generated by the establishment of the proposed casino;

(*h*) the physical facilities comprising or associated with the proposed casino;

and

(i) such other matters, whether or not of the same kind as the foregoing, which, to the committee, seem relevant to the consideration of any one or more of the applications.

This provision gives a very wide-ranging investigation to the committee to ensure that any casino licence will be to the maximum benefit of the State and will operate satisfactorily. Clause 6 (2) gives the committee power to permit the applicant to amend his application and a proper use of this power will facilitate the full consideration of applications. Clause 7 confers on the committee the powers of a Royal Commission in aid of the exercise of its functions. Clause 8 permits the committee to recommend an applicant to be the holder of the licence. It should also be noted that subclause (2) of this clause makes it competent for the committee not to recommend any applicant if it feels this course is an appropriate one. Clause 9 is the first clause in Part III of the Bill. This Part deals with a referendum on a question which will be put to the electors, the question being based on the recommendation of the committee should the committee make such a recommendation. This clause sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of this Part.

The applications that may be made will be in respect of an area of the State which is more than 80 km from the General Post Office, Adelaide, measured along the shortest route usually used in travelling—that is, not 80 km as the crow flies but 80 km according to the provisions used in the old Licensing Act. The aim in this Bill is the same as the aim in that Act—that people who live in large centres of population will have to make an effort to get to the casino.

Mr. Hall: What if they fly?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member may fly if he likes.

Mr. Hall: Is that a proper measurement of the required distance?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a question of whether the casino is more than 80 km from the G.P.O., Adelaide, by the usual road route. Clause 10 provides for the fixing of a day on which the referendum shall be held. Clause 11 provides for the framing of the "prescribed question" that is to be considered by the electors at the referendum. The question that will be put to the electors will be simple but it will be specific. The electors will not be voting on a proposal as to whether some inchoate, ill-defined unknown proposal for a casino should be approved. The question will be whether a specific proposal for a casino should be approved. The electors will know the conditions under which they are voting: they will be voting for a specific project, because it will have been investigated and recommended.

Mr. Mathwin: It's a loaded question.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is nothing loaded about it: they will know what they are voting on, instead of the imaginings of someone who will raise all kinds of objection that it might be in all kinds of place under all kinds of condition which are not proposed. For the purposes of this Part, the prescribed question will be "Do you approve of the establishment of a casino at . . .?" The committee will insert the place at which it proposes to grant a casino licence.

Clause 12 provides that all electors on the House of Assembly roll, which for practical purposes means all the electors in the State, shall be entitled to vote at the referendum. Clause 13, by reference, applies the Electoral Act and the regulations made therein to the conduct of

the referendum. Clause 14 provides for voting at the referendum on the day fixed. Clause 15 provides that the usual polling places will be used for the taking of votes at the referendum. Clause 16 provides for the ballot-papers to be used at the referendum. Clause 17 sets out the method of marking a ballot-paper at the referendum. Clause 18 deals with the number of persons who may be present in the polling booth at the polling. Clause 19 provides that electors whose names are on the appropriate rolls, which will close three weeks before the appointed day, will be entitled to vote.

Clause 20 provides that voting at the referendum will be compulsory. Clause 21 sets out the grounds on which a ballot-paper will be regarded as informal or invalid. Clause 22 provides for the scrutiny of the votes cast at the referendum. Clause 23 provides for the publication of the result of the referendum. Clause 24 provides that the result of the referendum may be declared if the result is clear, notwithstanding that all the votes cast have not .been counted. Clauses 25 to 30 deal with bribery, undue influence and illegal practices and are, in their terms, self-explanatory.

Clause 31 limits the size of material dealing with the referendum that may be displayed, and clause 32 is in aid of this clause. Clause 33 is an evidentiary provision. Clause 34 provides for the proceedings for offences under this Part. Clause 35 and the clauses following come into full effect only if a majority of the electors voting at the referendum approve of the granting of a licence. If a majority of electors at the referendum does not approve of the granting of the licence, that is the end of the matter. Subclause (2) sets out the form of the licence, and subclause (3) gives the Minister power to vary the terms and conditions of the licence from time to time.

Clause 36 provides for a monthly licence fee of $2 500. Clause 37 provides that, in addition to this licence fee, a tax is to be payable on the gross profit, as defined in the first schedule to the Bill, of the casino. The method of calculating this tax is set out in the first schedule to the Bill. Clause 38 provides that, in effect, the licence is a permanent one, so long as the licensee complies with the conditions of the licence. Subclause (2) of this clause sets out the grounds on which the licence may be withdrawn, and I commend these provisions to. members' particular attention. Clause 39 provides that "authorized games" may be played at the casino and also ensures that poker machines are not permitted in the casino.

Clause 40 generally provides that an authorized game played according to the rules specified in relation to it will not be an unlawful game. This is a most important provision, since under the general gaming law many, if not all, such games would clearly be unlawful games. Clause 41 makes the licensee responsible for the acts of his servants and agents for the conduct of the operations of the casino. Subclause (2) is the first of a number of provisions intended to ensure that, so far as is possible, control of the operations of the casino are vested in companies amenable to the law of this State. Clause 42 gives the licensee power to exclude persons from the casino either on his own motion or at the request of the Commissioner of Police. Clause 43 restricts the activities of persons under the age of 18 years in the casino.

Clause 44 confers a wide power of direction on the Minister in relation to the operations of the casino; it is suggested that a power of this nature is most desirable. Clause 45 permits the licence to be transferred in some circumstances. Part V is a very substantial part of the measure, consisting as it does of 36 clauses, and it is intended to ensure that so far as is possible, under the law of this State, "foreign" interests (that is, interests not primarily based in Australia) will be unable to secure control of the casino; this necessarily entails some extremely complicated provisions, and no apology is made for this. It is an attempt to ensure that by no schemes or arrangements will foreign interests dominate the casino.

Clause 46 sets out the definitions necessary for the purposes of this Part, and I direct members' special attention to it. Clause 47 extends the meaning of the expression "control", and again is intended to cover the general circumstances for which control may be directly or indirectly exercised. Clause 48 sets out the circumstances in which persons shall be deemed, in the business sense, to be associated one with the other. Clause 49 deals with the joint holding of shares. Clause 50 provides for the declaration of "specified companies", being companies that, in the opinion of the Minister, take part directly or indirectly in the control or management of the casino. Clause 51 provides that the details of the shareholders of a specified company will be readily available to the Minister. Clause 52 provides that, if these details are not made available, the powers of the foreign shareholders of the company will be even more restricted than is already proposed under the Bill.

Clause 53 provides that, on any matter at a meeting before the company, the percentage of non-foreign votes necessary to carry the motion shall be 62 per cent of the total votes cast. Clause 54 in express terms voids any action by a specified company where certain provisions of this Part are not complied with by the company. Clause 55 limits the number of directors in a company who are not ordinarily resident in Australia. Clause 56 is in aid of this clause. Clause 57 provides that a director who ceases to become ordinarily resident in Australia shall vacate his office. Clause 58 provides that the chairman or acting chairman of a specified company must be a person ordinarily resident in Australia. Clause 59 deserves close attention. This clause validates certain acts of a specified company, notwithstanding that some provisions of this Part have been contravened. The purpose of this clause is to protect innocent third parties who may have had dealings with the company and acquired rights thereunder.

Clause 60 limits the amount of "foreign shares" that may be held in a specified company and also limits the interest, when expressed by way of voting rights, that foreign shareholders may have in such a company; this is a key clause in this Part. Clause 61 provides that certain declarations shall be made in relation to the transfer of shares in a specified company in the interests of ensuring that substantial control over a specified company does not pass to foreign shareholders. Clauses 62 and 63 are in aid of clause 61. Clause 64 is intended to ensure that foreign shareholders in a specified company are readily identifiable. Clause 65 deals with trusts, particularly those where the trustee exercises his powers at the direction of the *cestui que* trust. Clause 66 empowers the Minister to forbid the transfer of shares where, in his opinion, clause 60 of this measure will be contravened, this being the clause that limits foreign shareholding.

Clause 67 applies substantially the same provisions to applications for allotment of shares as those that are applicable to transfers of shares. Clause 68 empowers the Minister to seek information regarding the shareholding of a specified company. Clause 69 provides for returns to assist in providing this information. Clause 70 empowers the Minister to order foreign shares to be disposed of, and fixes the period within which those shares must be

disposed of. Clause 71 provides that, where shares are not disposed of in accordance with a direction under clause 70, the Minister may cause these shares to be vested in the Treasurer. Clause 72 empowers the Treasurer to dispose of shares vested in him for the benefit of the person in whose name they were, immediately before the vesting, in the Treasurer.

Clause 73 suspends certain voting rights in shares subject to an order by the Minister to dispose of them. Clause 74 is proposed in the interests of ordinary business practice and ensures that transfers of shares in breach of this Act will be valid, notwithstanding that they will attract quite substantial penalties. This again is intended to ensure that innocent third parties are not affected. Clause 75 provides that a specified company, the Minister, the Treasurer or the Registrar shall not be affected by any notice of trust. Clause 76 provides for the service of documents. Clause 77 provides that the Minister or his nominee may attend all meetings of a specified company. Clause 78 makes it an offence to supply false information. Clause 79 provides for offences by specified companies.

Clause 80 sets out the substantial penalties in keeping with the gravity with which those offences are viewed. Clause 81 provides that the consent of the Minister be a necessary condition for the institution of a prosecution against this Part. Clause 82 provides for the application of this Part. Clause 83 gives the police right of entry into the casino. Clause 84 is an evidentiary provision. Clause 85 is formal. Clause 86 deals with offences by bodies corporate. Clause 87 is a formal financial provision. Clause 88 sets out the regulation-making power. The first schedule provides the method of calculating the tax adverted to earlier in relation to clause 37 of the Bill. The second schedule sets out the form of a declaration of shareholdings in a specified company.

Dr. EASTICK secured the adjournment of the debate.

LAND COMMISSION BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's amendments and suggested new clause 20a:

No. 1. Page 2, lines 11 and 12 (clause 4)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 2. Page 2 (clause 4)—After line 12 insert new definition as follows:

"'the Land and Valuation Court' means the Land and Valuation Court established under the Supreme Court Act, 1935-1972."

No. 3. Page 3, line 1 (clause 6)—After "6" insert "(1)".

No. 4. Page 3, lines 2 to 8 (clause 6)—Leave out all words in these lines after "Governor" in line 2 and insert "(of whom one shall be appointed to be Chairman) upon the nomination of the Minister".

No. 5. Page 3 (clause 6)—After line 8 insert new subclauses (2) and (3) as follows:

"(2) Where the Minister proposes to nominate a person for appointment as a member of the Commission, he shall cause notice of the proposed nomination to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

(3) Where either House of Parliament passes a resolution within four sitting days after the day on which notice of the proposed nomination is laid before that House disapproving the nomination of a person as a member of the Commission, then the Minister shall not nominate that person for appointment as a member of the Commission."

No. 6. Page 5, line 19 (clause 12)—After "development" insert "or".

No. 7. Page 5, line 20 (clause 12)—Leave out "or for other public purposes;".

No. 8. Page 5, lines 32 to 37 (clause 12)—Leave out all words in these lines.

No. 9. Page 6, lines 2 and 3 (clause 12)—Leave out "notwithstanding any enactment or law to the contrary" and insert ", subject to this section,".

No. 10. Page 6, line 10 (clause 12)—Before "subdivide" insert "subject to the Planning and Development Act, 1966-1973"

No. 11. Page 6, line 17 (clause 12)—After "Commission" insert—

(*a*)".

No. 12. Page 6 (clause 12)—After line 18 insert new paragraphs *(b)* and (c) as follows:

"(*b*) shall not conduct its business with a view to making a profit;

and

(*c*) shall have as its primary object the provision of land to those members of the community who do not have large financial resources."

No. 13. Page 6 (clause 12)—After line 18 insert new subclauses (4), (5) and (6) as follows:

"(4) The Commission shall not lease any land of less than one-fifth of a hectare in area.

(5) Where the Commission acquires land in pursuance of this Act and proposes to lease the land before it is developed for urban expansion or use, it shall offer the person from whom the land was acquired the opportunity to lease the land on fair terms.

(6) The Commission shall not acquire by compulsory process—

(a) any dwellinghouse that is occupied by the owner as his principal place of residence;

(b) any factory, workshop, warehouse, shop or other premises used for industrial or commercial purposes;

or

(*c*) any premises used as an office or rooms for the conduct of any business or profession."

No. 14. Page 6—After line 18 insert new clause 12a as follows:

"12a. *Appeal*—(1) A person who has an interest in any land that the Commission proposes to acquire under this Act may appeal against the proposed acquisition to the Land and Valuation Court.

(2) An appeal under this section may be commenced at any time after the appellant has received notice of the proposed acquisition whether or not a notice of intention to acquire the land has been served upon him pursuant to the Land Acquisition Act, 1969-1972.

(3) An appeal shall not be instituted under this section by any person after the expiration of three months from the day on which a notice of intention to acquire land is served upon him, pursuant to the Land Acquisition Act, 1969-1972.

(4) Upon the hearing of an appeal under this section, the Land and Valuation Court may declare—

(*a*) that the proposed acquisition of the land would be unjust or unfair to the appellant;

(*b*) that the land that the Commission proposes to acquire is necessary for the purpose of an industrial or commercial scheme of development that the appellant has commenced or has in contemplation and that the acquisition of the land would prejudice that scheme;

(*c*) that the proposed acquisition of the land would cause hardship to the appellant;

(*d*) that the proposed acquisition of the land is not necessary;

or

(*e*) that the acquisition of the land is not within the powers of the Commission under this Act.

(5) The Land and Valuation Court may make such orders as to costs on an appeal under this section as it thinks just.

(6) No notice of acquisition shall be published under the Land Acquisition Act, 1969-1972, in respect of land—

(a) in relation to which an appeal has been instituted under this section and has not been determined;

or

(b) in relation to which a declaration has been made by the Land and Valuation Court under this section.

(7) For the purpose of any time limitation prescribed by or under the Land Acquisition Act, 1969-1972, any time between the commencement and determination of an appeal under this section shall not be taken into account."

No. 15. Page 8 (clause 20)—After line 33 insert new subclause (la) as follows:

"(la) A person shall not enter upon any land under this section unless he has given reasonable notice of his intention to do so to the occupier of the land."

No. 16. Page 9 (clause 20)—After line 3 insert new subclauses (2a) and (2b) as follows:

"(2a) The Commission shall be liable to pay to the owner of any estate or interest in land that has been entered in pursuance of this section compensation for any damage or disturbance caused by the entry or by any survey, test or examination conducted on the land in pursuance of this section.

. (2b) The Land and Valuation Court may, upon the application of any interested person, assess and order payment of compensation for which the Commission is liable under subsection (2a) of this section."

Page 9—After line 5 insert new clause 20a as follows:

"20a. *Rights of person interested in land where the land is subject of proposed acquisition*—(1) For the purposes of this section, land is subject to acquisition where—

(*a*) any notice, letter or other document has been given or sent to a person interested in the land by or on behalf of the Minister or the Commission stating that the land will be, or may be, acquired under this Act;

(b) any statement is made in a newspaper, journal, periodical, or by radio or television, by or on behalf of the Minister or the Commission stating that the land will be, or may be, acquired under this Act;

or

(*c*) any other public statement or report (including a report to Parliament) is made by or on behalf of the Minister or the Commission stating that the land will be, or may be, acquired under this Act.

(2) The owner of any land subject to acquisition may give notice in writing to the Minister of his intention to sell the land.

(3) The person by whom a notice is given under subsection (2) of this section may within six months after giving that notice sell the land by public auction.

(4) A person who proposes to sell his land in pursuance of this section must give not less than seven days' notice in writing to the Minister of the date, time and place of the public auction at which the land is to be sold.

(5) A person who sells land in pursuance of this section must do so in good faith and must take all reasonable steps to obtain the best possible price for the land.

(6)Where land is sold in pursuance of this section at a lesser price than the vendor might reasonably have expected to receive, if the land had not been subject to acquisition, the vendor may apply to the Land and Valuation Court for compensation.

(7) Upon the hearing of an application under this section, the Land and Valuation Court may access the difference between the price at which the land was sold and the. price that the vendor might reasonably have expected to receive on sale of the land if it had not been subject to acquisition, and may order the Minister to pay to the applicant the amount so assessed as compensation."

Amendment No. 1:

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

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

This is one of the amendments made by the Legislative Council to cut out the provision that the Prime Minister be consulted in relation to the nomination of the Land Commission, having the right, after consulting the South Australian Government to nominate a member of the commission. The Government regards this as an essential provision of the Bill, as the whole operation is a joint operation between the State and Commonwealth Governments. The commission remains responsible to the South Australian Government but, since the Commonwealth is providing the overwhelming majority of the funds for this exercise and doing this subject to the controls proposed by the South Australian Government, it is necessary that we should, in constructive federalism, make this a joint operation. The Government made clear in the earlier debate that it considered this an essential part of the measure, as does the Commonwealth Government in offering this money to us.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support this amendment, as I believe it is completely responsible. Having regard to the way in which the Commonwealth Government seeks to override the responsibilities and influence of the States, as witnessed almost daily, I believe there is no value at all in allowing the Commonwealth to take over the conduct of the business of the State, and that would clearly be one of the implications of the Commonwealth's making a nomination of this type. Involving the Commonwealth in this way would be contrary to the best interests of South Australia.

Dr. TONKIN: J, too, strongly support the amendment, believing that the intrusion of the Prime Minister is entirely unnecessary in this matter. What the Premier said about this being a joint affair and about the Prime Minister's therefore needing to be represented is hogwash. If the Labor Party wants to abolish State Parliaments, let it be honest and take the necessary steps. There is no need in this case for the Prime Minister to nominate a member of the commission.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As, on this occasion, I think the Upper House is right, I support its amendment and oppose the motion. It is all very well for the Premier to say that this is a joint venture but, if we are in the future to have Commonwealth representation on every board or body that spends Commonwealth money, the Commonwealth will be represented in everything, because there are few activities nowadays (particularly as a result of the centralist policy of the present Commonwealth Government, although I do not exclude the policies of previous Commonwealth Governments) in this State or the other States where some Commonwealth money is not given and earmarked for a specific purpose. This has happened for several years. However, this is the first time that the Labor Party has suggested that there must be Commonwealth representation on a commission because it will spend Commonwealth money.

As has been said, if we want to abolish State Parliaments we should do so straight out. I thought that (he Constitution Convention was supposed to deal with matters of this kind. It is obvious that the Labor Party is going ahead, notwithstanding the convention. This is a good, although perhaps in the overall result a small, example of a progressive weakening of State administration. I do not approve of this departure from the past custom; I do not believe the Premier has justified it. If it is justified in this case, it would have been justified on many previous occasions and in relation to many other activities carried out by Government agencies in this State.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the Council's amendment. I do not take seriously the Premier's statement that, as we are using Commonwealth moneys, the Prime Minister should have a say in representation on the commission. If this were done in one case, we would have to assume that it would be done in every other case involving Commonwealth finance. If that is what the Premier intends, let him say so. He should not try to use kid gloves about the matter in order to make it easier to accept.

Mr. McRAE: I oppose the Council's amendment and support the motion. I speak only because of the Whitlam witch hunt which is taking place and which was egged on somewhat by the remarks of the member for Mitcham when he referred to the Constitution Convention. With him, I was present at the first meeting of that convention. In this Bill, we have a prime example of the notion of co-operative federalism. There is a mid-way point between centralism, to which members have been referring, and States' rights attitudes which, in some cases, are taken to rather ludicrous extremes by members who were at that convention. Any thinking person who has looked at the whole issue would realize that in this case we have a good example of co-operative federalism, without intruding the notion of centralism.

Furthermore, it is absurd to suggest, after the explanation of the Premier, that this is a concession by the State Government that, in relation to every administrative body where Commonwealth money is involved, automatically there will be representation of the Australian Government. The position clearly outlined by the Premier is that each matter depends on its individual merits. This is a special and crucial matter for South Australia, and it cannot proceed without Commonwealth assistance. However, it can proceed usefully by co-operation between this State and the Australian Government, and this amendment is a tactical measure by the members of another place to try to introduce a general argument into a specific issue. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. EVANS: The Premier has said that, if the Commonwealth Government makes more money available to this State, it should have a right to be represented on its commissions or boards. However, the Commonwealth Government is giving South Australia not its money but the people's money, and the States are responsible, under the Constitution, to administer the sums of money made available to them by the Commonwealth Government. Regardless of the present Prime Minister, I do not believe we should be giving more power away, which is what we would be doing unless we accepted this amendment.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Crimes, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (19)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Gunn, Hall, Mathwin, McAnanaey, Millhouse, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Corcoran and Duncan. Noes—Messrs. Goldsworthy and Rodda.

Majority of 3 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 agreed to.

This amendment relates to later amendments which provide that, where the commission exercises its powers of entry, the owner of land who has suffered damages is entitled to claim compensation in proceedings before the Land and Valuation Court. The Government agrees that this is a useful amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 3 *to 5:*

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 3 to 5 be disagreed to.

These amendments also relate to the reconstitution of the membership of the commission on which the Committee has just voted.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 6 *and* 7:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 6 and 7 be disagreed to.

These amendments remove the power of the commission to acquire land for public purposes other than those specified in the Act. It was possibly not recognized by the Legislative Council that, where words of general import are used after words of particular import, there is a rule of construction called the *edjustum generis* rule and, consequently, "other public purposes" must be related to urban expansion or development.

Dr. EASTICK: The Premier has indicated the purpose of this measure and the manner in which it will be applied, suggesting that another place has failed to acknowledge that situation. I suggest that probably the other place, having regard to how this Government has used several of these matters and how the Commonwealth Government has used them or is trying to use them, thought that was a good reason why a clearer definition should be inserted. I consider that there is good reason to agree to the amendments.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Duncan and Hudson. Noes—Messrs. Goldsworthy and Rodda.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment No. 8:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 8 be disagreed to.

It removes the powers of the commission to perform actions incidental to its enumerated powers and to perform functions assigned by the Minister. These powers are necessary to ensure that there is no technical restriction on the commission's carrying out the functions provided by the Bill.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 9 *and* 10:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 9 and 10 be disagreed to.

They try to make a reference to the Planning and Development Act. I do not know what was in the mind of the Legislative Council, but, as the commission will be holding land on behalf of the Crown and the Planning and Development Act does not apply to land held on behalf of the Crown, the amendments are quite inappropriate.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos. 11 *and* 12:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 11 and 12 be agreed to.

They insert new principles that the commission is to observe in conducting its business. They provide that

the commission shall not conduct its business with a view to making a profit and also that the commission shall have as its primary object the provision of land to those members of the community who do not have large financial resources. The Government agrees with both of those objectives and, therefore, does not find any objectionable features in the amendments.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 13:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 13 be amended by striking out new subclauses (4) and (6).

New subclause (4) provides that the commission shall not lease any land of less than one-fifth of a hectare (about one-half of an acre). That would effectively prevent the commission from leasing a home site. We consider that the commission ought to have flexibility and be able to act particularly in accordance with whatever recommendation comes from the Else-Mitchell committee on land tenure. New subclause (5) is a proper and harmless amendment, and I consider that it should be agreed to.

New subclause (6) could well prevent the acquisition of properties for future redevelopment where one of the things mentioned in the subclause was on a very large piece of land. Where it is situated on a large parcel of land required for future development, that would prevent acquisition of the whole parcel. That is an absurd provision. Whilst it is true that the commission's aim is to acquire broad acres, if the business premises of a land agent were situated on a large parcel of land, that would prevent its acquisition. The provision is a nonsense and should be rejected.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier give the Committee any indication about the approach or attitude expressed by the meeting of Ministers on this whole subject? It was clearly slated earlier that there would be a meeting with the Commonwealth Minister. Although it was suggested late last week that a meeting would take place yesterday, I do not know whether it was held, what action was taken by the States in their consultations with the Commonwealth Minister, or whether the views expressed by the Commonwealth Minister were different from those expressed on a previous occasion and more in line with the attitude of the State Ministers.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There was a meeting with the Commonwealth Minister yesterday, and apart from Mr. Lewis, the Minister in New South Wales who, with all due respect to him, tends to be something of a professional dissenter at almost any Ministerial meeting—

Mr. Coumbe: He is a South Australian.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: He was a South Australian; we exported him. Otherwise, the meeting was extremely co-operative and reached a great deal of accord. The Commonwealth Minister said that he expected that the Else-Mitchell committee would probably recommend that, as a general rule, conditional freehold should be used and, if that were so, that would be in accordance with his policy. I have commented in this Chamber previously that much can be said for that form of tenure, and it is exactly what the Government is looking for to ensure that there is no subsequent land speculation. A considerable measure of agreement was reached at the Ministerial meeting yesterday and it is expected that, apart from some small difficulties in New South Wales, accord will be reached in all States on measures to implement the policy of the Commonwealth in buying large areas of land and placing them on the market in order to effect land prices to the average member of the general public.

Dr. EASTICK: It is difficult to understand why the Premier refuses to accept new subclause (4), which clearly spells out that leasehold will not be an accepted method. Can the Premier say whether any of the other decisions made yesterday will cause any major changes in the attitude of the State Government to this measure or another relating to this one?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: There is no change on the part of this Government. We want these measures through and. we are determined to get them through. They are a major part of our election programme, we have a mandate for them, and that mandate will not be refused. These measures are being brought on, they will be debated, and they will be put through; I expect them to be completed within a week. The Government in South Australia has never committed itself on leasehold tenure. At no time has it said it was committed.

Mr. Gunn: That is not what the Minister of Development and Mines said.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The Minister did not commit the Government to the use of leasehold alone. He answered some of the absolute nonsense on this score that came from members opposite, including the utter misquotations and quotations out of context from the member for Davenport, whose remarks were one of the worst attempts I have ever known to mislead members. I pointed out that we would consider freehold with the attachment of conditions. When I raised the matter here, it was not discussed by members opposite, but I pointed out that this was one of the alternatives which may well come from the Else-Mitchell committee and that it would be perfectly satisfactory to this Government. That does not make any difference to the overall necessity for these measures.

Mr. COUMBE: I seek further clarification regarding new subclause (4), especially following what the Premier has said about conclusions reached and attitudes expressed yesterday at the Ministerial meeting. I should like the Premier to explain at greater length why he is objecting to this new subclause, which relates to an area of only one-fifth of a hectare.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not believe that the commission should be hampered in its development by refusing it the right to lease, in any circumstances, land it has subdivided. In some circumstances it may be appropriate to lease land (certain sites) for a limited period; this may be necessary in its overall business operations. To put such a restriction on an organization setting out to subdivide land and put it on the market would be absurd, but our insistence on the right of the commission to lease land does not necessarily mean that this will be general policy. However, I do not think it should be deprived of the opportunity to do so where it may be administratively advisable or necessary. It is not the purpose of the Minister of Transport to lease land, but he has the power to do so and, having acquired properties and held them for a period, it is necessary on some occasions, for the benefit of the public purse, that he lease them. It is perfectly proper and incidental to the general operation. It is necessary that this commission should have such a power.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: We have been accused of making certain false claims about the leaseholding of land. We gave the Government every opportunity in previous amendments. I refer specifically to one which gave a time limit of 10 years to carry out any necessary leasing of land on a businesslike basis for a short period. I support fully this amendment, because it is an assurance to the people that the Government does not intend to lease large areas to the public for house building.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Wells, and Wright.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Hudson and Virgo. Noes—Messrs. Goldsworthy and Rodda.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment No. 14:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 14 be disagreed to.

This is the most strange amendment I have seen, and it brought hilarity from all Ministers yesterday, regardless of their political persuasion. It provides the right of appeal against the decision to acquire, and in such circumstances the commission could not function. There would be no way in which it could have land acquired and then place it on the market. As this amendment will wreck the whole procedures of the Bill, I ask that it be rejected.

Dr. EASTICK: There should be a right of appeal. The Premier indicated to me when I moved an amendment that there was to be an alteration to the Land Acquisition Act that would encompass this and other legislation to allow for appeal considerations.

The Hon. D. A. Dunstan: That is not on the question of whether or not you acquire land.

Dr. EASTICK: This provision is necessary unless we are to see the people of this State walked over by the State Government, aided and abetted by the Commonwealth Government.

Mr. McRAE: I oppose the amendment. If the Legislative Council is serious, it discloses the true depths of the incapacities to which it has now sunk and, if it is not serious, it highlights what I suspect: that this is an indirect means of trying to sabotage the Bill by suggesting that a right of appeal can somehow be provided in this curious way.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (22)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan (teller), Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Wells, and Wright.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Hudson arid Virgo. Noes—Messrs. Goldsworthy and Rodda.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried;

Amendments Nos. 15 *and* 16:

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 15 and 16 be agreed to.

These amendments relate to the power of the commission to enter land for the purpose of determining whether it is suitable for urban expansion or development. The amendments provide that notice must be given before the land is entered and that the commission shall be liable to pay compensation for any damage suffered by the owner of the land. The amendments are acceptable to the Government.

Motion carried.

Suggested new clause 20a:

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

That the Legislative Council's suggested new clause 20a be disagreed to.

This suggested new clause enables a person whose land the commission proposes to acquire to sell the land and obtain compensation from the Minister if the price obtained upon sale is less than it would have been if there had been no proposal to acquire the land. There seems no justification for singling out this legislation for the implementation of such a proposal. If some such amendment is desirable it should obviously apply to all public acquisitions, whether made by the commission or by any other public authority. The matter will be looked at when the Land Acquisition Act is generally amended, but we do not intend to include suggested new clause 20a in this Bill now.

Dr. EASTICK: I refer to a person who may be disadvantaged between the proclamation of this legislation and the amendment of the Land Acquisition Act, which amendment may not take place until the autumn sittings or the next session. What compensation will apply and what advantage will be given to persons who are subsequently shown to be disadvantaged by the provisions?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Frankly, I do not believe that this Bill will properly assess any disadvantage. The suggested new clause would be extremely difficult to work. Consequently, any question of disadvantage, if there is any, should be dealt with when the general revision of the Land Acquisition Act is considered, and I have told the Leader that that will take place.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments Nos. 1, 3-10, 13, and 14, and to suggested new clause 20a was adopted:

Because the amendments make administration of the legislation impossible.

STANDING ORDERS

Notice of Motion No. 2: The Hon. L. J. King to move:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the Standing Orders Committee Report, 1973.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, in relation to this motion. A report, tabled last week, has been placed on file today; it is report No. 22, which indicates that the Standing Orders Committee has met on three occasions. The report also states the decisions taken by the committee, but nowhere does it indicate that the discussion on these matters was divided.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What is your point of order?

Dr. EASTICK: The report gives no indication of the division of opinion in the committee. You, Mr. Speaker, as an *ex officio* member of the committee, were automatically Chairman of the committee and you were called upon to give a casting vote, which must, with all due respect—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What is the point of order?

Dr. EASTICK: It is that you, Mr. Speaker, have not been able to be impartial through the requirement of voting for the Government in favour of these recommendations.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What Standing Order covers that?

Dr. EASTICK: My point of order Is that you, Mr. Speaker, have been placed in the invidious position of not

being able to remain impartial in connection with measures that are to affect the future conduct of this House.

The SPEAKER: I cannot uphold the point of order, because the Leader is challenging the impartiality of the Speaker. The Votes and Proceedings will show the conduct of the committee when it discussed these measures. The matter is now in the hands of the House and will be determined by the House, not by the Speaker. I cannot uphold the point of order.

Dr. EASTICK: I rise on a further point of order. The information that you, Mr. Speaker, have just given the House is to the effect that the matter will now be decided by the House. That matter involves a report which fails to indicate clearly the manner of voting in the discussions.

The SPEAKER: The Leader is making a point of order and entering into a debate. What is the point of order?

Dr. EASTICK: You, Mr. Speaker, were forced into the position of not being able to deliver an impartial vote, and the material before the House has been decided by putting you in the invidious position of not being able to carry out the duties of your office with impartiality.

The SPEAKER: Once again, I cannot uphold the point of order, which questions the impartiality of the Speaker. The Speaker has, on the basis of the Standing Orders of this House, certain rights as regards voting in connection with the discussions of the Standing Orders Committee, and I voted in accordance with those rights. The whole matter is not one dealing with the impartiality of the Speaker: it now rests with the House itself. A report has come back to the House for its consideration, and the House itself has the matter in its own hands to determine what it shall do in this respect. I cannot uphold the point of order. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) moved:

That the Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole of the consideration of the Standing Orders Committee Report, 1973.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (25)—Messrs. Broomhill, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Hall, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Hudson and Simmons. Noes—Messrs. Goldsworthy and Rodda.

Majority of 8 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

In Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: Members should turn to the appendix to the report of the Standing Orders Committee, namely, Parliamentary Paper 22. The honourable Attorney-General.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General): I move:

That proposed Standing Order 82A be agreed to.

Proposed Standing Order 82A provides that, notwithstanding Standing Order 82, Parliamentary Counsel and such other advisers to a Minister of the Crown (not exceeding two at any one time) on a matter presently under discussion in the House may be seated in the area on the floor of the Chamber set aside for such purpose. The reason for this proposal is set out in paragraph 2 of the report of the Standing Orders Committee, as follows:

. The committee considered the advisability of admitting advisers to Ministers other than Parliamentary Counsel to the floor of the Chamber, and after ascertaining that such advisers in varying numbers in each of the other Australian Parliaments were admitted to the Chamber decided to recommend that a maximum of two advisers at any one time to Ministers on a matter currently before the House, as well as the Parliamentary Counsel, should be admitted by Standing Order rather than by a suspension of the Standing Orders as has been the practice in admitting Parliamentary Counsel in the past.

The proposed new Standing Order does two things: first, it puts on a regular basis the practice which has existed in the House for a long time of suspending Standing Orders to enable the Parliamentary Counsel to be present in the Chamber whilst Bills are debated and, secondly, it makes the additional provision for the presence in the Chamber, in the place provided, for advisers to a Minister, not exceeding two at any one time. I think that the view of the majority of the members of the Standing Orders Committee was that the presence of advisers to the Minister has a number of advantages. It is well known to all members, certainly to those with Ministerial experience, that Government Bills are often the end product of a long period of preparation, discussion, departmental examination and the like, and that generally there is an officer or officers who have been involved throughout the discussions—indeed, often at a time which is antecedant to the involvement of the Minister in the discussions.

Further, in more complex Bills there are many matters dealt with, the precise reasons for which are known best to the officer or officers who have been involved in the preparation of the Bill. It has been found in other Parliaments, and it is a well-established practice in other Parliaments, that the officers concerned should be in the Chamber. In this Parliament that has not been the practice, and we have often seen the officers concerned sitting up in the gallery while following proceedings, and from time to time we have seen Ministers and other members going up to speak with them—

Mr. Mathwin: Are you suggesting we are unique? That happens in other Parliaments, too.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: —in contravention of Standing Orders. I do not intend to engage in a shouting competition and, if the honourable member intends to shout, I will stop each time, because I have no intention of engaging in such a shouting competition. It has been found in other Parliaments that the presence of officers actually in the Chamber where they are easily accessible to the Minister responsible for the Bill is an advantage. It enables the Minister to consult with his advisers, which facilitates the disposal of the business. It is an advantage to all members, especially during Committee stages, where matters are raised in respect of the reasons why a clause has been framed in one way rather than another or why one method of approach has been adopted rather than another, as it ensures that members can be given accurate information based on the consideration and consultations which have taken place and which have gone into the production of the end result.

The system appears to work extremely well in other places. It probably works even better in those Chambers that are equipped with a table to which Ministers can go during the consideration of a Bill. In such cases, the officer can be alongside the Minister or near him so that consultations can take place as the debate proceeds. Even without that, the presence of officers in the space in which the Parliamentary Counsel are now situated would be an undoubted advantage in considering Bills. This is particularly true in the case of Bills originating in another place. In such cases, the Minister handling the Bill in this House has not been involved in its preparation. He depends for his detailed knowledge of the Bill on his

consultations with his colleague and on what appears in the official docket and in another briefing material that he may possess.

One consequence of this is that when points are raised in Committee about details of the Bill it can happen that the Minister is not able to give the complete information that members are entitled to have, because the departmental officer, who is acquainted with the matter, is not present. An unfortunate by-product has been that an unnecessary burden has been placed on the Parliamentary Counsel, who often find themselves in the position of acting as a sort of go-between or as instructing officers to the Minister. This is no part of the function of Parliamentary Counsel, who are distracted from their proper business of drafting legislation for the Parliament to consider. On all counts it would be of great advantage to the smooth and efficient working of the Chamber if the practice that exists in other Parliaments were adopted and officers could be seated on the floor of the Chamber. Therefore, I commend to the Committee this new Standing Older.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): Will these officers be available to all members? The Attorney has said that the proposal will be to the advantage of Ministers. Certainly the Minister of Labour and Industry will have farther to go for information than he has had to in the past. Will members have the same opportunity to discuss matters with these officers as they currently have to discuss matters with Parliamentary Counsel? In the past, Parliamentary Counsel have acted as go-betweens and, rightly or wrongly, have provided Opposition members with pertinent information that has been obtained from advisers to the Minister. I do not want to reflect on this new Standing Order: I want a clear indication from the Attorney that the advantage of having these officers on the floor will be shared by all members, including Government back-bench members. In the past it has not been unusual for Opposition members to obtain from advisers of the Government answers to verbal or written questions, this information being provided without those advisers overlooking their responsibility to the Minister.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The position will be similar to the position at present, the only difference being that instead of officers sitting in the gallery they will be on the floor of the Chamber. No further limitations than already apply will be placed on the right of officers to discuss matters with members, those limitations being well understood by responsible public servants. They know when the point is reached where consideration of policy or questions of loyalty to a Minister are involved, and they do not go beyond that point in providing information to members. The position will be no different when they are seated on the floor; it will just mean that they are more accessible to everyone.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am a bit worried about the apparent intention of Liberal and Country League members to filibuster. The member for Hanson tells me to shut up, and that rather confirms my opinion. So far, the comments made by the L.C.L. member seem to assume that he will always be in Opposition. In his case, that may be a reasonable assumption to make.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the matter under discussion.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I hope that in this debate members will realize that at least for some of us our places in this Chamber are not absolutely fixed.

Members interjecting:.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I put it in that way advisedly to see what the reaction would be. L.C.L. members may feel that they will always be in Opposition and that they therefore have to fight tooth and nail to preserve whatever they think is an advantage from the Opposition point of view. For some members, this is a two-way business. We change sides from time to time, so that all the advantages are not with one Party. I hope that the dark forebodings about the ordering of breakfast that I heard from the member for Hanson will not be fulfilled, because that will bring Parliament into disrepute.

Mr. McAnaney: That's been done already.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not seem to be the most popular member at the moment.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member is dealing with the matter of officers being sealed in the Chamber. I ask him to confine his remarks to that subject.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I support this recommended Standing Order. I hope that there will be no further physical accommodation provided on the floor of the Chamber for the people who are to come in. I believe the accommodation in the north-western and north-eastern comers of the Chamber is sufficient. When I first became a member, there was no accommodation in the north-cast corner and rather less in the north-west corner than there is now. I seek from the Attorney an assurance that we will no more be fiddling about with the layout of the Chamber and that those who come in will use the north-western corner and not the other part of the Chamber.

Finally, neither the Attorney nor any other Minister now present can possibly say whether these advisers will be available to any member in the Chamber, because it is not contained in the Standing Orders, and this is a matter entirely for the Minister to whom the advisers are responsible. Ministers change from time to time, so that the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition was, in my view, irrelevant.

Mr. ARNOLD: I object to this proposed Standing Order, as it contains no specific provision for private members to have access to these advisers, although the Attorney has said in a round-about way that they will have that access. Although the member for Mitcham has said that we may be worrying too much about the interests of Opposition members, I do not care which Party is sitting on the Opposition benches: it is in the interests of informed debate to have officers available to Opposition members in order to enhance their knowledge of the subject matter.

Mr. EVANS: I agree with the member for Chaffey regarding this matter. The member for Mitcham has said that some Liberal and Country League members may not be interested in their Party's assuming office. Of course, that is his snide, niggly way of operating.

Mr. Millhouse: No.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I have ruled previously regarding the honourable member for Mitcham, and I rule the same for the honourable member for Fisher. The Committee is discussing the matter of accommodation for departmental officers in the Chamber, and I ask him to confine his remarks to that matter.

Mr. EVANS: The opportunity for an Opposition to work effectively in the Parliament is important to the democracy of the State and to the operation of the Parliament, regardless of which Party is in Opposition, and it is wrong for one to say that it is all right to give the Government an advantage and to place the Opposition at a disadvantage, because one day that Opposition will be in Government. It is important that any member should be able to obtain from a departmental officer information on any subject, whether or not that information accords with the philosophies or policies of the Government. Will the

Attorney-General say whether he and the Government are in favour of giving private members an opportunity to consult departmental officers regarding Bills, and may this be done without reference to the Minister? Opposition members are being denied the same opportunities that their counterparts have had in the past.

The media keeps saying that Opposition members are ineffective, but it has not examined the changes that have occurred in recent years or compared the facilities at present available to the Opposition with those available to the Government. If we arc to have good Government and good Parliament, sound judgment and reasonable debate in this Chamber, we must encourage the provision of more aid to the Opposition Parties. Although I have doubts about this proposal, I should like the Attorney-General to say whether private members introducing Bills will have available to them, without reference to the Minister, the full advice of departmental officers, without any fear of redress if that advice does not accord with Government policy.

Mr. HALL: I support this move, on the basis that departmental officers who are now assisting Ministers but who are not now accommodated on the floor of the Chamber will be so accommodated. Any Opposition that has an effective point to make will in future be able to obtain information that has in the past been unavailable to it. This proposal will be of advantage to Parliament, and it is no use the L.C.L. Opposition, because of its own ineffectiveness, crying that it needs more time when it does not know how to use the time it has available now. The way in which the Opposition debated the motion to go into Committee to debate this issue, especially when it says it does not get enough time, was illuminating.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the attention of the honourable member for Goyder to the fact that the Committee is discussing accommodation in this Chamber, and I ask him to confine his remarks to that matter and not introduce other subjects.

Mr. HALL: I will observe that ruling, Sir. However, I have never known a time when so much help has been given to Opposition members as is given them now. The Opposition in this Parliament is treated much more generously than are its counterparts in other State Parliaments. This proposed Standing Order now before us is a sensible move which need not be held up for any length of time, as there are more contentious issues to debate.

Mr. GUNN: I should like to know whether the departmental officers who will be taking a place on the floor of the Chamber will be available to all members. I should be grateful if the Attorney-General, who is engaged in a conversation, would pay attention to what I am saying.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Eyre should address his remarks to the matter now being debated: that of accommodation for officers.

Mr. GUNN: Certainly, Sir. I merely want a simple answer to a simple question. Will these officers be available to all members, no matter what information they want, as long as it pertains to a matter being debated?

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

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out to honourable members that we have in our gallery this evening some people who are deaf and dumb and, as you can see, what I am saying is being translated to them. If it is possible without in any way detracting from the debate, honourable members may turn towards the gallery when speaking, because these people can lip read. However, I do not suggest that anyone take advantage of that. It will be permitted but I will keep a rein on it.

Mr. GUNN: I wondered whether the Attorney-General would give the Committee the benefit of his knowledge on the matters that I had raised before the dinner adjournment.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I told the Leader privately (and I repeat this now to the Committee) that I intended that, when all members seemed to have made their contributions on all topics, I would make one reply, in which I would try to answer the queries raised. I do not intend to intervene in the debate at each stage.

Mr. MATHWIN: I seek information from the Premier on the matter regarding the Parliamentary Counsel and officers, which is before this Committee because of the casting vote of the Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee. Will a member be able to ask a question of the Minister's adviser during debate, as we now ask questions of the Minisier?

Mr. Jennings: No.

Mr. MATHWIN: It is all right for the substitute Minister from Ross Smith to give his back chat.

The CHAIRMAN: There is nothing in the Standing Orders dealing with the honourable member for Ross Smith.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Attorney-General slated that the Minister's adviser would be available to assist both the Government and the Opposition. He said that the advantage would be to both sides and to every member in the Chamber. If that is so, I ask the Attorney whether, when directing a question to the Minister's adviser, who I presume will be sitting on the front bench, the officer will be able to reply direct to the question.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I did not at any time say that the advisers who were seated in the Chamber would be available equally to the Government and the Opposition. I said, in reply to the Leader, that the present position would be unchanged, that the only change would be in the location of the adviser. In circumstances in which it is proper for a member to speak to an officer now, when he is seated in the gallery or elsewhere, it will be equally proper to speak to him when he is seated on the floor of the Chamber, but no more so and no less so.

Officers and, I hope, members understand the circumstances in which it is proper to discuss a matter and the circumstances in which it would be improper. The responsibility of officers who advise Ministers is to those Ministers, and from time to time the officers, when seated in the gallery, give information to members. It is also true that, on many matters, because they relate to policy or because they are matters on which policy has been formulated, it is not proper for the member to seek the information or for the officer to give it. The member can seek the information through the Minister. The position will be unchanged.

The point made by the member for Mitcham was well taken. That was that I cannot give any undertaking on this topic, because the officers are responsible to their Ministers and the Minister must decide the circumstances in which an officer may discuss a matter with someone other than his Minister. I make perfectly clear that, when I said that the presence of officers on the floor of the Chamber would be an advantage to all members, what I meant was that, because the officer will be readily available, there will be circumstances in which information can be obtained from the officer more quickly and conveyed to members.

In relation to the point raised about private members' Bills, once again the officer's responsibility is to the Minister and to the Government. If a private member's Bill is introduced, obviously the member acts on what

information and advice he may have from some other source. The officer may be able to assist the Minister but there would be no question of the officer's being available to an Opposition member or another private member in the same way as he would be available to a Minister dealing with a Bill.

The member for Mitcham has raised the matter of accommodation, and my only comment is that arrangements in this Chamber are a matter for the Speaker, not for me. There have been no discussions about that matter, and, to the best of my knowledge, no suggestions that there would be any extended accommodation. However, I do not know whether the Speaker has considered this matter or what he may have in mind. That is a matter for him to arrange.

Motion carried.

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

That proposed Standing Order 127 be agreed to.

I am not taking the recommendations precisely in the order in which they are made in the report of the Standing Orders Committee. The member for Bragg has asked me to take this proposition before proposed Standing Order 90, and I have mentioned this matter to the member for Mitcham. So far as I am aware, there has been no disagreement by those to whom I have spoken, so I am content to proceed on that basis. The effect of this recommendation is to reduce the time for questions without notice from two hours to one hour. This matter was fully discussed in the Standing Orders Committee and this recommendation was adopted in that committee by a majority of three to two. I think the consideration that led the majority to take this view is that experience shows that, generally speaking, the two hours for questions is not well used in this House. That is probably true not only of the present Parliament and the previous Parliament, but of Parliaments that have preceded them. It is, of course, considerably more than the period of question time permitted in other Parliaments. In the Commonwealth Parliament the time allowed is 45 minutes, in New South Wales it is 45 minutes, in Victoria it is 30 minutes, in Queensland it is one hour or three questions from each member, whichever is the lesser, in Western Australia it is at the Speaker's discretion but limited to 10 questions, and in Tasmania it is five minutes or 10 minutes each day.

The period allowed in this State is far longer than anything obtaining anywhere else in Australia and it has led to some curious practices which contribute nothing to the effectiveness of the Parliament and which indeed detract from it. The Standing Orders Committee has directed its attention (in proposals to be considered later and included in this report) to some of those aspects. If all the recommendations of the committee are adopted it will mean that the effective Question Time will not be reduced at all, and that the time of one hour will achieve all that has been achieved usefully in the two-hour period to which we have been accustomed, if members are frank with themselves I think they will acknowledge that very often the Question Time in this House has been occupied with questions which could well be addressed to a Minister by letter or informally, and the necessary information obtained. Sometimes questions are asked for no better reason than a desire to occupy the crease for the full period of two hours. I am told this practice is not confined to this Parliament or to the previous one, but' that it was known in earlier Parliaments.

Mr. Gunn: The member for Glenelg—

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Never!

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am not commenting about this, but members who have been here for a long time have told me that this practice has been known no matter which Party is in Government or in Opposition. I think it is certain that this would happen, that any Opposition would wish to occupy the crease and perhaps even feel it a matter of honour or principle to do so. It is a fact of life, of human reaction, and of human behaviour, but it does have the effect of reducing the effectiveness with which the House uses its time. It is unnecessary and the same result can be achieved by other means. It is incumbent upon the institution of Parliament to look at its procedures and its methods to see whether they are effective in achieving the results desired.

Parliament is here to do the business of the public and to make use, in the best possible manner, of the time available. We should be so arranging our affairs that the time of Parliament is devoted to the most important questions for this State. What is proposed in this entire report is that the waste of time occasioned by members asking questions which they know can be answered only on a subsequent day and then, on that subsequent day, repeating the question in summarized form, following which the Minister will read very often a long reply, can all be eliminated if the recommendations of the committee are adopted. That, together with a sensible pruning of the type of questions asked, will save at least an hour and perhaps more, so the hour left can be used in, the most effective manner.

Mr. Mathwin: One question each.

The Hon. L. J. KING: It is not necessary, nor is it sensible, for members of the Opposition to ask one question each, if they are able to co-operate with one another and so arrange Question Time as to pursue certain topics with Ministers in any way they choose. It is a matter of teamwork on the part of the Opposition. The really important thing is that we should not be wasting the time of the House, and the present period of two hours means that we do indeed waste a great deal of the time of the House as well as of Ministers, all of whom are required to be in the Chamber during the two-hour period at an important business time of day when they are thereby unable to receive deputations or see people. To that extent the business of the State is impeded also.

The really important aspect of this is that all questions of any importance at all can be asked in one hour a day. If it arranges its affairs properly, the Opposition has ample time to pursue all the important questions of the day with the Ministers concerned. The system proposed would mean that the question merely designed to seek information, not designed by way of testing the Government or of cross-examining a Minister, could be dealt with without occupying the time of the House, simply by questions and answers being incorporated in *Hansard* at the appropriate time. This system will enable members to follow up those questions and answers, if they so desire, during the actual question period. The period suggested provides ample opportunity for members, particularly Opposition members, to test and cross-examine the Government, at the same time avoiding the enormous wastage of time that comes from members asking, "When is the police station going to be built at such and such?", then giving a long explanation, on a subsequent day asking whether the Minister has a reply, and then having the Minister read a reply on the subject, all of which occupies the time of members and of the House without gaining anything at all.

Mr. Mathwin: What about the water in the catchment area? That is an important question.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member has chosen his own example. I accept that. I am quite sure that under the system proposed by the Standing Orders Committee the time for effective questions is not reduced at all, and the time of the House will not be wasted. Surely it is our job to see that the lime of Parliament is used to the best advantage.

Dr. EASTICK: The Attorney has used the words "one hour" rather loosely. If any member believes there will be one hour of effective questioning as a result of the recommendations put forward by the Attorney, then he has been very much misled. This afternoon we had al least 11 petitions plus Ministers' reports. Of course, there is always the possibility that there will be Ministerial statements. So, the effective period for questions will be much less than one hour. Further, the tabling of documents and other matters will take up some of the one-hour period. So, we are not really looking at one hour of questions but one hour of total lime available for all these matters. This afternoon, with a minimum of questions from Government members, it was 3.14 p.m. before each Opposition member had had the opportunity of putting a question to a Minister, and we must remember that two Opposition members are at present overseas. When all members are here it will be impossible for members to obtain the type of information they require.

In this motion the Attorney-General is asking members to erode their right to question the Ministry effectively, to scrutinize its activities, and to ask supplementary questions that are important to the general community. The committee's recommendation, on which the committee divided two all and on which the Speaker gave a casting vote, will erode members' rights. When they receive proper attention to the questions put, when they do not receive evasive answers from Ministers, when they do not get a tirade of abuse from Ministers, when they do not gel from the front bench a series of misleading statements aimed at keeping the truth from them or by-passing the real import of the question put, members have shown that they will then get on with questions and accede to genuine requests from the Government to proceed with urgent business.

Nowhere in the announcements by the Attorney-General or by any other person who has commented on them has it been clearly stated that the Government will not use the additional period to introduce additional legislation. It has not been clearly indicated that in future there will be a reasonable closing time for debates. Further, we have not been given any undertaking that we will not be subjected to sittings that last until 5.10 a.m., as happened 3⅓ weeks ago merely because someone got upset. Nowhere in any of the pronouncements has it been clearly indicated that the time saved will be made available to members so that they can research Bills more effectively. It has not been clearly indicated that members will not be subjected to additional legislation, which will increase the degree of pressure on them. Can the Attorney-General state categorically that the work load will not be increased by virtue of the additional time that becomes available to the Government?

A change in the method of introducing legislation, by removing the requirement that the Minister should read his second reading explanation, will again increase the time available to the Government. Or, does the Government say here and now that, as a result of the reduction in the amount of time needed to introduce Bills, there will be a more reasonable approach to the adjournment time of this House? No statement has been forthcoming on that matter. It is extremely important for members to know what the Government desires to do with the additional time that will be made available. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your tolerance in allowing me to mention other aspects of this report. It is necessary for us to look at this matter in total. Unless the Government is willing to say that it will not use the additional time to its own advantage and to the disadvantage of the Opposition, it should not expect, and will not obtain, the support of any Opposition member for the motion.

Mr. McANANEY: I believe that we should place a limit on the time taken by Ministers to reply to questions, but I do not know how such a limitation could be put in writing. If we put it in writing, it might give some Ministers an excuse for not providing a reasonable reply. Last week I asked a question of the Minister of Transport, but I did not get a reply to the question: instead, the Minister abused me because, according to him, I had let my mates down and was protecting law breakers. Another time he said I had not asked an intelligent question. Actually, my question was in plain English. Surely we should not put up with that kind of reply, which is covered by Standing Order 125, as follows:

In answering any such question, a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.

Ministers debate matters when they reply to questions. The Minister of Education publicly stated that any member should be able to say what he wanted to in eight minutes, yet the Minister himself cannot answer a question in under eight minutes. He gets right away from the point. Nowadays the Minister cannot spend five minutes or so saying why the Commonwealth Government is not giving this State enough money. Of course, the Minister is not getting a bigger percentage than he got before, but it would not be good politics for him to admit that. This is what we have had to put up with in replies to questions. It would be satisfactory if we could get a reply to the question asked, but that is evaded. The Minister of Labour and Industry is a champion at evading the question asked and never coming back to the answer sought.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I gave the Leader of the Opposition a little more latitude in speaking to the motion, but the honourable member should keep to the Standing Order under discussion.

Mr. McANANEY: I was speaking of the value we obtain in an hour. If Ministers would provide a reasonable reply we would be reasonable enough to accept a shorter period. Members on this side are constantly pulled up, yet this does not apply to those Ministers who are abusive and do not answer the question asked of them. If Ministers provided more satisfactory replies we could do this in an hour, but not under the current interpretation of Standing Orders; indeed, Standing Orders might as well be eliminated altogether, because they are completely ignored by some members.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In supporting generally the amendments recommended by the Standing Orders Committee to reduce the waste of time in this Chamber, I believe by putting more effort into our debating we can improve the standard of debate and the asking of questions and lose nothing. I hope we will avoid the absurd situation we have seen in recent years of a group, of middle-aged to elderly men and one woman sitting here in the middle of the night pretending to discuss rationally matters of importance to the State. This situation should be avoided if it is at all possible.

I refer to the two hours allocated to Question Time. Until 1968, as far as I was aware, it was rare (and so rare as to be almost unknown) for the whole of Question Time to be used, except on the last couple of days of a session, when perhaps an extension to Question Time was provided. Question Time was usually over in an hour.

That applied to both Parties, whichever happened to be in Government or in Opposition. Certainly, on Wednesdays Question Time lasted only for about 10 minutes, and I recall Wednesdays when no questions were asked so that private members' business could be got on with. The Opposition then was no less effective or probed the Government less than is the case today.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: Have you proof?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes. I believe that both Parties proved it, because before 1965, when Labor was in Opposition, it did not use the full time and it managed to topple the Government, and we were able to do the same in 1968, although we had not used our full time. It is not necessarily the hallmark of the effectiveness of the Opposition 'to ask questions for a full two hours. I hope that disposes of the heated argument that it is essential to protect the interests of private members by giving them a full two hours. With a bit of effort (and heaven knows there is not much in this place too often) and with a bit of teamwork it could be done in an hour.

Mr. McAnaney: The expert on teamwork!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The honourable member is getting personal, I am afraid. I refer to how this began in 1968.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: What about 1965?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It started in 1968. In the Parliament from 1965 to 1968 I believe we did much better with questions than the Labor Party ever did. We certainly started to hit hard in that time. It was after the 1968 election that the present practice began, when there were 19 members on each side with an independent Speaker. It was known that he was not a fit man and could not take late nights.

The Hon. D. H. McKee: He's still around.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That may be so. but he is not in this place. The obvious tactic of the Labor Party (and I do not necessarily blame it) was to keep Question Time going until nearly 4 o'clock. The then member for Glenelg (the Minister of Education) used to try to end Question Time just before 4 o'clock so that il would not be noted in *Hansard* that the bells had been rung. That was the beginning, the idea being to take time from the Government, which could not make it up at the end of the day by sitting later at night. That was the origin, and there was reason for it: a matter of Party tactics.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: We knew the House had to get up at 9.30 or 10 p.m.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is right, because the Speaker could not continue. We had to accept that. We followed suit from 1970 and now we have kept it up prelty well. Let us realize that it is really an abuse of the Parliamentary process: there is now no reason for il at all. We have become used to late sittings to make up time that the Government loses (two hours a day), but it was certain that, whichever Party happened to be in office, sooner or later a slop would be put to the practice, because it was a pointless exercise. It has just happened that it is the Labor Party that is in office. There are other Parties in Opposition. Let us remember that the first time limits were introduced to this House was when we were in office. I introduced them myself when I was Attorney-General, and it was an accident as to which Party was in power.

I do not oppose the concept of cutting down Question Time to one hour. However, I am worried about getting a full hour for Question Time. Under Standing Orders it is intended that we shall not get our full hour. Apparently, the Leader did a bit of work this afternoon and noted that it was 3.14 p.m. by the time every member who wanted to ask a question had asked his first question. Because I knew that the debate would come on today, I noted particularly that it was between 2.9 p.m. and 2.10 p.m. before the first question was asked. Although it is unusual, as happens from time to time we had today a spate of petitions. It took 9½ minutes for those petitions to be presented. There were no notices of motion or messages from the Governor. If we had had notices or messages, it would probably have been 2.15 p.m. before we got to the first question. Bearing in mind the background to which I have referred, it does not matter much that the time for questions will' be reduced but, if it is to be made one hour, 10 or 15 minutes is a significant proportion of that time to be .taken up in some other way. Although that does not always happen, it happens frequently enough to matter.

Therefore, I believe we should have a certain length of time for questions (irrespective of the time Question Time begins), as we are used to having on the opening day of a session. Under this scheme, if questions started at 2 p.m. they would finish at 3 p.m., and if they started at 2.9 p.m. lhey would finish at 3.9 p.m. In addition, we should allow the last question, instead of being belled out, to be answered. If the questioner is half way through his question, he should be allowed to finish the question and the Minister should be allowed to reply. As replies will most probably be most affected, the matter will be in the hands of the Government, and Ministers will probably take only a couple of minutes to complete replies. If these requirements arc met, our way of proceeding will be perfectly satisfactory. To provide for a full hour of questions and to allow the last question and reply to be completed, I move:

That proposed new Standing Order 127 be amended by striking out "on the first day of a session and, on other days, shall cease at three o'clock" and inserting "but if the last question asked or commenced to be asked before the expiration of that hour has not been answered that question may be answered notwithstanding that the period of one hour has expired".

The Standing Order, in the amended form, would read as follows:

Unless otherwise ordered, the period allowed for asking questions without notice shall not exceed one hour but if the last question asked or commenced to be asked before the expiration of that hour has not been answered that question may be answered notwithstanding that the period of one hour has expired.

Mr. MATHWIN: I oppose the motion. I think that, apart from members of the Liberal Movement, all Opposition members believe that the proposed Standing Order will take away the rights of members. When in Opposition, some members of the Government were great talkers who took every unfair advantage they possibly could take. Those members are now Ministers and take 10 to 15 minutes or more to answer only one question.

Mr. Coumbe: You're being conservative.

Mr. MATHWIN: Yes, I am. We should be concerned with what is right and what is wrong in this matter. The left-wing Government has everything to gain by suppressing the minorities. It is following the example set by its masters and pattern makers in Moscow and Peking.

Mr. Crimes: What a magnificent statement!

Mr. MATHWIN: That should make the member for Spence happy. In those countries there is no Opposition at all.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member will resume his seal. The matters before the Committee are the motion relating to new Standing Order 127 and the amendment to that Standing Order. I ask the honourable member to relate his remarks to those subjects.

Mr. MATHWIN: With due respect, I suggest that I was doing so. I intend to refer to the practice of other Governments in relation to Question Time. In police states, where there is no Opposition, there is no Question Time, and I think that is where we are headed.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Don't be stupid.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the subject of reducing Question Time to one hour.

Mr. MATHWIN: The Government is cutting our Question Time by half, and if it is cut down by half again we will have no Question Time at all. This is the thin end of the wedge. The Standing Orders Committee consisted of two members from our side of the House (and their feelings on this matter are obvious), and two lawyers, representing the Government, who were inflexible in their approach. I presume that the impartial Chairman of the committee used his casting vote on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are not discussing the vote on the committee: we are discussing proposed Standing Order 127, and I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to that.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am referring to the report of the committee. On all the committees with which I have been associated, when a chairman has had to give a casting vote on a matter of importance he has voted to retain the *status quo.*

The Hon. D. J. Hopgood: That's because all your committees are conservative.

Mr. MATHWIN: No, it is because it is the proper procedure.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: That's what Tom Stott did when he was Speaker!

Mr. MATHWIN: The Attorney-General has referred to Question Time in other places.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! As no-one can hear what is being said, I ask honourable members to keep their voices down. The member for Glenelg has the floor, and I ask him to confine his remarks to the matter before the Chair.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am referring to that matter, Sir. The Attorney-General referred to what the other State Parliaments do regarding Question Time. In France, another free country, Ministers reply to questions with or without debate, and members are allowed five minutes to comment on any questions. Speeches, lasting from 15 to 30 minutes, can be made on any questions. Therefore, each member can ask his question and debate it for that duration.

In the House of Commons, where they have starred and ordinary questions, 12 995 starred questions were asked and a total of 15 720 questions were asked in 1950-51; in 1958-59, as many as 14 518 questions were asked. Yet the Government is worried about the number of questions asked in this Parliament. In 1967, 2 093 were asked: in 1968-69, 3 133 were asked; and in 1972, 2 280 were asked. Members should compare that with the 14 518 questions asked in the British Parliament in 1958-59. The Premier has said that the Opposition is weak, and that is exactly what is behind this matter: the Government wants the Opposition to be weak, and it is therefore trying to suppress it by denying it time.

I turn now to the Indian Parliament which also has a system of starred and unstarred questions. Certain questions must be answered by the Minister on the floor of the House, whereas replies to other questions can be inserted in *Hansard.* If a member puts an asterisk alongside a question, it must be answered on the floor of the House. In the four years ending 1961, 124 379 questions were asked and, I presume, answered. Yet this Government says that 2 280 questions is far too many. In New Zealand replies to questions on notice are given on Wednesday, and a member is allowed five to 10 minutes to discuss his question. When discussing questions that have been asked, members must not speak for more than two hours. However, they can thereafter apply for extra time to speak.

I. refer now to what the Hon. L. G. Riches, C.M.G., M.P., said in a report at the First Conference of the Presiding Officers and Clerks at the Table of the Parliaments of Australia on January 25, 1968, as follows:

> In its critical function, Parliament has the important duty of criticizing the Executive Government, of bringing to light abuses, of ventilating grievances, of exposing and preventing the Government from the exercise of arbitrary power, of pressing the Government to take action. Question Time in the House is a vital element in this critical function of Parliament.

He later continued:

> The existence of Question Time in the House may conceivably lead to excessive caution in the operations of Government services, but this, to me, seems to be a small premium to pay for the cover and safeguard it affords to the citizens in a democracy.

He also said:

> In fine, I consider that a Speaker should approach the conduct of Question Time in the belief that in these days of bureaucracy and party discipline, Question Time provides a vestigial opportunity to preserve a measure of independence for private members of Parliament *vis-a-vis* the Executive, and to prove that Parliament is not a rubber stamp for the Government; and that the facile criticism that the battle of the two major Parties is a charade is untenable. In my view, it behoves a Speaker to ensure that in the context of the Party domination and the inexorable operation of the Party machine in major legislation and the passage of financial measures, the critical function of a legislature as exercised during Question Time is preserved in a vital form.

Later, the Hon. Mr. Riches said:

> I believe that in South Australia the absence of a debate on the adjournment motion and the non-availability of a regular grievance debate (apart from "Supply")—

and the only time the Opposition can really debate a matter is when the Parliament is dealing with a Supply Bill-

> have contributed to a certain prolixity in the explanation of questions. Maybe, Speakers salve their consciences subconsciously during lengthy questions with the knowledge of the absence of these other regular procedural opportunities for the ventilation of grievances; the "superior wisdom of the House", they rationalize, can always intervene through the voice of a single member, to terminate the leave of the questioner to make an explanation of his question.

We know that at times the member for Ross Smith has called "Question!" Will the Attorney-General forbid questions by Government members and tell them to ask the questions in Caucus? Will he prevent the member for Unley from asking a question once or twice a month about the intake of water into our reservoirs, which wastes about five minutes each time? Will the Minister prohibit members opposite from asking Dorothy Dixer questions such as wc have had today? He will ask them to ask as many questions as possible. On private members' day, when we try to cut down the number of questions so that we can deal with private members business, Government members ask most of their questions and Ministers give many written replies to our questions.

In most Parliaments Question Time is really Opposition time. If the Government is concerned about the time taken to get its business through, I suggest that it introduce the legislation earlier, instead of having the pile up towards the end of a session, with as many as five Bills being introduced

on one day. I would prefer to have the session extended by a month or two rather than have Question Time reduced to one hour and rather than sit into the early hours of the morning. I oppose the amendment as strongly as I can.

Mr. McRAE: I support the proposed Standing Order. I was one of the two members of the Standing Orders Committee who supported it because it was part of a balanced report. For those members of the public who are present this evening and who are getting a report of these proceedings, surely it is a tragic state of affairs when it is assumed that any political Party, if it is in Government, will manoeuvre its members and Parliamentary time so as to cut down the opportunity for the Opposition to ask questions.

Mr. Evans: That happens now.

Mr. McRAE: If that is done, it is wrong, regardless of who does it, and people ought to be told about it. I am not impressed by whether the Liberal Party or the Labor Party did it in the past. If either Party is in Government and is adopting those tactics, that Party is not Worthy to be in Government. I have never heard the suggestion at our Party meetings that Government members should take up Opposition time. The reverse has been true, and a perusal of the Parliamentary records will show that the overwhelming majority of questions is asked by Opposition members.

I do not consider that there is any substance in that allegation being made in relation to Parliaments of which I have been a member. If it happened in the past it was a disgrace, and if it were suggested in future it would be a disgrace. A Government Party that did such a thing would be participating in a conspiracy just as bad as the events in the Watergate affair in America at present.

For once, I am sympathetic to a proposition put by the member for Mitcham. L see his point, and the Leader has made it in a different way. On any given day, apart from Prayers, we may have many messages from the Governor or his Deputy, as well as many petitions, notices of motion, committees reports, etc. The Committee should consider seriously the validity of allowing one hour for questions. If such a period for Question Time is put to proper and effective use, Question Time will become what it ought to be now, namely, a vital, exciting and interesting period.

Members of the committee all agreed that the first hour or so of each day's questions is a vital, exciting, and interesting time, but after that the questions taper off into parish pump issues of extreme dullness, lack of interest, and lifelessness, the very things we do not want Question Time to be. I understood the member for Glenelg to say that Government members were getting better type of question replies to routine questions but that Opposition members were not. I would be extremely worried if there were any suggestion of that happening. In the lime I have been here I have not seen any tactics of that nature from this Government and, if the situation arose where Ministers, in the ordinary course of business, were facilitating replies to their own members and not to Opposition members, that would be a disgrace no matter which Party was concerned. Any member who formed part of such a conspiracy should resign as a matter of principle, because that would be a conspiracy against democracy; if he did not, he would have no guts, let alone principle.

I see no evidence of any suggestion on the part of the

Government that it will erode the one hour of Question Time by deliberate tactics; I believe no member of this Government is so gutless that he would accept such a conspiracy without having the courage to make an open issue of it. I believe that Government Ministers, in the course of business, are giving to Opposition members the same rapid attention as they are giving to members on their own side. Given all those things, then the way out provides everything we want, and I am taking into account the points made by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mitcham about consideration being given to routine matters being excluded from the period of one hour. It was not merely the reduction of the two-hour period that influenced the committee: it also considered that replies to questions could be tabled, thus facilitating supplementary questions. I have not been impressed by any member opposite with any concrete evidence to demonstrate that there is ground for the fears expressed. Were there grounds for those fears I would not be supporting the motion. If there were such a conspiracy I would not remain a member of this Chamber or of this Party, but I do not believe it will come to that; there is no need. T support the motion.

Mr. COUMBE: I speak on behalf of all private members on this most important matter, a jealously guarded right of all members on behalf of their constituents. It is the right of all members, irrespective of Party, to question members of the Government. Some remarks made earlier in the debate related to this Chamber when it had a membership of 39 as compared with the membership today of 47. Taking the mathematical fraction with 60 representing the minutes and 38 representing the number of private members, excluding the Ministry and the Speaker, I point out that the time for asking questions and receiving replies is not great. Some Ministers give succinct replies and others fairly lengthy ones. On some occasions I have not been able to ask in the two-hour period, all the questions I wished. Today I was able to ask only two questions, both of which were topical and to the point. Neither was one to which the Minister concerned had informed me that a reply was available.

The matter of supplementary questions is a most important facet of this argument, one seen to perfection in the House of Commons. We are now considering taking away a certain facility and privilege of members. I admit the time of two hours is more than that allowed in other parts of Australia, and I am being realistic in saying that the Government, having the numbers in this Chamber, can carry the day. When we exclude all the routine matters we should consider one hour clear. The member for Mitcham has moved an amendment which may provide a realistic approach to the matter. It is claimed that, by cutting the time allowed for questions to one hour, we will get a better type of question, but that is open to debate. I do not ask parish pump questions. I try to avoid this, but il is a, matter of individual choice.

It is the private members (that is, all members except the Speaker and Ministers) who have the opportunity of using Question Time. In the Commonwealth Parliament members have another opportunity to analyse Government actions, an opportunity that is denied us here; I am referring to the adjournment debate at the end of each sitting. I would prefer that no privilege now available to members be denied them but, being a realist, I believe that the amendment and a further amendment that has been foreshadowed have merit, provided that the whole period of one hour is devoted entirely to questions and that other matters such as petitions, laying papers on the table, Ministerial statements, and messages from the Governor are not allowed to intrude into that hour. The rights that members now enjoy should be jealously

guarded, and we should never allow those rights to be taken from us.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The whole theme of the changes to Standing Orders tends to destroy the level of democracy that we have enjoyed in South Australia for so long. First, Question Time provides an opportunity for members to put up ideas on how the administration of the State can be improved; secondly, it provides an opportunity for members to put up ideas that they receive from their constituents as to what changes should be made; and, thirdly, it gives members the chance to ask questions concerning the general administration of the State. Question Time provides the only opportunity that members have to analyse critically the way the State is administered. If that opportunity is reduced in any way, it will tend to make a mockery of democracy and of Parliamentary procedures. This attack on Question Time has been carefully planned from the day when the member for Ross Smith wrote a leading article in the *Advertiser.*

Mr. Millhouse: He didn't write any such article.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I may have misunderstood—perhaps it was a speech. I apologize to the honourable member for my false accusation. However, there is no doubt that Government members have been trying to suggest that Question Time is a waste of time. After carefully analysing Question Time in *Hansard,* J have found that about 66 per cent of the time is spent wastefully while Ministers give replies. This time is wasted because of the way in which Ministers give replies: they do not answer the questions but, rather, attack Opposition members or introduce red herrings. Standing Order 125 states:

> Tn answering any such question a member shall not debate the matter to which the same refers.

In this connection I took a point of order today. For a long time Ministers have debated issues without answering questions. Erskine May provides the following longer explanation of how questions should be answered:

> An answer should be confined to the points contained in the question, with such explanation only as renders the answer intelligible.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I think the honourable member for Davenport is reflecting on the Chair. The Speaker has ruled on that matter during Question Time, and any such remark is a reflection on the Chair.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I was not trying to reflect on the Chair. Mr. Chairman, but I was referring to the use of Question Time. If Question Time is to be reduced, it must be used fairly by Ministers in answering questions. T carefully analysed today's Question Time. By 3 p.m. (when Question Time would cease if the recommendation be adopted) eight out of the 18 members of the Liberal and Country League Opposition had had the chance to ask questions—less than 50 per cent. It is therefore clear that, if the recommendation is adopted, most members of the L.C.L. will not have an opportunity to ask a question. Tf the Minister of Education was here he would immediately say that under the new system replies to questions previously asked will simply be tabled, not read; that would be a valid point. There were only two such questions today, and the answers were very short. The total amount of time devoted to answering questions previously asked was about four minutes; this period would allow one more question. So, each Opposition member has a 50 per cent chance of asking a question. The members who are most severely hit by this are back-benchers or new members like myself because, quite properly, there is an order in which members on this side ask questions.

Mr. Jennings: If that has been the case, you should have been quiet ever since you became a member.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: If Question Time is reduced (and no doubt Government members, against the best interests of the State, will use their numbers to see that the time is reduced) it is important that Ministers start to obey Standing Orders. Further, it is important that all of us appreciate what the Standing Orders are and ensure that they are carried out. The member for Playford has referred to the importance of keeping an open and democratic Government in this State, and I support that. At times there have been many Dorothy Dix questions, and some questions have been parochial. Government members can hardly accuse the Opposition of asking such questions, because many of them ask Dorothy Dixers and parochial questions. Indeed', they cannot attack the Government. I suppose Opposition members can expect one hour of Question Time from now on. Government members would not attack the Government, because they would be expelled if they tried to do so.

Members interjecting;

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Davenport.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In the best interests of democracy, and of airing our views and providing the Opposition with an opportunity to express its opinion on how the State is being administered, the Government should, if Question Time is reduced, carefully consider suggestions I intend to make to the appropriate committee. First, we should have a half-hour adjournment debate with a maximum speaking period of five or 10 minutes each to give Opposition members a chance to comment on issues. It is ridiculous that members cannot comment during Question Time, especially as after tomorrow private members' time will be completely cut out for the rest of this session. Opposition members will no longer have an opportunity then to air any grievance. As we cannot comment during Question Time and as no other period is available, I suggest (especially as members opposite have referred to Question Time in other Australian Parliaments) that members opposite consider the situation in other Parliaments in respect of adjournment debates. The Commonwealth Government has a three-quarter hour adjournment debate. This would be a vast improvement, as it would encourage the Opposition not to comment during Question Time. The Government, just when it is about to guillotine Question Time, should appreciate the value of democracy and provide an alternative means by which members can air grievances. In seeking to reduce Question Time the Government is hurting not members but the people they represent. Members raise not their own personal matters but those of their constituents, and the Government is reducing the opportunity for these people to be represented.

Mr. Wright: Can't you write a letter?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Most of the problems raised by people who see me concern specific questions to be asked here. Those matters that should be handled by letter are done so. Reference has been made to the Opposition seeking information by letter from Ministers, but it is time that Ministers replied promptly and precisely to questions. I refer to a two-month delay in the reply from one Minister. I hope that Ministers have noted the points' I have raised; first, that Ministers currently waste 66 per cent of Question Time.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member has already covered these points and is referring also to

replies to questions. We are considering one hour for Question Time.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am trying as quickly as possible to summarize my case. First, Ministers must appreciate that Question Time in future will obviously be valuable, and I ask them to consider Standing Order 125 in respect of giving direct replies. Secondly, Government members are, in effect, stifling the people of South Australia; they are not stifling the Opposition, because we can make our comments elsewhere. They are stifling the opportunity of people to air their problems.

Mr. KENEALLY: I am amused that the honourable member who has just resumed his seat has complained about other members taking up the time of the House, because that is what he has been doing. In supporting the motion. I find that much of what the member for Mitcham has suggested is to my liking; indeed, I could be convinced to support the amendment. The suggestion that Question Time consist of one full hour has much merit. I have been provoked to speak in this Committee for the first time since becoming a member.

Mr. Gunn: There is an admission of Caucus control.

Mr. KENEALLY: It is not: it is an admission of not taking up wastefully the time of the Chamber. My contribution has been provoked by that of the member for Glenelg and the member for Davenport. I point out to both these members that Question Time is not there especially for use by Opposition members. It has never been suggested that it should be used as such. Back-bench members on the Government side share equally with Opposition members the desire to ask questions of Ministers, despite the fact that Opposition members have seemed to suggest that Question Time is for their use alone.

Mr. Coumbe: I wouldn't say that.

Mr. KENEALLY: What the honourable member said was sensible, which is more than can be said for what other Opposition members have said. The member for Davenport said that all members should understand Standing Orders, especially those relating to Question Time, and he referred to Standing Order 125. However, I refer him to Standing Orders 123 and 124. He said that Question Time was designed to enable members to state their ideas and make suggestions. That is not the intention of Question Time at all, as Standing Order 124 states:

In putting any such question, no argument or opinion shall be offered, nor shall any facts be stated, except by leave of the House arid so far only as may be necessary to explain such question. .

The honourable member chose to ignore that Standing Order as he tried to bolster his argument. Typically, the member for Glenelg made wild, irrational statements. He challenged members on this side to check in the Parliamentary Library the facts he gave. I accepted his challenge. The honourable member said that in the House of Commons about 14 000 questions were asked in a session, whereas only 2 000 questions were asked here. On this basis, he wondered why the Government should be concerned about the length of time Question Time takes in this Parliament. The following passage from Wilding's *Encyclopaedia of Parliament* is relevant:

Nothing could more weaken the control of Parliament over the Executive than the abolition or curtailment of the right of a member of Parliament to ask a question in the House, and so important has this method of ventilating grievances become that it has been responsible for a corresponding decline in public relations.

All members would agree with that. Then we come to some history of the matter, as follows:

The first formal question to a Minister was put in 1721 in the House of Lords and questions first appeared on the order paper in 1835. At first a member could ask any number of questions, but it was later fixed at eight in 1909, four in 1919, three in 1920, and finally in 1960 at two oral questions in any one day—there is no limit to questions requiring a written answer.

The member for Glenelg said that the new lime for questions would restrict the rights of members, and to support his argument he referred to the practice in the House of Commons. When we asked him the method of asking questions in the House of Commons, he refused to answer, because it did not suit his argument to do so.

Mr. Mathwin: You were screaming so much abuse that I didn't hear.

Mr. KENEALLY: In the House of Commons, Question Time begins not later than 2.45 p.m. and finishes not later than 3.30 p.m. That is 45 minutes, and there are about 600 members. The fact is that in this Chamber the time available for questions without notice is probably the most generous that is provided in any Parliament of which the honourable member can think; it is certainly the most generous time provided in Australia.

Mr. Mathwin: What about New Zealand?

Mr. KENEALLY: If honourable members feel that one hour will restrict them in asking questions, why do they not put their questions on notice and get replies in that way?

Mr. Mathwin: You won't give the answers.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You get them given to you.

The Hon. L. J. King: The difficulty is that you have to be able to read to understand them.

Mr. KENEALLY: It seems to me that the members opposite who are most adamant in demanding that two hours for Question Time be retained are those who in fact ask the most puerile questions. There is no doubt that what the member for Ross Smith has said before is correct, and this applies equally to Government as well as to Opposition members. Many questions asked are asked merely to fill in time and would be better referred to the Minister by letter or in some other way. Question Time in this Chamber should be used sensibly by the Opposition to probe the Government. Often Opposition members on the front bench or of the L.M. ask a sensible, pertinent question early in Question Time. However, a series of parochial questions follows, and they have no chance to ask a follow-up question. Since I have been a member, Question Time has not been used sensibly by either Opposition or Government back-bench members. We do not complain that the time will be reduced to one hour. With Opposition members, we wish to ask questions relating to our constituents, and parochial questions. We also like to ask questions of public concern. However, we realize, as members opposite who are sensible must realize, that Question Time is not being used properly.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: As I realize that, as my amendment is presently worded, it would allow for a full hour of questions after an urgency motion, and as that is not what I intended, I ask leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I move:

That proposed new Standing Order 127 be amended by striking out "on the first day of the session and, on other days, shall cease at three o'clock" and inserting "but if the last question asked or commenced to be asked before the expiration of that hour has not been answered that question may be answered notwithstanding that the period of one hour has expired provided that in any event on a day other than the first day of a session the period shall expire at fifteen minutes past three o'clock.''

Honourable members will see that this is the same as my first amendment, with an appropriate proviso added.

Mr. EVANS: I oppose the motion, and I have no real enthusiasm for the amendment. Although this Parliament has operated successfully under Governments of different political persuasion, the Opposition has, since the present Government has been in office, lost some of the bite that Oppositions have had in the past, especially in relation to opportunities to explain questions before they were asked. This was a privilege and a right enjoyed by most members, particularly members of the present Government when they were in Opposition. I refer, for instance, to a question asked on July 2, 1969, by the then member for Glenelg, who is now the Minister of Education. The procedure followed by him, of explaining his question before asking it, does not now obtain in this Parliament.

It does not matter what happens in other Parliaments, because this procedure benefited the Parliament and the State. The number of Ministers has since been increased and they have been given press secretaries who can write reports not only concerning Government departments but also to promote Party policy. At the same time, these people, who are employed by the State and whose income is nearly as much as that of a Parliamentarian, write reports for the media in other States. The Government has also employed research officers and other administrative staff to promote its line of thinking. I agree with the member for Goyder when he said that members of Parliament had also been given electorate secretaries, which is an increase in the service provided for members. Despite all this Opposition members have now lost the privilege of being able to explain their questions before actually asking them. The *Hansard* report of the question asked by the present Minister of Education (then member for Glenelg) on July 2, 1969 under the heading "Rental Accommodation", is as follows:

Mr. HUDSON: If an individual wants, for himself or his family, to rent a Housing Trust house or flat there are varying delays depending on the part of the metropolitan area in which the person is seeking accommodation. These delays vary from a short time in the case of Elizabeth to a considerable time for the southern and south-western suburbs, in which the delay normally exceeds three years. As this is a problem that concerns my district and that of the member for Edwardstown, I draw it to the attention of the Minister of Housing and point out that unless the trust makes available additional rental accommodation south of Adelaide the only thing that can happen is for the waiting list to lengthen further, because at present some timber frame houses that have been rented in the past by the trust are being sold. I know this does not occur frequently but, nevertheless, the stock of trust houses for rental in this area is, I believe, gradually declining.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: You are debating the question.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member must now ask the question.

Mr. HUDSON: Has the Premier called "Question" again? The Premier said I was debating the question: does that mean that you, Mr. Speaker, are ordering me to ask the question?

The SPEAKER: I understood that the Premier called for a question.

The Hon. R. S. Hall: I said that the honourable member was debating the question.

Mr. HUDSON: This is a serious matter. I realize that there may not be adequate additional land on the Adelaide Plains south of Adelaide to permit the construction of a significant number of rental houses or flats. Therefore will the Minister of Housing ascertain whether the trust can expand its building rate in the southern suburbs on the Adelaide Plains of rental accommodation and, to the extent that further accommodation is needed, whether provision can be made for building extra rental accommodation in the Morphett Vale, Happy Valley and Christies Beach areas? Many people who request rental accommodation in the southern suburbs would be satisfied if they could get accommodation at these places or one of the areas a little farther to the south. Unfortunately, people who work at present—

The Hon. R. S. Hall: Is this a speech or a question?

The SPEAKER: I think the honourable member is beginning to debate it, and he had better ask the question.

Mr. HUDSON: —in those areas get preference—

The Hon. Robin Millhouse: You have been told to ask the question.

Mr. HUDSON: I know that the Premier is sensitive.

The SPEAKER: Get the question over, please.

Mr. HUDSON: Will the Minister of Housing take up these matters with the Housing Trust with a view to getting a significant expansion in the building of rental houses and flats in the general southern area so that some reduction in the long waiting list can be obtained?

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I got more houses built, too.

Mr. EVANS: That is a point. The Minister admits that this system of asking questions was successful. That is something that cannot be said about the present system. This proves that the original system, which obtained before this Government assumed office, was more successful than the present system. Members have now lost the right to explain a question before asking it, and there is no doubt that the member for Playford, who said he would resign from his Party if it took away the rights of members, to the detriment of the Opposition, should read the *Hansard* extract to which I referred, so that he can see exactly what happened. There are many more examples of this in *Hansard.* Members of the present Government and their former colleagues asked questions containing 300 and 400 words.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I didn't ask more than 11 questions in one day.

Mr. EVANS: I accept that. However, if we accept the motion before the Chair, members will have only one hour in which to ask questions. Excluding Ministers and the Speaker, there are 38 members, and it would be impossible for each of them to ask 11 questions a day in that time. It would be impossible to ask even one question each on each day, but we are asked to accept that position. If the member for Mitcham is willing to move an amendment to the effect that the Opposition shall be allowed one clear hour of Question Time, with the Government able to please itself whether it uses an hour, that is an entirely different matter. As the member for Davenport has said, with only one hour of Question Time, the Government could limit the whole process to about eight questions a day. Today the Premier took about 10 minutes to reply to the first question asked by the Leader of the Opposition. We could have the position on one day of three questions being asked by the Opposition and three Dorothy Dixer questions by the Government. '

Mr. Jennings: In most cases, that would be enough.

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member, for a long time, had the benefit of being able to ask questions, explain them, and use up much time. He would be a past-master at using material that was not related to the question. Many important and controversial Bills have been introduced by Governments of both Parties towards the end of Parliamentary sessions, and. that is why we have had many late sittings. I know that Ministers and private members have other commitments and that the, burden on them is greater now than it has been in the past.

Parliament could sit for more months in the year. A limit could be put on the time that Parliament sat each day, except perhaps in the last month. The Government could say what matters it wanted dealt with before the end of the session and tell the Opposition it could please itself how long it took to deal with them. We seem not to have sufficient Parliamentary Counsel available to draft

the legislation so that it can be introduced when the Government wants to introduce it. We have to force legislation through towards the end of a session, and perhaps this is because of lack of planning by both Labor Governments and L.C.L. Governments.

It can be argued that replies to questions can be included in *Hansard* without being read here, just as it could be argued that speeches could be included in *Hansard* without being read and copies of those speeches could be sent to the news media each day. It could be argued that we could demolish this building and have the Premier send us copies of the Government's proposals so that we could send our views back for inclusion in *Hansard.*

Ministers have press secretaries to prepare information for the news media in such a way that it can be published, but it is difficult for the Opposition to counter that move. Not all members can write reports in what we may term a journalistic form. The Leader of the Opposition is the only member of the three Parties represented on this side who has available to him a Press Secretary, a journalist of repute. The Premier's Department employs about 100 people, whereas when Sir Thomas Playford was Premier fewer than 10 persons were employed there.

The Minister of Education has rectified one fault that existed previously. When we wrote to the Minister asking a specific question about a school, the school as well as the member received a reply, but the school received it one day before the member did. I do not know whether that happened by direction or by accident, but it did not please me, although I did not raise the matter, because, as members opposite know, I can fight hard but I also fight fairly. It has been said that members can write to Ministers and obtain information. In the Stirling Council area there is a proposal to pul a sewage treatment works in the main street, and a resident objected because Engineering and Water Supply Department surveyors walked on to his property and surveyed an easement that would have interfered with the boundary fence.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. EVANS: I want to answer this point, if I may. The matter of receiving information by letter has been raised in this debate.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! This point is out of order. I have asked the honourable member to speak to the specific point. He has had a fair amount of latitude and I ask him to come back to the matter before the Committee.

Mr. EVANS: The proposal before the Chair is that Question Time be reduced from two hours to one hour, and it has been said that information normally available by question can be obtained by letter. I want to cite an example of what happens when we try to use the letter method. I hope that is speaking to the point before the Chair. We have the alternatives of asking a question in the House during a two-hour period or writing a letter and having Question Time cut down to one hour. In the case to which I referred the Engineering and Water Supply Department was on the verge of going through the person's property before a reply was received. It took two months to get a reply to a letter in a situation affecting the individual's right to his property, and the reply came from the office of the Minister of Works.

Let us be quite honest about this. Members who make telephone inquiries find that departments prefer matters of this kind to come through the Minister, and we are back to the same situation. I challenge anyone to see how many effective calls can be made to Government departments. He will find that, allowing for engaged lines, people being put to lunch, departmental heads being out at meetings or with Ministers or other departmental officers, the opportunity to speak to officers is not great. I do not say that with any disrespect to the officers concerned; it is because of the burden they bear in carrying out their duties.

I have sat through most of the late sittings in this House, some of them caused perhaps because of a two-hour Question Time. I have sat and suffered, but some members leave for home at the first opportunity, often before 10 o'clock. I have accepted that burden for the sake of the Opposition and the people I represent, but I hope that my Party will not always be in Opposition. One day perhaps today's Government members will be in Opposition, and I should like to preserve their rights because I believe this is the best way for Parliament to operate. I cannot support the amendment or the motion but, if the member for Mitcham can guarantee an hour's Question Time for the Opposition. Government members have a decision to make. I believe that would be a fair solution to the problem. In the present circumstances, if the Government wishes to tie up the whole hour of Question Time, six questions will do it.

The member for Davenport spoke of Standing Orders for the future. It is most difficult for any Speaker to interpret Standing Orders and it is extremely difficult for a Speaker to sit in a Party room and say to his Ministerial colleagues, "You are debating the replies to questions, and I will have to pull you into line", because his Party will tell him to be quiet, saying they are out to win if they can. That is the unfortunate situation. I hope we do not reach the point where the Premier informs individual members by letter of what will happen and those members write back telling him whether or not we will accept it. That is the way we are heading, and I do not support the proposal.

Mrs. BYRNE: As a member of the Government who asks many questions and who intends to continue to do so, I view this matter most seriously. Some members believe that the present two-hour period should remain, and because I do not wish to be restricted in my present practice I have examined the matter closely and decided Lhat one hour would be sufficient, provided that period did not include the matteis mentioned by the member for Mitcham—prayers, messages from His Excellency, petitions, Ministerial statements and reports of committees. The report of the Standing Orders Committee states that the one hour will not include replies to Questions on Notice and replies to questions already asked in the normal course of Question Time. At present much of the time is taken up by replies from Ministers. One day last week I asked four questions, but three were seeking replies to questions I had asked previously, so that time could have been excluded.

I write many letters to Ministers, as I am sure they will bear out, and I make telephone calls where necessary. Everyone has his own idea on the best way to conduct business and I prefer to continue with the way in which I look after my constituents now, to raise questions in this House if I wish and to write letters on other matters when I consider that the best method. A telephone call does not give a permanent record of a reply, but a question in this House produces a permanent record for everyone to see.

Mr. Venning: Why don't you support the *status quo?*

Mrs. BYRNE: Because I am satisfied that I can continue to ask the number of questions I wish in one hour.

Mr. Mathwin: As long as no-one else does.

Mrs. BYRNE: I am sure the honourable member will continue to ask his questions and get replies, just as he is doing now. I am sure Opposition members could ask the questions they wish, provided that the matters mentioned by the member for Mitcham were excluded. The lime limit of one hour will make questions, explanations, and replies more concise. The member for Fisher quoted the case of a member who asked a question with a lengthy explanation. We all know that, with Question Time limited to one hour, it would not be fair to other members to do that. The member for Davenport said that on some occasions replies were not given by Ministers, but I have sat on the Opposition side and I did not always get replies from Ministers.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: Especially when you asked a question of the former Premier, now the member for Goyder.

Mrs. BYRNE: I shall not single out any member, but I can assure the member for Davenport that it is not one sided. He may never find out that things are quite different when one is in Opposition from what they are when one's Party is in Government. I am satisfied that I could ask all the questions I wished, without restricting myself in any way, within an hour provided the matters referred to by the member for Mitcham and replies to questions already asked were not included in the time.

Dr. TONKIN: Question Time is important to private members from either side of the House, and I do not particularly care for the cutting down of that time, particularly if it is a cutting down of questions without notice. I am not certain about this; we have the Attorney-General's assurance that, with answers to previous questions being delivered al the beginning of the afternoon, much time will be saved. At present the obtaining of replies from Ministers in another place takes much time. I do not think that I personally will suffer from cutting down the time to one hour. Concern has been expressed that private members could lose control of the situation, whereas with two hours of Question Time they feel that they have some degree of control. For that reason I believe that the amendment of the member for Mitcham, the result of a combined effort by the honourable member and the Attorney-General, is good. I support it because I know perfectly well, as do other members, that, if we do not support it, the original recommendation will be passed and Question Time will end at 3 p.m.

Mr. Mathwin: Don't speak for me.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: I would not presume to speak for the honourable member. With those provisos, including the proviso that extraneous matters do not intrude into the true time of one hour for questions without notice, it is a much better proposition. The member for Davenport suggested that there be an adjournment debate allowed, and the member for Fisher suggested that there be a set adjournment time each night and more rational sitting hours. These matters have been canvassed in the past by the member for Mallee, who is probably a greater expert on these matters than is any other member. His views on this matter will be very valuable. The idea of an adjournment debate is excellent, because it would afford private members an opportunity to make comments that they have been precluded from making during Question Time ever since the method of preceding explanations with a question has been adopted. I deplore any loss of privileges by private members, and I support the amendment for pragmatic reasons.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I do not intend to take half an hour to deliver a three-minute message. I am not adamant about retaining two hours for Question Time, as has been suggested by the members for Fisher and Glenelg, but I am adamant about gaining an assurance from the Attorney-General that he will practise what he has preached to us this evening.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Alexandra has the call, and I ask other members to be reasonable. The honourable member for Alexandra.

Mr. CHAPMAN: Earlier this evening the Attorney-General told us that, if we were sensible and pruned our questions, an hour would be adequate. What is good enough for the goose is good enough for the gander. The Attorney-General and other Ministers must demonstrate to me that they are willing to uphold the theory that has been expounded before I will be willing to support any reduction in Question Time. I will not support the motion and I will not support the amendment of the member for Mitcham until Ministers demonstrate when answering questions that they can observe the rules that Opposition members and Government back-benchers are required to observe. We can often be called to order and asked to confine our remarks to precise matters, yet Ministers may ramble on or off the subject at random. This is where the time is being wasted during the two hours allotted to questions and other procedures. Until Ministers have a fair and reasonable attitude to the time allotted to them and until they adhere to Standing Orders, I will oppose the pruning of Question Time in any form.

Mr. GUNN: It has become patently clear that these recommendations represent a Caucus decision, and it is typical of the arrogant attitude that the Government and the Labor Party have always adopted.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Eyre should discuss the question before the Chair; if he does not, I will rule him out of order.

Mr. GUNN: I was hoping to deal with the question before the Chair when I was cut off. The rights of the elected representatives of the people should not be usurped. Members should not be prevented from questioning the Government. I am concerned that the Government has put before this House (through the Standing Orders Committee, which made its decision on the casting vote of the Chairman) a recommendation to reduce Question Time by one hour. Judging from the remarks of the members for Ross Smith and Adelaide over the last few months, it is obvious that the Labor Party has deliberately set out to usurp the power of the Opposition to question Ministers. Particularly when Ministers have their backs to the wall, they do not like the logical probing that members on this side use. The recommendation suits the Attorney-General because he does not like questions: he likes to ram his Bills through Parliament. He is the greatest producer of Bills that I have ever seen in this House. The Attorney-General does not like the democratic system.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I draw the honourable member's attention to the fact that we are debating a report of the Standing Orders Committee, not the Attorney-General. The honourable member for Eyre will relate his remarks to the one hour of Question Time.

Mr. GUNN: I thought my remarks were relevant, because I was referring to Question Time being reduced by one hour. In prefacing my remarks I pointed out that this would suit the Labor. Party in Government as it would deny Opposition members the opportunity to probe and question Government policies. What is to stop the

Attorney-General and the Labor Party—all Labor members are bound by decisions of Caucus and have signed the obnoxious pledge.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I will not warn the honourable member again. We are debating the matter of one hour for Question Time. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I was certainly doing that. I find it strange that when I try to back up my remarks I am called to order, yet other members on this side and members opposite have ranged much further in their remarks.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member in his latest remarks has been reflecting on the Chair. The honourable member has a tendency to do this and has done it in the past. He has done it this evening, and I warned him a few moments ago. I will give him one more chance to debate the question before the Committee. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: I never cease to be amazed at the actions of the Labor Party. The Labor Party in Government now seeks to reduce, by half, the length of Question Time. There is nothing to stop the same argument being advanced in the future to reduce Question Time to half an hour—

Mr. Coumbe: Or to nothing at all.

Mr. GUNN: —or to nothing at all. That was the point I was trying to make when you, Mr. Chairman, made me resume my seat. Other members have been making wide-ranging remarks and linking them back to this matter, but I have not been given this opportunity. Question Time in this House is the most valuable time.

Mr. Keneally: Why misuse it as you do?

Mr. GUNN: It may appear to be a trivial matter to the honourable member, but I have not misused it. If a matter affects one's constituents, the best way to get a quick result is by a question asked in this House.

Mr. Keneally: I do not—

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member for Stuart does not ask many question, but perhaps he does not have many problems.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Stuart is out of order in interjecting and the member for Eyre is out of order in replying to him.

Mr. GUNN: I cannot support the motion, but I reluctantly support the amendment, which is a slight improvement. If a democracy is to function, members should have the right to cross-examine the Executive. This is a fundamental right of the British Parliamentary system: the Executive has to answer directly to the representatives of the people in Parliament. We should not pass such motions as this, especially when put before Parliament in this manner. The Labor Party, through the Attorney-General, has ramrodded this motion through the Standing Orders Committee, only on the casting vote of the Chairman. Like the member for Glenelg, I was led to believe that, if voting on a committee was equally divided, the Chairman should not vote in favour of changing the *status quo.*

Mr. Keneally: Do you support two hours for Question Time?

Mr. GUNN: I reluctantly support the amendment of the member for Mitcham. I believe this is just the first step: the Labor Party has put the wedge in the door and seeks to deny Parliament and the people their rights to be provided with proper information. In examining other recent matters I cannot help but be concerned about what is happening to democracy in this State. I refer to the Queenstown shopping project.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. VENNING: I support the *status quo* in respect of Question Time. I am concerned that the Standing Orders Committee has reversed a situation previously applying, especially as the voting was equal and the decision in favour of change was decided on the casting vote of the Chairman. The Government through its numbers can do this but, if the Government were honest and truly sought to reduce the Question Time, Government members should be willing to go without it, leaving it available only to Opposition members.

Members have referred to the abuse of Question Time, yet Question Time has often concluded before the full two hours have passed. It has often finished before an hour and a half. Members should be able to question and probe Ministers on matters affecting this State. Ministers and their departments have become so involved that they are finding difficulty in keeping up with the questions asked of them. It is the replies to questions that have become strung out and much improvement could be achieved if the Speaker in handling this House introduced some law and order not only to the asking of questions but also to the replies to questions by Ministers.

In answering questions, Ministers preach sermons, saying finally that they do not know exactly what is the position but that they will get a report for the member, yet this could have been the reply initially, without further wasting the time of the House. The *status quo* should be retained. Any attempt to take from members their rights is an example of the Government using its numbers to queer the pitch of Opposition members in this House. I deplore any alteration to the *status quo.*

Mr. NANKIVELL: I support the amendment. No-one has yet clarified how long a question must be on notice before it is replied to. Questions are presently put on notice in one week and replied to in the next week. If the principle of Questions on Notice is to be adopted, consideration must be given to speeding up the replies. In my 15 years as a member of this House I have been subjected to as much ear-bashing as any other member. I have seen members on both sides abuse Question Time and the privileges of this Chamber in many ways, not just as a matter of principle but simply because it seems impossible sometimes for some members to stop talking. If Question Time is used properly, as it is used in many Parliaments, we need not fear that we will lose our opportunity to ask questions and receive replies.

The member for Stuart referred to the House of Commons. Anyone who has seen the House of Commons in action realizes how efficiently these matters can be dealt with if members are co-operative and the Speaker is precise. The procedure there is for a Minister to give a reply. Immediately, the Speaker calls on the member who asked the question to ask a supplementary question. He may then let supplementary questions flow until he brings down the guillotine and calls on the next question. There is no argument whether the matter has been discussed properly: that is the end of it and the next matter is dealt with. This practice gives members an opportunity to deal with vital matters affecting their district. Such a procedure can work if Ministers are precise in their replies. I agree with one of my colleagues that much of the effectiveness of a system for questions depends on whether Ministers debate the matter or give positive and quick replies. Much of the time spent in Question Time in this place is taken up by Ministers debating matters during their replies. They put forward not only departmental views on matters but also Party-political views.

Other members have canvassed the suggestion that, if we were to rationalize the whole procedure, we could think of providing an adjournment debate that would allow members to air grievances. Opposition members have said that in Question Time they are able to express their grievances. The only other time for a grievance debate is when there is a motion to go into Committee of Supply, and that happens infrequently. Members are entitled to be able to raise matters of grievance and speak on them, and not just ask questions about them. To compensate for any loss of opportunity to express grievances during Question Time, the possibility of providing an opportunity for a grievance debate at the end of a day after ordinary business has concluded should be examined. Such a system applies in many Parliaments.

This Chamber controls its own Standing Orders, which it can suspend when it so desires. The sitting time in Parliament can be rationalized by stating a time at which debates will close and by allowing a period for grievance debates at that stage. In addition, many of our problems could be solved if we spread sitting times. I support the proposal that the Standing Orders Committee should consider the possibility of Parliament's sitting for three weeks and then adjourning for a week. We should not try to sit continually all day and all night just for the sake of talking. I am afraid that there are too many in this place who talk for the sake of talking.

Mr. WARDLE: I will support the amendment, provided that the Government can guarantee that there will be an hour of Question Time. Unless there is such a guarantee, members will not support this proposal. We must be assured of an hour of questions that does not include time for prayers, petitions and so on, or Questions on Notice. If members are willing to give and take on this issue, Ministers are surely duty bound to do so too. On occasions, Ministers have debated replies, not giving concise answers. Surely Ministers will now be willing to co-operate to see that the new system operates efficiently.

Mr. BECKER: I oppose the motion and the amendment. I consider the amendment to be a weak compromise, and I do not believe that the Opposition should compromise at all. We should have every opportunity to question the Government for two hours each sitting day. The Minister of Education is proud of the fact that, in the past, he has asked as many as 11 questions on one day. Good luck to him. He made full use of the replies by seeing that they were read by all and sundry. It is the right of a member to question the Government as often as he can within the time available. Even if all other Parliaments in the world have an entirely different system, I do not see why we should follow them and reduce our Question Time. As there is no fixed time for the sittings of this Chamber on a given day, whether or not we take two hours for questions the Government can get a certain amount of business done, even though we have to sit until all hours of the morning. That is part of the business of running this Chamber. I do not see why we should give up the privilege of a Question Time of two hours, and I will fight tooth and nail to see that we retain this right.

If the time is reduced to one hour, Opposition members will be lucky to be able to ask even one question. Government members may wish to ask questions on certain matters and will be able to match Opposition members question for question. Good luck to those who do, because most members refrain from asking questions. The position in future will be that the time the Opposition has for questions will be halved, and we have already lost time this session. Where we could formerly ask five or six questions a day, we are now lucky to be able to ask three or four. The position will be that we will be able to ask only one question without notice a day. Certainly we will be able to put Questions on Notice, but all members will not see replies to those questions until the *Hansard* galley is available, unless they are able to see a copy of the reply of the member who has asked the question. However, I know some members from whom such copies will not be freely available, and this procedure will result in a further disadvantage to members generally.

It has been asked why members should not ring the Minister or the department concerned. However, I have rarely used that privilege because, realizing that the Minister is busy, I do not think he should be interrupted. Like certain other members, I should prefer to receive a reply in writing. However, it can take up to two months for one to receive a reply from Government departments. Indeed, letters that I wrote in January and February this year, before the election, were not answered until April or subsequently, and that is not fair or reasonable. I accept the challenge made by the member for Playford in this respect, and I will look up some of my correspondence and bring it to his attention. Question Time is being reduced because of the sheer incompetency of some Government Ministers, and for that reason I oppose the motion.

Mr. MATHWIN: As there are 21 Opposition members, who would have only one hour in which to ask questions each would have less than three minutes to ask a question and receive an answer, provided that no Government members asked questions. Also, as Opposition members on the front bench will no doubt be given preference, back benchers may not have an opportunity to ask a question for over a week. Does the Government believe that is fair? If members examined the matter in that light, they would realize that it is not fair. Finally, I refer to the following statement by a former Speaker in this House (The Hon. L. G. Riches):

> Question Time has been attacked as the "ritual exchange of non-information". I am convinced, however, that the proper use of the daily Question Time, with its opportunities to raise topical or urgent issues without delay, is invaluable. It means that in the mass of our Parliamentary procedure there is left a small space where the camel of "instant democracy" can get his nose under the tent. I believe strongly that Question Time provides one of the most valuable Parliamentary defences of the liberty of the subject. In the 1967 session of Parliament in South Australia, 19.4 per cent of the total time at the disposal of the House was devoted to questions. Further, 2 093 questions were asked during 57 sitting days, which is equivalent to an average of 37 per sitting day.

That sums up the whole matter. Even though the Hon. Mr. Riches thought that 37 questions each sitting day was fair, the Government now says that 10 questions a day is sufficient. I should be surprised if any Minister thinks that this is really fair.

Mr. McANANEY: The Hon. Mr. Riches referred to instant democracy in Question Time. I have not received from incompetent Ministers replies to questions that I asked a month ago. I congratulate the member for Mallee on his speech, because in two minutes he solved the whole problem. If the Speaker followed the same procedure as that obtaining in the House of Commons, and we got precise answers from Ministers, I would support this innovation immediately, in preference to the present system in which Opposition members must put up with the vague, unrealistic meanderings of, as well as abuse by, Ministers.

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Attorney-General say when this change, if effected, will be implemented?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I want to comment on three matters. First, the Leader referred to the use to which the additional hour taken from Question Time would be put, and asked whether this would impose a further burden on members. This House is here to consider public business. It is not a question of tailoring the amount of business according to the convenience of the House: Parliament has a responsibility to discharge public business, and it is its responsibility to examine its procedures and to ensure that they are sufficiently efficient to enable the business that has to be considered to be dealt with. In other words, the Government must put before Parliament such business as it considers to be in the public interest, and Parliament must from time to time so tailor and review its procedures as to enable it to handle that business most efficiently.

There is no reason why the proposed changes should not come into effect immediately on the passing of this motion and the consequent amendment of the Standing Orders. As I understand the position, the moment these recommendations are adopted by this Committee, the Standing Orders are thereby amended. They must be approved by the Governor, but they take effect as soon as that is done. At present, I see no reason why they should not be in effect by the beginning of next week. I cannot say that there may not be a problem about getting them ready for the Governor's approval, but certainly the Government desires that they should be implemented at the earliest possible time.

The Government and my two colleagues on this side who are members of the Standing Orders Committee have considered the amendment moved by the member for Mitcham and we are willing to accept that as a compromise. The view that I and the majority of the members of the Standing Orders Committee have taken is that the recommendation of the committee provides a fair and reasonable period for Question Time. However, this is not the sort of matter that one wishes to adopt a dogmatic attitude about, and I appreciate the point made by the member for Mitcham that there may be exceptional circumstances in which presentation of petitions occupies more than the usual time and members then do not have the full time for asking questions. It is the intention that there should be an hour for Question Time. The amendment moved by the member for Mitcham ensures that that will be so and I am therefore willing to accept it.

Mr. MATHWIN: I should have thought the Attorney-General would try to answer my comments regarding the number of questions that can be asked under the proposal and also regarding the statement by a former Speaker that 37 questions on a day was a fair thing. If the Committee's proposal is accepted, however, less than three minutes will be available to each member on this side to ask a question and receive a reply, and then only if Government members do not ask questions. That position is impossible, because it means that we would be limited to 10 questions a day.

Mr. EVANS: The Attorney has said that the Government must tailor its operations in relation to its ability to have its legislation passed, and there is no guarantee that the proposal will lessen the burden on members. Indeed, the implication is that it may increase that burden. The Attorney has correctly made the point that the Government has the responsibility of handling the business of the State, but I ask Government members not to forget that the Opposition also has a responsibility, but that the opportunity for an Opposition to keep up with the machinery available to a Government is becoming less and less each day. The Attorney has said to us, by implication, "Bad luck. You will have to keep up with the Government machine, with its many more advisers than in the past, and we will make sure that you toe the line." What happens this evening through the pressure of Government numbers will do no credit to this Parliament or to anyone who supports the motion.

The Committee divided on Mr. Millhouse's amendment:

Ayes (34)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Blacker, Broomhill, Dean Brown, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Coumbe, Crimes, Eastick, Groth, Gunn, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McAnaney, McKee, McRae, Millhouse, Nankivell, Olson, Payne, Russack, Simmons, Slater, Tonkin, Virgo, Wardle, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (5)—Messrs. Becker, Chapman, Evans (teller), Mathwin, and Venning.

Majority of 29 for the Ayes.

Amendment thus carried.

The CHAIRMAN: I now put the motion as amended. Those for the motion say "Aye"; those against say "No". I declare the motion as amended carried.

Mr. GUNN: I oppose the motion. I supported the amendment—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, you declared the motion carried. Surely it will need a recommittal for the honourable member to speak to it.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order, because I put the question "That the proposed Standing Order as amended be agreed to". Then I called on those for the motion to say "Aye" and those against to say "No".

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN: I put the question and I gave the decision to the Ayes.

Mr. GUNN: On a point of order, I was on my feet before you put the question. Long before you put the question I was on my feet.

The CHAIRMAN: When I put a question it is the duty of any honourable member wishing to speak to rise and draw the attention of the Chair. In this case the honourable member for Eyre did not do that. I will give the honourable member the benefit of the doubt.

Mr. GUNN: I supported the amendment because it was an improvement on the motion which we are now discussing and on which the Committee will have to make a decision. I strongly oppose the motion because it is a step to deny members in this House the right to question the Executive. As a person who believes that members of this House should represent the people who elected them, I believe it should be our right to question the Government on every occasion. Even though arguments have been advanced in this debate tonight that many of the questions are trivial and that Ministers consider they should be handled in another way, I believe if it is a matter affecting a member's constituents it is important to that member. If the Parliament cannot discuss matters affecting electors in this State why does it assemble? There should not be matters too trifling to be brought before the Parliament. Once we reach the stage where it is ruled arbitrarily that matters should not be discussed by the Parliament we are verging on a state of dictatorship. It is all very well for the member for Ross Smith to laugh and to make caustic remarks, because we are aware that he would inflict on the people of this State any arbitrary decision so long as he could protect for himself the Australian Labor Party endorsement. He will do anything, and so will other members of the A.L.P. Government.

They are bound by a pledge and they will do anything to protect their endorsement. They are not concerned about constituents or the little people of this State. They are bound to that machine.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member can speak only on the motion as amended.

Mr. GUNN: At this stage we are debating the motion as amended, which means that this House will have one clear hour of Question Time in which a member .can rise in his place to ask a direct question of a Minister without giving notice. This means that the Minister would not have the opportunity to consider the matter and think up a reply that is often evasive. Nor would be unable to withhold the information. Members should have the right to two hours for Question Time. It has been one of the fundamental principles of this House, and we have been proud that private members in this Parliament have more rights than those in any other Parliament one may look at. Is that not a right that we should pursue as so-called democrats representing the people? How can any member opposite claim to be a democrat if he supports the motion before the House, a motion which comes from the Standing Orders Committee by the casting vote of a political appointment, the Speaker, who is supposed to be impartial?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Eyre is reflecting on the Speaker.

Mr. GUNN: I would not wish to do that. I withdraw the remark if I was reflecting on the Speaker. I will not continue on that line, but I will summarize my remarks. I supported the amendment because it improved a completely obnoxious motion. Members of this House are to be prevented from raising matters vital to the rights of their constituents (and that is what this will mean). The member for Brighton and the member for Albert Park are not concerned about constituents. This is evident if one scrutinizes the record of members of the A.L.P. in the index of *Hansard,* which shows how interested they are. It also shows that they are more interested in toeing the Party line—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member not to continue that line of debate, but to wind up his remarks. As I told the honourable member earlier this afternoon, he should not follow that line of debate.

Mr. GUNN: I do not want to transgress Standing Orders or your ruling, Sir, but I feel strongly on this matter. Having examined the records of this House and having seen how the member for Brighton has carried on in this place, with other members exercising their democratic rights to properly examine the Executive, I remind the Committee that one of the reasons why the British Parliamentary system is the best is that the Executive is always under scrutiny, not like the American system which in my opinion is a rotten system.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must stick to the question under discussion.

Mr. GUNN: This Parliament, if it carries this motion, is taking a retrograde step and I hope that future Parliaments will consider altering the system if the motion is carried.

Mr. MATHWIN: I oppose what I would term a weak, watered-down motion as amended by the member for Mitcham. I oppose it because members on this side will not be given a fair go. I fear that back-benchers will have little opportunity to question Ministers.

Mr. BECKER: I oppose the motion because we are losing a privilege that we have enjoyed. Despite the comments made this evening, I believe that the privilege has not been excessively abused. Under the present system the first question on each sitting day goes to the Leader of the Opposition, the second question goes to the Deputy Leader, and then questions can be asked from all over the place; generally, they go to members of other Parties. Under the new system the majority Party in Opposition will be at an extreme disadvantage when it tries to attack the Government vigorously on any issue. The Government must be willing to accept an attack, and it should expect an attack to come from the majority Party in Opposition.

Motion as amended carried.

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

That proposed Standing Order 90 be agreed to.

New Standing Order 90 is a rearrangement of the routine of business of the House. Inevitably, this motion is bound up with new Standing Order 130, which creates a new procedure for dealing with answers to Questions on Notice and answers to questions without notice where the answers are given on a day subsequent to the asking of the question. In explaining the motion I seek your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, to discuss matters raised in new Standing Order 130, because the two matters are bound up together, and it is perhaps inevitable that the debate on new Standing Order 90 will comprehend the question of the desirability of new Standing Order 130. The order of business will be as follows: first, the presentation of petitions; secondly, replies to Questions on Notice and to questions without notice previously asked; thirdly, asking questions without notice and giving notices of motion and questions; and, fourthly, motions and orders of the day. The motion already carried limits the time for questions without notice. The second and third items in the order of business tie in with the Standing Order that has just been adopted, limiting the lime for asking questions without notice to one hour.

The procedure recommended by the Standing Orders Committee for answering questions is designed to save time and to ensure that the time allotted to questions is made available for effective questioning. Consequently, it is intended to eliminate the time taken by members in asking on a subsequent day whether a Minister has an answer to a question previously asked and asking for the giving of that answer by the Minister. The recommended procedure is that those answers will be given to the Speaker two hours before the sitting and the Speaker, having examined them to see that they comply with Standing Orders, will direct that they be incorporated in *Hansard.* The same applies to answers to Questions on Notice. It is that procedure that necessitates the new routine of business provided in new Standing Order 90.

Mr. COUMBE: Regarding replies to questions without notice previously asked, what advice will the member who asked the question receive that the answer is being incorporated in *Hansard?*

The Hon. L. J. KING: Standing Order 130 provides:

> The answer to a Question on Notice or to a question without notice previously asked but not then answered shall be given by delivering the same to the Clerk in writing at least two hours before the time of meeting of the House each day and that after presentation of petitions the Speaker shall, if satisfied that the answers are in accordance with the Standing Orders, direct that a copy of the answer be supplied to the member who had asked the question and that such question and answer be printed in the official report of the Parliamentary Debates.

So, the Speaker gets the answer, and there will be a copy with the Clerk. The Speaker will announce each day that he has directed that the answers be incorporated in *Hansard.* So, the member who has asked the question has an answer supplied to him, and all other members will

know that the answer has been given and they can walk up to the table and inspect the Clerk's copy of the answer. So, if they wish to use Question Time to follow up an answer, they can do so during Question Time.

Dr. Tonkin: Will there be a copy of both the question and the reply?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Standing Order provides that the answer will be supplied. Presumably, the member involved will be able to track down his own question. If members desire to make an arrangement about the question, it is a matter of machinery. The actual Standing Order provides that the Minister will supply the answer to the Speaker.

Mr. EVANS: Is the existing Standing Order to prevail regarding the time in respect of giving replies to Questions on Notice? Replies to questions without notice can be subjected to long delays. Will the existing Standing Order prevail?

The Hon. L. J. King: There is no change.

Mr. EVANS: A guarantee by the Attorney would be some consolation.

The Hon. L. J. KING: There is no time limit included in Standing Orders in respect to replies to Questions on Notice. The practice is that replies are given on the Tuesday following the asking of the question. No alteration is foreseen, and nothing in this Standing Order affects the time limit.

Mr. McRAE: It was the intention of the Standing Orders Committee (I think unanimously) that, as part of the routine business, when the Speaker was incorporating into *Hansard* the answers to Questions on Notice and the answers to question without notice previously asked but not answered, he would give a short resume so that not only the members concerned but all members would know which replies were being given to the questions concerned. It was foreseen that the Speaker would say in respect of certain questions that he had received replies to those questions and that he would direct that they be incorporated in the Parliamentary record. Therefore, the fear expressed by members opposite that they would not be able to identify which questions were being answered is overcome by that procedure. This obviates the need to include this procedure in the Standing Order.

Mr. ARNOLD: It is essential that the procedure of replying to Questions on Notice and questions previously asked but not answered be streamlined, otherwise it could intrude into the one hour allowed for oral questions.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am pleased that at least one of the amendments was not passed on the casting vote of the Chairman. When will the laying of papers on the table by Ministers occur? Has provision been made for this?

The Hon. L. J. KING: There is no change in the recommendations regarding the laying of papers on the table, and the current practice will continue.

Mr. MATHWIN: Will the laying of papers on the table take up part of the one hour given to Question Time?

Motion carried.

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

That proposed Standing Order 129 be agreed to.

This is simply consequential on the adoption of new Standing Order 90 and the assumed adoption of Standing Order 130.

Motion carried.

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

That proposed Standing Order 130 be agreed to.

I have already explained this Standing Order when explaining Standing Order 90, and I commend it to the Committee.

Dr. TONKIN: The last part of proposed Standing Order 130 answers the question I asked earlier whether such questions and answers would be printed in the Official Report of the Parliamentary Debates. I presume that will be done at the beginning of each day.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Will copies of replies be made available to the press? If they are not, members of the press would have to examine *Hansard* pulls from the previous day and the relevant information could be old news.

The Hon. L. J. KING: This is not a matter included in Standing Orders. It is the practice of Ministers to supply copies of replies to the press, as is done with copies of second reading explanations, and this will certainly be done by Ministers.

Mr. COUMBE: We understood previously that we had one hour of Question Time clear of everything. However, a few moments ago I understood the Attorney to say that this hour would also include the laying on the table of papers and the giving of notices of motion by Ministers. Will the Attorney state categorically that during the hour of Question Time no other business will be transacted?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The amendment of the member for Mitcham substituted one hour for a fixed time of 3 p.m. Consequently, the question of matters that now take place during Question Time being changed did not arise. Little time is involved in these matters, which come within the discretion of the Speaker. I have had a conversation with him, and he says that he will be happy to adopt the procedure of calling for the laying on of papers and the giving of notices of motion before questions without notice, so that that will leave an hour for questions. It is to be understood that that does not preclude a Minister from giving a notice of motion during Question Time. When the Speaker calls for notices before Question Time, Ministers who have them available will give them at that time. However, if a Minister is not in the Chamber for some reason or if the Parliamentary Counsel has not completed the notice at that stage, it may be necessary for the Minister to give a notice later, during Question Time. There is no question of abandoning that right that exists at present for a Minister to give notice during Question Time, but the Speaker will adopt the practice of calling for the laying on of papers and the giving of notices of motion before questions without notice, thereby leaving a full hour for those questions.

Dr. EASTICK: I accept that assurance. It is understood that the giving of notices will be permitted during the hour.

Mr. MATHWIN: I thank the Attorney-General for that statement. I hope that the new procedure will allow Ministers to have more time to prepare Bills, so that we will not have another case of a roneoed copy of a Bill, as we had last year from the Minister of Education.

Mr. RUSSACK: Because the Government had accused the Opposition of wasting time during Question Time, I was worried that the Opposition might be stifled. Therefore, I am pleased that the Attorney has given this assurance with regard to these matters being dealt with before Question Time. I wish to express my appreciation to the Speaker as well, for his concurrence in adopting a procedure that would be more acceptable to the Opposition.

Motion carried.

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

That proposed Standing Order 144 be agreed to.

This proposal involves reducing the time for speeches from 45 minutes to 30 minutes. In addition, the practice of permitting an unlimited right of reply has actually been

written into the Standing Orders, this practice having always been adopted. The view of the majority of members of the Standing Orders Committee was that, provided the mover and the main speaker in Opposition were allowed unlimited time to express their views, the efficient dispatch of business would be better served by limiting the time of members' speeches. If they are willing to be candid, most members will admit that they can say in 30 minutes everything that needs to be said about a matter, given that the main speech has been made on the matter. It is simply a question of marshalling one's thoughts and arguments a little more carefully and taking care to express ideas without too much verbiage. The time limit might lead to a greater degree of quality in speeches. J do not think any member will suffer any hardship, in this regard, and I hope that some of the looseness of thought and expression, which is not uncharacteristic of some speeches, will be eliminated.

Mr. COUMBE: Despite what the Attorney has said, I oppose the amendment. Members this evening agreed to a reduction of one hour in the time available to private members to ask questions. Now, we are being asked to agree that private members (that is, virtually everyone except those members on the front Government bench) should have not 45 minutes but 30 minutes in which to speak.

The Bon. Hugh Hudson: That would also apply to Ministers speaking on Bills that are not their responsibility.

Mr. COUMBE: That is so, and that is the only good thing I can see about il. Time limits have operated in this Parliament for only a few years and, if the present time limit of 45 minutes for speeches is reduced to 30 minutes, members in this Parliament, which comprises 47 members, will have the same time available to them to speak as have members of the largest House of Parliament in Australia, the House of Representatives, with its 126 members. I understand that this was not a unanimous recommendation by the Standing Orders Committee an aspect that should be borne in mind. Our rights are being whittled away.

Many important measures are considered in this Chamber, and I would be the first to agree that a mover of a Bill and the main speaker in reply should have unlimited time in which to speak. However, subsequent important matters that need to be raised by members cannot be canvassed in 30 minutes. Also, it should not be overlooked that not all members take their full time. This is a matter for regulation by the Parties concerned. Because this involves a matter of free speech, I oppose the motion.

Mr. EVANS: I, too, oppose the motion, believing that we are witnessing a gradual restriction of the rights of private members. If, during the debate on the Loan Estimates, the Budget or the Address in Reply, a member is keenly interested in referring to his district, especially if it is a developing district, it is necessary for him to have more than half an hour in which to speak. I agree, on the other hand, that half an hour is sufficient in some cases, as *Hansard* will show. However, members who were in this Chamber from 1968 to 1970 will remember when a member of the Australian Labor Party spoke for 3¼ hours on Scientology. Although questions were asked and statements made regarding his speaking for that time, I should prefer to suffer that for the sake of democracy. Our way of life has been brought about by a proper examination of matters in this Parliament and by a proper application of the laws.

As my colleagues know, I was not enthusiastic about restricting to three-quarters of an hour the time available to members to speak to a Bill. I am even less enthusiastic about reducing that time limit by one-third to half an hour. Can the Government imagine, in a 47-member House, the burden that this will place on the Opposition? In this respect I refer to the Education Act. which was recently re-enacted. How long was it available to members to enable them to give it the necessary scrutiny? We had one week to consider a Bill that the Education Department took about five years to formulate. If the speaking time is reduced and the Government continues to introduce Bills as though they are coming from a machine gun or a pea shooter, with Government members not speaking in debates, the burden on the Opposition will be greater than at present. Government members have the benefit of an explanation. in their Party meeting, by the Minister of the pros and cons of a Bill, but the Opposition hears only the good side and must seek information from the community.

I do not think Government members can deny that filibustering occurs at times because we are waiting for information from people or bodies interested in legislation before us. No member of this Parliament knows all about everything: he may not even know all about one thing. The more we restrict members the less will be their opportunity to obtain information from other people. If the Government would arrange for a waiting time under the Standing Orders of six sitting days between when a Bill was explained and when it was debated, I would accept the proposal, but a problem would arise with the Address in Reply and Supply Bill debates. We have had other examples apart from the Education Bill, and I refer to the Land and Business Agents Bill that was introduced last year, The next move may be for the number of members to be increased to 50 and for the speaking time to be reduced to 20 minutes. Standing Orders affect all members and they should not be a matter of Government policy, but the Opposition cannot win. It can only lose, because the Government has the numbers.

Mr. MATHWIN: I oppose the amendment as strongly as I opposed an earlier amendment. I understand that this proposal is the result of a decision of the Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee, as a casting vote. That means that this is a matter of the Government's saying what il wants and directing the Chairman. In any committee, if there is a deadlock, the Chairman usually votes to preserve the *status quo.*

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ruled earlier this evening on similar remarks by the member for Glenelg when his remarks were reflecting on the Chair. I ask him not to follow that line.

Mr. MATHWIN: If I upset you by reflecting on you, Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to do so and I apologize. I consider that any member of this Chamber is as important as another and I, as a back-bencher with a responsibility to my constituents will discharge that responsibility. Sometimes I need more than 30 minutes to put my case, yet the time limit here is being reduced by one-third. This is entirely wrong. The Attorney-General has not given any shining examples of what happens in other States or in the Commonwealth Parliament. I wonder why—because it would not look too good! In the House of Commons in 1965, 95 members of Parliament spoke for an average of 29 minutes on the Queen's Address. The House of Commons sits each day from Monday to Friday, so members have many opportunities to approach the Government and to ask questions, and to speak for and against Bills. The National People's Congress of China meets only once a year. Is this how we will finish up?

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I take a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The fact that the People's Congress of China meets only once a year has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with the proposition, which relates to the reduction of time allowed for speeches in this House, and I ask that the honourable member confine himself to that point.

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order.

Mr. MATHWIN: I was simply trying to point out what could happen here with the whittling down of the time allowed for members' speeches. If this trend continues, the ultimate aim could be that the Government will fix it so that we meet once a year. There must be some reason why it wants to cut down the debate. In the House of Representatives in the United States of America, all members are allowed to speak for one hour, and that is a bigger Parliament than this. That ruling has been in existence for 100 years. Members speak whenever they wish for a maximum of one hour. Presumably the lenient American Government would give members extra time if they wished. There must be some reason why the South Australian Government is making this move. Is it working up to a 35-hour week in Parliament? Are we to set an example to the public by cutting down Question Time and by reducing the time for speeches?

The CHAIRMAN: The 35-hour week has nothing to do with the Bill. We are discussing a speaking time of 30 minutes and I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to that subject.

Mr. MATHWIN: I was simply searching for information. I do not know whether that is the idea behind this move.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member for Glenelg.

Mr. MATHWIN: The basis of the whole thing is to subdue the Opposition, to belittle the Opposition, and to crush minorities. It is a denial of freedom of speech in this House. If this is not the reason, then why is the Government doing it? Generally speaking, very few members take the full time when they speak, but they should be given the opportunity to do that if they wish. However, the Government will not allow this. I wonder how the member for Playford would feel if he were putting a case in court and if he were told to sit down after he had spoken only a few minutes. He would object most strongly; he would be up and down like a fiddler's elbow. The Government is determined to call members of the Opposition to heel. I remember one of the first speeches of the member for Playford when he likened the Upper House to a man with a riding crop with the dogs behind him, being called to heel. I suppose he had in mind bringing the Opposition to heel and cutting down the time, first for questions and then for speeches. This is a democratic Parliament and the Government should support the Opposition at every opportunity. It is a bad policy to cut questions by a half and speeches by a third. In a round-about way the Government is getting at the back-bencher, because in many cases it has more to fear from the outspoken back-bencher, and now it is getting back at him. A member has no chance at all.

The member for Fisher spoke of the legislation passed in this Parliament, especially at the end of each session. I put the question previously and got no reply, but again I ask the Minister to say what is the reason for cutting down a member's time. Are we to expect a great deal of legislation to come through willy-nilly? Are we to be faced with the usual intake of legislation at the end of the session? Last year the Minister of Education introduced a lengthy Bill on the education system; it was introduced into this House on a Thursday and was passed by both Houses by the following Thursday. Yet members are supposed to get information from experts before they debate Bills! I do not believe that this is a fair go. It is only through decisions of the Chairman of the committee and his two colleagues that this matter is before us tonight.

Mr. McRAE: The honourable member has just provided a classic example of the kind of practice that the committee had in mind; his speech lasted 28.35 minutes and you, Mr. Chairman, were absolutely lenient with him. He was called to order when he dealt with the People's Congress in China, and in his speech he wandered all over the world and repeated himself on at least a dozen occasions. He made every attempt to string out his speech and he was helped by laughter and by numerous interjections, largely from me.

Mr. MATHWIN: I rise on a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The honourable member is accusing me of being irrelevant in my speech, but he has not spoken on the motion at all, and he has been speaking for several minutes.

The CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. The honourable member for Playford.

Mr. McRAE: If a member had done his homework he could, in three to five minutes, have made the same points as the member for Glenelg made, and he could have viciously attacked the Government and the committee and he could have made his attack come across a great deal more effectively than the member for Glenelg did. I shall explain to the honourable member why the majority of the committee acted as it did. First, the decision was not unanimous; secondly, there was no decision of Caucus; and thirdly, as far as I am aware, there was no Cabinet decision. At the first meeting of the committee I said (and the honourable member's colleagues can confirm this) that I thought we could well leave the time limit at 45 minutes because many members did not use all of that time; I said that to reduce it to 30 minutes might invite loquacious members to use up the full 30 minutes. I changed my mind because of my experience at the Constitution Convention, which I attended with the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Mitcham, the Attorney-General and the Premier. At that convention there was a 20-minute time limit on speeches and in that time we got accurate, concise speeches covering every bit of ground.

During the last two days of the convention there was a 10-minute time limit on speeches, and again (once the crunch was there) people made their points all light. With the protection provided whereby the main speaker in opposition has unlimited time and with the protection of the Committee system, where members can speak on each clause with unlimited time and can rise to speak on an unlimited number of occasions, to suggest that a 30-minute time limit will produce a subservient situation like that in Mao's China, Kosygin's Russia or Nixon's America is an insult. I do not accept any of those regimes as being democratic, but the honourable member is dealing here with a democratic committee and a democratic Government. If members do their homework they can hammer the hell out of the Government in 30 minutes. It is a question of the Opposition preparing its own business in the best way possible. It is the Government's responsibility to put through the business that it was elected to put through. I do not care what happened in previous Parliaments. At one stage there was an unlimited time for speeches, and members abused that. Some members have

abused the 45-minute time limit, and I believe that a 30-minute time limit will help us a great deal.

Mr. EVANS: The honourable member has raised the matter of the Constitution Convention. I point out that the Commonwealth representatives at that convention had more than 40 top-line advisers and research officers preparing material for the debates. Some of the speakers at the convention said that they could not get through all the material they had in 20 minutes. Further, the resolutions were available to many members for a considerable time before the actual debate; so, the members had time to conduct research. When the time limit for speeches at the convention was reduced to 10 minutes some members could not get their remarks into that period, and they sought leave to incorporate material into the record of the debates. If the Government would consider giving the Opposition time to research material, one could accept a 30-minute time limit. However, no-one has said that reasonable time for research will be allowed.

Mr. GUNN: I oppose the motion. The Attorney-General implied that the present system was cumbersome and inefficient. It has been recognized that the Parliamentary system of democracy is cumbersome and inefficient, but it is important in the creation of new laws affecting every citizen that Parliament properly scrutinizes and discusses them. If members opposite do not like attending sittings, they should not seek re-election. It seems that members of one Party have gone home.

Mrs. Byrne: We would never get home if we all spoke.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We are speaking to the amendment to Standing Orders. I ask the honourable member for Eyre to confine his remarks to that topic.

Mr. GUNN: If this motion is carried it will reduce the time in which a member can discuss a matter before the House. I illustrate this point in speaking against the curtailment of members' rights. I refer to the contribution to debates made by the member for Salisbury, who has made only two speeches—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ruled a few moments ago in this regard. We are discussing not the Labor Party but a report of the Standing Orders Committee. If the honourable member does not confine his remarks to that, I will rule him out of order. The honourable member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: On such an important occasion involving the fundamental issues of Parliamentary democracy, I should have expected that every member would be in the Chamber. Where are the Liberal Movement members tonight? After 11 o'clock they go home to bed.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Eyre.

Mr. GUNN: Although many members do not want to exercise their rights they now support a course of action which will deny to those members who wish to scrutinize the actions of the Government the opportunity to do so. The Attorney-General apparently does not want the duly elected members of this House to exercise their democratic right. This is a classic case of the Executive directing Parliament instead of a Parliament directing the Executive. The Attorney gives only brief explanations to important amendments to Standing Orders and brushes aside all criticism laid against him. By the casting vote of the Chairman of the Standing Orders Committee all honourable members will have their democratic rights swept away. With the support of Caucus, the Attorney could bring the procedures in this Parliament into line with procedures of other Parliaments because all Government members must accept them because they have signed the pledge. Why has not the Attorney referred to the Standing Orders Committee the suggestion put by the member for Davenport concerning a grievance debate? Why has he not considered the adoption of the principle of the Speaker and Chairman of Committees being drawn from both sides of the House? That would speed up the operations of the running of Parliament.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must refer to the report of the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. GUNN: I am concerned about the lack of interest shown by members in debating this matter, especially the Liberal Movement members who have gone home to bed.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The honourable member must debate the proposed Standing Order. Any reference to Parties is out of order.

Mr. GUNN: I am pleased to be a member of a democratic Party which allows its members to exercise their independence. I am entirely opposed to this motion and I support the member for Fisher and the member for Glenelg. I am disappointed that the publicity seekers have gone home to bed because the press has stopped taking notes.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (21)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Groth, Harrison, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (17)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe (teller), Eastick, Evans, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dunstan and Hopgood. Noes—Messrs. Goldsworthy and Rodda.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

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

That proposed Standing Order 298 be agreed to.

This simply provides that where a Bill requires a constitutional majority the bells shall be rung for two minutes before the Speaker counts members for the purpose of putting the question. I think at times we have all seen Whips faced with the problem of having their members in the Chamber at the moment the last speech concludes before the vote is taken. I think that it is reasonable that, where a constitutional majority is required for a Bill to become law, members should be warned of the fact that a count is about to be taken for the purpose, and that the bells should be rung for this purpose.

Motion carried.

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

That proposed Standing Order 299A be agreed to.

This will enable the incorporation in *Hansard,* by leave, of the second reading explanation of a Bill. Much time can be saved in this way. Some people might say that this would also save the vocal cords of Ministers. Certainly, we have all seen long second reading explanations read here with no-one listening to them, not even the member who is to get the adjournment of the debate for the Opposition. Such a member reasonably prefers to read and absorb the explanation in his own way, rather than listen to a long reading of it.

The latter is a ridiculous practice. Ministers read their explanations at a fast rate, the time of the Chamber being taken up unnecessarily. It will be just as satisfactory for the explanation to be incorporated in *Hansard.* Members then have the opportunity to read it; by convention, the Opposition member who has obtained the adjournment is

given a copy of the explanation. In this way, time can be saved and the same result achieved. An explanation can be incorporated only by leave, a member always being able to have the explanation read in the Chamber, if anyone wants to listen.

Dr. EASTICK: The proposed Standing Order refers to the inclusion of the explanation or part thereof. In what circumstances would there be a benefit in partially incorporating a second reading explanation? In explaining a Bill yesterday, the Premier referred in part to his prepared explanation, then ad-libbed, then went back to the explanation, ad-libbed some more, and finally came back to the explanation. I assume that he was giving a little more information than that contained in the bare bones of the explanation prepared for him by officers. Only by leave can the explanation be incorporated in *Hansard* without the Minister's reading it. In such circumstances, in the absence of the Leader, Whip, and Deputy Leader, an Opposition member may feel disposed to oppose leave being granted, without reflecting on any arrangement made, and require the Minister to read the second reading explanation. If this precaution were taken away, it would erode the benefits of Opposition members. However, there is the danger to which I have referred whereby leave can be denied on the objection of one member. I acknowledge that this provision applies in relation to many other matters.

Why does the provision relating to second reading explanations refer to a part of a second reading explanation, and why was the matter of including a second reading explanation in *Hansard* not made the subject of a majority vote? I think that at some stage the fact that one member can prevent leave being granted will cause embarrassment or contention.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Regarding the Leader's second point, I suppose that much of what is done in the transaction of Parliamentary business depends on the good sense of members. After all, Ministerial statements and personal explanations are made by leave, and leave is always granted, as it is also granted in respect of including statistical material in *Hansard* without its being read. The assumption is that when people are elected to represent their constituents in this place they are judged by their constituents to be responsible. We must assume that they will act responsibly, because, if they do not so act, the workings of Parliament will become difficult indeed. The Standing Orders Committee framed this on the basis that it was dealing with 47 responsible members. I hope that it turns out so in practice. I am confident that it will, because I do not think any member wants to sit here and listen to second reading explanations.

Mr. Coumbe: We did this afternoon.

The Hon. L. J. KING: That may be so, and in some cases it may be desirable for the explanation to be read. However, I have delivered as many second reading explanations a year since I have been a member as perhaps has any Minister, and I have not noticed any considerable glimmer of interest evinced by Opposition members while I have been reading them.

Dr. Eastick: I remember wondering whether a recent one was read or garbled.

The Hon. L. J. KING: That is so. Although I have not been able to look at my colleagues behind me, I have noticed that Opposition members have not listened to second reading explanations, for which I do not criticize them. It is much more satisfactory for one to read the printed word and absorb it. I am confident that, once they get used to the idea, members will agree, as a matter of course, to the granting of leave, because they will realize that it is a satisfactory way to approach the matter.

The second reading explanation serves two purposes: first, it is a vehicle for the mover to persuade members that he has produced a desirable Bill; and secondly, it affords him an opportunity to explain the Bill. It may be that a member wants to rely on the former. He is entitled to make a speech and to put his argument to the House, if he so desires. A second reading explanation may well consist partly of arguments that the Minister desires to address to the House and partly by a technical explanation of the clauses. Perhaps he may wish to deliver part of it and to incorporate in *Hansard* another part of it. For that reason, provision is being made for part of the speech to be incorporated in *Hansard* by leave, if that is desired.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Attorney say whether it is intended that the explanations of the two most important financial measures, the Loan Estimates and the Budget, which are followed with much interest by Opposition members, will continue to be read?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have not discussed this matter with the Premier, who is also the Treasurer and who would be introducing them. It will be for him to decide whether he wants to seek leave for this purpose. Although I do not know his point of view, I do not think he would be terribly enthusiastic about reading these second reading explanations and, frankly, I doubt the statement made by the member for Torrens that members follow second reading explanations. I have sat here on each occasion that the explanation of the Budget has been given, and I have watched the reaction of members. I am certain that all Opposition members who are following the matter are reading pages ahead. Certainly, they are reading and not listening; this illustrates that it is much more satisfactory to absorb the printed word by reading than it is to listen to a speech. Perhaps the Premier may choose to discuss the matter with the Leader of the Opposition before making a decision. That is a matter for him.

The sort of thing that obviously cries out for incorporation in *Hansard* is the second reading explanation to which the Leader referred and which I had already given in the previous Parliament. No-one wanted to listen to that, and I do not blame members for that. Members have heard it, read it and discussed it, and it was just a waste of time my reading it! Individual Ministers will have to decide whether they want to seek leave in certain cases, and they may choose to discuss the matter with the Leader before doing so.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I appreciate some of the points the Attorney has made. However, I should like to know when copies of second reading explanations will be made available to members, as it could be embarrassing for them if they are asked by a constituent what the second reading explanation of a Bill which has just been given is all about. It is difficult for members to obtain a copy of explanations from the *Hansard* pull, as only one copy of it is made available to each room.

Mr. Coumbe: And it isn't available until the next day.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: That is so. Also, the press, being vitally interested to know what Bills are about, would want a copy of second reading explanations.

Mr. MATHWIN: I wonder why the present practice, which has obtained for so long with no ill-effects, should be discontinued. The only reason the Attorney gave was that it was a waste of time and that the new Standing Order would streamline the whole procedure. I believe it

would be easier for members to understand Bills if they could follow the second reading explanations when they were being read. I agree with what the member for Davenport said regarding the provisions of second reading explanations. As I have seen when I have been a member of a Select Committee, one can follow what is being said more easily by following written submissions. Therefore, this matter is worth reconsideration by the Government.

Mr. GUNN: I support the member for Davenport. If the Ministers intend to adopt this change, members should at least be given a copy of the second reading explanation. Recently, a Bill was introduced but printed copies of it were not available, yet members had to address meetings about it that evening.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: If you don't get a copy, you can refuse leave.

Mr. GUNN: The next thing will be that the Government will make it mandatory that Ministers do not read the explanations.

Mr. EVANS: In most cases, a private member would want to read the second reading explanation of a Bill he was introducing, but we should not deny him the opportunity to include the explanation without reading it, if he desires so to do. Before moving an amendment, I ask the Attorney why that right has not been given.

The Hon. L. J. KING: As far as I recall, this matter was not even mentioned at the meeting of the Standing Orders Committee. Certainly, no effort was made to have this provided for. I think it was assumed that a private member would want to speak in support of his Bill, and for that reason there did not seem to be any point in the matter. There does not seem to be much point in putting into Standing Orders a provision that is not likely to be used, but I have no strong views on the matter. I would not favour amending the Standing Order as the honourable member has suggested, although I do not say that I would oppose such an amendment if it were moved. I think it is better to. adopt the committee's recommendation.

Mr. EVANS: The occasion may arise: for instance, a private member may have laryngitis when he wants to introduce a Bill. I therefore move:

To strike out "Minister of the Crown" and insert "member".

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING (Attorney-General) moved:

That the report of the Standing Orders Committee, 1973, including proposed amendments to Standing Orders, as amended, be adopted.

Motion carried.

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

That the alterations to the. Standing Orders, as adopted by this House, be laid before the Governor by the Speaker for approval, pursuant to. section 55 of the Constitution Act, 1934-72.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 12.40 a.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, October 24, at 2 p.m.