

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, November 29, 1973

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

Pyramid Sales,
Reynella Oval (Vesting),
Roseworthy Agricultural College,
Urban Land (Price Control).

**ROAD TRAFFIC ACT AMENDMENT BILL
(WEIGHTS)**

At 2.7 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to amendments Nos. 1 to 3:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendments.

As to amendment No. 4:

That the Legislative Council do not further insist on its amendment but make the following amendment in lieu thereof:

- (7) In considering whether to grant exemptions that are to be effective while the exempted vehicles are carrying loads consisting of primary produce, the board shall subject to the requirements of road safety give due consideration to the need for the transfer of primary produce without undue delay from the point of production to the place at which it is to be stored or processed, or from which it is to be carried further by some other form of transportation.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

Later:

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

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to. At the conference, the managers were confronted with several propositions. Rather than deal with the amendments in numerical form, I think it is simpler to deal with the various subject matters. The Legislative Council had proposed that the membership of the Road Traffic Board be increased from three to four (or certainly that it be increased) to provide for a representative of primary industry. This proposition was previously fully debated in this Chamber and rejected. The managers from the House of Assembly maintained that attitude at the conference, and eventually the Legislative Council was willing to withdraw its insistence on that amendment.

Secondly, the Legislative Council desired that the committee established under the Bill to advise the Registrar on gross vehicle weights and gross combination weights should also contain a representative of primary industry. The Government adopted the attitude in the debate in this Chamber (and the managers carried it into the conference room) that the advisory committee was a committee of professional and technical experts. It was not a committee of sectional representatives, but one that would be able, on a technical level, to advise the Registrar. The managers from the Legislative Council acknowledged the folly of their amendment and did not proceed with it.

The next matter was a proposition of the Legislative Council to provide a general (but, nevertheless, continuing) exemption for vehicles carrying specific types of primary

produce, but the Government does not believe there should be special provisions for one section of the community. However, we have agreed to include an additional clause (clause 7), which follows the exemptions clause in relation to weights, etc., and which requires the board to consider specific matters. An important point included is that the board's decision is "subject to the requirements of road safety". As a result, if the board grants an exemption it will require the vehicle being exempted to take the shortest practical route when it is contravening the general provisions of the legislation.

Mr. BECKER: In supporting the motion, I pay a tribute to the managers, who acted wisely in agreeing to a compromise. I agree with the Minister's remarks on the requirements of road safety.

Mr. GUNN: I agree with the Minister that the conference was valuable but, unfortunately, I believe the attitude of some managers was not conciliatory. The points made by the Legislative Council were valid and designed to protect the largest group of owners of commercial vehicles in this State who, while not wanting any special privilege, desire the right to be able economically to carry their goods to market. The compromise reached has gone some of the way but should have gone further. If it has the result of not being in the best interests of those vehicle users who will be affected, I hope the Minister will review the situation and introduce amending legislation.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE REPORTS

The SPEAKER laid on the table the following reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, together with minutes of evidence:

Brighton-Christie Downs Railway (Duplication and Extension South of Beach Road),
Mines Department Building, Glenside,
Uley South Underground Water Basin.

Ordered that reports be printed.

QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER: I direct that the following written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

MORGAN DOCKYARD

In reply to Mr. ALLEN (August 29).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Work on the new dockyard at Swanport has commenced and is scheduled for completion in three years. This programme is subject to the availability of funds, but no other delays are expected. The facilities at Morgan are unsatisfactory from the point of view of efficiency in operation and also in relation to the working conditions for employees. It is therefore considered undesirable to delay the move to Swanport. However, it is expected that the present employees at the dockyards will continue to be employed at Morgan until the new dockyards are completed, that is, in three years time.

WHEAT QUOTAS

In reply to Mr. HALL (October 18).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The question of the admission of non-quota wheat into the quota system is a matter for the Australian Wheat Board and the industry to decide. I am not aware of any approaches to the Government by either party to alter the present situation. Apparently, the amount of wheat involved is only a few thousand bushels.

HAWTHORNDENE SEWERAGE

In reply to Mr. EVANS (November 21).

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: A temporary sewage pumping station has been installed at Hawthorndene because there will be a delay in obtaining the permanent pumps, which are of a special type because of the high-head conditions. This action has been taken to make sewerage facilities available as soon as possible rather than wait until the permanent pumping station has been completed. Some difficulty has been experienced with the temporary pump and there have been several overflows, but in each case the overflow has been cleaned up and sterilized. A different type of temporary pump is intended to be established this week that should overcome the problems. It is pointed out that, at this stage, a large proportion of the liquid being handled through the pumping station is water from the sewer-construction trenches.

The installation is checked daily but, because of the difficulties being experienced, arrangements are being made for an alarm to be installed that will alert the control room at Thebarton as soon as a pump stoppage occurs. The difficulties regarding voltage drops when the pumps cut in are regretted but, at this stage, little can be done until the permanent pumping station is completed and permanent supply and transformers from the Electricity Trust of South Australia are available. Every effort is being made to complete the permanent pumping station as soon as possible, and it is expected that it will be operating by the end of the summer.

MISSING PERSONS

In reply to Mr. BECKER (November 8).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Between January 1, 1973, and November 16, 1973, 3 013 persons were reported missing, and 165 are still outstanding. Of this number 91 are females and 74 males. Although the number outstanding seems considerable, it should be appreciated that most of these people are the subject of matrimonial disputes; namely, children whose parents are in the process of divorce, are separated, or one party to a divorce or separation has moved from his last known address without informing the other party, mental patients who have failed to return to institutions, and others who have been reported missing but we are satisfied have voluntarily absented themselves from the usual place of abode. Of the 165 persons listed there are only three in respect of which suspicious circumstances apply. These include the child one year, the boy Shannon, who was removed from his mother's care by the father on June 9, 1973; the father was killed in a vehicular accident and the child has not been found. The children four years and 11 years are the Gordon and Ratcliffe children respectively, the subjects of the Adelaide Oval abduction case on August 25, 1973.

BALDNESS

In reply to Dr. TONKIN (August 1).

The Hon. L. J. KING: This matter is still under consideration as to whether and what legislation is required to prevent false claims as to the prevention, cure, or alleviation of baldness.

GLENGOWRIE HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to Mr. MATHWIN (November 7).

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: At the request of the Secondary Division of the Education Department, the Planning and Design Section, Public Buildings Department, has prepared a master plan of the future accommodation needs of the Glengowrie High School. This is now being

examined by officers of the division before being submitted to the high school council. To make the school a fully comprehensive secondary school with facilities equivalent to those provided in our latest general purpose high schools, modifications and additions in solid structure are required in certain areas; for example, drama, music, physical education, additional craft facilities, and some general learning areas.

However, it must be appreciated that, because Glengowrie High School is a relatively modern school, it already possesses facilities not provided in many other schools. Some of these schools are almost entirely composed of wooden buildings, amongst which are many 'obsolete structures. Consequently, in allocating available funds, priority must be given at least to partial upgrading of the older, less fortunate schools before further building development can take place at schools such as Glengowrie. The proliferation of transportable rooms at Glengowrie High School admittedly is aesthetically unattractive, but, despite the criticism levelled at them by the honourable member; it should be appreciated that they are functionally sound, and the fact that they are able to be erected very quickly has been of inestimable value in meeting the needs of schools, especially where unexpectedly rapid expansion in student enrolment has occurred.

In the case of Glengowrie it should be noted that, as a result of the conversion of neighbouring single-sex technical high schools to co-educational high schools and the levelling out of housing development in the area, enrolments have reached their peak. According to the latest estimate of the first-year intake in 1974, the total school population will be reduced from its present enrolment of over 1 400 to fewer than 1 200 in a few years. Thus progressive removal of many of the transportable units from the school site will be possible.

BLACKWOOD BRIDGE

In reply to Mr. EVANS (November 14).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Land will be available as a result of a subdivision for the approaches to the new bridge that is to be constructed over the railway line south of Blackwood High and Primary Schools. The land south of the line which is subject to the subdivision application allows for a 10ft. (3 m) wide public walk-way to the bridge site. The bridge is at present being designed by the Railways Department and is expected to be constructed next year. The decision to build the bridge was made by Cabinet some 12 months ago with the cost being shared equally by the Education Department, Mitcham council and the Minister of Transport through the Transport Planning and Development Branch. As its contribution the Railways Department will design, construct and maintain the bridge. The purchase of land does not arise, as it will be vested in the council as a condition of the subdivision approval.

BELAIR NATIONAL PARK

In reply to Mr EVANS (November 14).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: No survey work has been carried out by representatives of the Highways Department in Belair National Park for many years. The last survey work carried out in this area was in 1963.

KANGAROO ISLAND FERRY

In reply to Mr CHAPMAN (November 15).

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Kangaroo Island Ferry Co-ordinating Committee has accumulated sufficient data to enable hydraulic model studies to be instituted to test the preliminary design developed for a ferry terminal at

Cape Jervis. The firm of Geo. Wimpey & Company Limited of Middlesex, England, has been retained to carry out the study because of its considerable expertise in this field. Details of the proposed harbor layout and a summary of available hydrographic, meteorologic, and topographic data have been forwarded to the firm with a request for terms of engagement under which it would be willing to undertake the work. Advice has been received that a proposal is now being prepared. Funds to the extent of \$63 000 have been approved for 1973-74 to cover the cost of the model studies and the survey work being carried out by the Marine and Harbors Department in the Backstairs Passage area under the aegis of the committee.

EMERGENCY HOUSING

In reply to Mr. DUNCAN (October 31).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: The Government is aware of the need for emergency housing, and I am very concerned by the inability of families to find accommodation while waiting for Housing Trust assistance. The Housing Trust has attempted to meet the most critical cases through the establishment of a priority housing scheme, which was introduced after consultation with various professional people from the welfare and health fields. Unfortunately, the demand for houses under the scheme is so great that to assist all of them would mean the trust would rarely be able to accommodate people from the normal waiting list. The honourable member will be aware that the Highways Department also owns houses, which are often used by welfare agencies in emergencies.

A third solution is the provision of grants or loans by the Community Welfare Department towards bond money or rent in advance. This allows those families, who because of low incomes rarely have savings, to obtain private rental accommodation. The Housing Trust does not consider that the former Smithfield Migrant Hostel is suitable for conversion into housing for those on the waiting list. The Australian Government is at present considering the disposal of the hostel site, and the trust has expressed an interest in acquiring the site. I am at present investigating other possible solutions to the emergency housing problem.

OYSTER FARMING

In reply to Mr. HALL (November 28).

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD. No proposals are known for oyster farming in the Port Broughton area, but it is understood that interest has been shown in prawn farming by Mr. Racovalis, who is believed to have Japanese connections.

PORT AUGUSTA HOUSING

In reply to Mr. KENEALLY (November 13)

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: I believe that, if some 1 400 job places are to be actually in the petro-chemical complex at Redcliffs, it is probable that the total new job places in the area will reach 5 000, which will include the natural growth rate of Port Augusta without Redcliffs. The Housing Trust is thinking at the moment of a programme of about 3 000 houses, but this may be too small, because it is unlikely that the private sector will take up the balance. The plan is to increase its existing programme in so far as it is able, and to try to use 1974 to plan commencements in at least two areas with a view to beginning really serious construction in 1975. This could mean that at least 500 houses could be commenced in 1975, rising to 1 000 in 1976, 1977, and possibly even in 1978, depending on how many ancillary jobs are generated by the 1 400 work places in the plant.

I should add that there will be little hope of getting anywhere near the volume of production necessary with traditional house building, and that many houses will have to be imported to the site. The Housing Trust's experience of importing over 3 000 houses in the early 1950's suggests that, in a time of high employment, to import building labour and materials is the only way to overcome the actual shortage in a region. I am not implying the import must be from overseas, but certainly it must be from an area outside the immediate influence of a construction job the size of Redcliffs.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

In reply to Mr. WRIGHT (November 6).

Dr EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): The union official to whom I referred in asking my question on the recent strike within the brick manufacturing industry was Mr. J. C. Lewin. Industrial Officer for the Australian Workers Union Mr. Lewin is from New South Wales, not Melbourne as I indicated. The member for Adelaide may well be correct in his claim that Mr Lewin has no say in respect of union policy, but my contention that he was involved with and assisted union involvement in the brick industry strike was correct. Mr. Lewin conducted the negotiations with the employers in this industry, negotiations which, for the first time ever, broke down and resulted in strike action. It would seem that the all-or-nothing attitude adopted by Mr. Lewin in his negotiating role was a major factor in causing this first-ever strike within the industry.

I am told that the employers, confronted with a 17-page log of claims, made major concessions on 18 of the 22 clauses, including an offer of an \$8 a week wage increase. The union response, however, was that it sought \$10 without compromise, and this hard-line official union attitude resulted in the strike. The responsible attitude adopted by the employers and their desire to achieve an acceptable settlement to the log of claims was, I believe, acknowledged by the decision of Commissioner Pryke at the compulsory conference on November 8 in the South Australian Industrial Commission. Commissioner Pryke ordered the A.W.U. to direct the strikers to return to work, to remove pickets, to accept the \$8 a week increase and return before the commission in six months to discuss claims for the additional \$2 a week increase, shift allowances, penalties and overtime increases.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the sittings of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells, to enable the managers to resume the adjourned conference on the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This motion has been moved without any reasons being given for it. I point out to the Deputy Premier that this is the last day on which we expect to sit before some time in February. I am certain several members (and I am certainly one of them) have questions to ask. As I understand the new Standing Orders, if we suspend the sittings it will effectively (and perhaps this is the idea of the exercise) cut out Question Time, which would otherwise run for the full hour. For the life of me, I cannot see any reason why we should not go on with questions while we are waiting for the managers to complete their conference. I may say that this is one of the disadvantages of the so-called new system

for conferences whereby we do not go on straight away with the conference, as soon as the Houses adjourn for it, and stay until it is finished, giving plenty of time, during the evening if necessary, for it to take place.

I suggest that, in all fairness to members, the Deputy Premier should have canvassed these matters when moving his motion. No doubt he hoped that it would slip through with no-one saying anything. I suspect that, if I had not spoken, that might have been the case. However, I seek from him an assurance that private members such as I will not be prejudiced by the carrying of this motion, because we would be deprived of our last opportunity in this part of the session to ask questions I hope that the Deputy Premier will at least have the courtesy, when replying to the debate, to answer the point and give that assurance.

The House divided on the motion:

Ayes (28)—Messrs. Allen, Max Brown, and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs Corcoran (teller), Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Eastick, Evans, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Venning, Virgo, Wardle, Wells, and Wright.

Noes (13)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Chapman, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Millhouse (teller), Nankivell, Russack, and Tonkin.

Majority of 15 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

[Sitting suspended from 2.16 to 7.30 p.m.]

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL

At 7.30 p.m. the following recommendations of the conference were reported to the House:

As to amendment No. 1:

That the Legislative Council insist on its amendments but make the following additional amendment:

Clause 4, after paragraph (a) insert:

- (b) by striking out from the definition of "injury" in subsection (1) the word "and" immediately following paragraph (a);
- (ba) by inserting after the word "disease" in paragraph (b) of the definition of "injury" in subsection (1) the passage "not being a coronary heart disease";
- (bb) by inserting in the definition of "injury" in subsection (1) after paragraph (b) the following word and paragraph—
and
- (c) the aggravation, acceleration, exacerbation, deterioration or recurrence of any pre-existing coronary heart disease.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto and make the following consequential amendment:

Insert new clause (4a) as follows:

(4a) Section 9 of the principal Act is amended by inserting immediately after subsection (4) the following subsection:

(4a) In the case of an injury that is an aggravation, acceleration, exacerbation, deterioration or recurrence of any pre-existing coronary heart disease it shall be a defence to a claim for compensation for the employer to prove that the employment did not contribute to the injury.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendments Nos. 2, 8, 9 and 10:

That the House of Assembly do not further insist on its disagreement to the Legislative Council's amendments.

As to amendment No. 12:

That the Legislative Council insist on its amendment but make the following additional amendment thereto:

From proposed new section 63 strike out subsections (b) and (c) and insert:

(b) by way of special rates paid to the workman to compensate for disabilities under which work has been performed.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

As to amendments Nos. 5 and 11:

That the Legislative Council insist on its amendments and the House of Assembly do not further insist on its alternative amendments thereto.

That the Legislative Council make the following consequential amendment to the Bill:

Clause 29—Strike out proposed subsection (4a) proposed to be inserted and insert the following proposed subsection in lieu thereof:

(4a) Where a policy of insurance, at the time of issue, indemnified or indemnifies an employer for the full amount of his liability under this Act or the repealed Act, whether that policy of insurance was issued before, on or after the commencement of the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Act, 1973, that policy of insurance shall, in respect of any injury sustained during the period of the policy or any renewal thereof and notwithstanding any term, limitation or condition expressed therein, have, and shall be deemed always to have had, effect as if it were a policy of insurance indemnifying that employer for that liability under this Act, as from time to time in force, or as the case may be, under the repealed Act as it was from time to time in force.

and that the House of Assembly agree thereto.

Later.

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

Consideration in Committee of the recommendations of the conference.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE (Minister of Labour and Industry): I move:

That the recommendations of the conference be agreed to.

The conference was a very lengthy one, but there were only one or two really vital matters. The first refers to the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1. Instead of replacing in the Act the existing definition of "injury" by a new definition, as provided in the Bill, it is retained with amendments that specifically provide that a recurrence of a pre-existing heart disease is a compensable injury unless the employer proves that the employment did not contribute to the injury.

Amendments Nos 2, 8, 9, and 10 dealt with two different matters. Amendment No. 2 would have given a right of action under this legislation to a workman who does not now have a claim. Amendments 8, 9 and 10 concerned the introduction of domestic assistance services.

Amendment No. 12 took most of the time of the conference. The compromise reached is that, in calculating the average weekly earnings of a workman, all of his earnings shall be included except only expenses for which he has been reimbursed because of the nature of his employment and special rates paid to compensate him for disabilities associated with the conditions under which he has performed his work. All payments for shift and weekend penalties and overtime will be included in calculating the average weekly earnings.

In relation to amendments Nos. 5 and 11, the average weekly earnings will be calculated in respect of the 12 months prior to the incapacity. A consequential amendment concerns a drafting alteration to an amendment made by the Legislative Council.

Mr. COUMBE. The conference was certainly protracted, taking about 7½ hours, which wearied not only the managers but also apparently members generally. Certain arguments advanced by members on this side of the Chamber were accepted, and one or two matters

that we should have liked accepted were not accepted. In my view, the definition of "injury" was one of the most important aspects of the whole measure; I suggested it was the nub of the measure, because the Bill removes the provision prescribing causal connection with the source of employment.

The definition of "injury" has been widened. Certainly "disease" has been widened, too, because later we see a reference to disease, not being coronary heart disease or, to use the vernacular, a myocardial infarction. We have this wider provision regarding coronary heart disease, referring to the aggravation, acceleration, exacerbation, deterioration, or recurrence of any pre-existing coronary heart disease. The House of Assembly agreed to the Legislative Council's amendment on this, and a new clause 4a has been inserted, dealing with section 9 of the principal Act, which provides a defence in certain cases. The linkage clause has been deleted, the House of Assembly not insisting on its disagreement. We had argued that the court should determine the matter, and we cited cases where the court has made determinations favourable to the workman. The other provision dealt with domestic assistance. Regarding payments, I should like to have seen an alteration, but it was not to be. However, real gains were made at the conference. Special rates will be paid to workmen to compensate for disabilities suffered through performing certain work, and this is tied to the original suggestion made by the Legislative Council. The conference had the advantage of references from the High Court regarding wording, and a consequential amendment has tidied up the matter of insurance policies. Both sides have made gains. A prerequisite in workmen's compensation is clarity to avoid confusion and delay in courts. Secondly, any amendment must be fair to all concerned. Both sides have gained advantages from the conference and I mention particularly that an important matter was tying the injury back to the work performed. That has been retained. Experience will show how what has been achieved is dealt with in the courts.

Dr. TONKIN: I am pleased at the results of the conference, particularly regarding the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1. However, as "coronary" relates to "heart", the term "coronary heart disease" merely means "heart heart disease" and coronary heart disease is presumed to refer to myocardial infarction. The term used at present does not mean anything and I wish that the managers had taken the precaution of obtaining a medical opinion; they need only have telephoned Dr. Shea for the correct term, which, as I say, is "myocardial infarction".

Mr. Millhouse: The courts will work it out.

Dr. TONKIN: That is what I am afraid of. We should have a precise definition I am inclined to amend the term, but I do not think I can. The Hon. Mr. Springett, the medical man in the other House, would agree with me that the terminology was incorrect.

Mr. Wright: Sit down and listen while the member for Playford explains it to you.

Dr. TONKIN: I do not know that he can help, but I am happy to hear what he has to say.

Mr. McRAE: Although the procedure is complicated, the substance is quite clear. The present definition of "injury" has been retained, with an additional provision in respect of a certain condition I had discussed informally with the member for Bragg the matter that he has raised, but the member for Mitcham was quite right: there is no reason why the concept of coronary heart disease cannot be dealt with by the courts. That is where it ought to be dealt with. One of the factors that influenced the managers from

the House of Assembly to look carefully at the words "myocardial infarction" was that at the time; some expert might have other words to describe the same condition.

Dr. Tonkin: It's very specific.

Mr. McRAE: Yes, and that is what concerned us, because there are several related heart conditions that are not covered by the words "myocardial infarction". Therefore, the intention was to expand the concept in such a way that those other matters, which people commonly refer to as heart attacks or coronary attacks, could be dealt with.

Dr. Tonkin: The same thing technically.

Mr. McRAE: That may be so, but as I understand it the words "myocardial infarction" do not cover the full range of complaints that people commonly refer to as heart attacks.

Dr. Tonkin: Yes, they do, it's the basic term.

Mr. McRAE: I do not quarrel with the honourable member's medical knowledge, but, as I understand the position, coronary heart disease does have a meaning that is wider than myocardial infarction. Originally, the managers from the House of Assembly had suggested that we refer to myocardial infarction or any prescribed disease. As far as we are concerned, I suppose we would be happy to go back to that, but the managers from the Upper House put forward a concept of coronary heart disease, and that is why it was agreed. Although the procedure may be complicated, the substance is simple.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I am willing to accept the honourable member's explanation. I have also taken some expert advice on the matter, and I am willing to allow to be done what I suggested, by interjection, would be done, and that is that it would be worked out by the courts. As I also said by interjection, much of the legislation put through this Parliament in the past few years, particularly by Labor Governments (and this is what often happens), is lawyers' law; it is a paradise for the profession, and I know the Attorney-General would be the last to quarrel with me on that. This is another example of that. Certainly to a layman or a member of the medical profession (such as the member for Bragg) "coronary heart disease" is a tautology. I accept what the member for Playford has said and hope for the best, which in our case may be fees for arguing the matter in the Industrial Court.

The most significant matter in these recommendations is the complete and utter collapse of the Opposition in the Upper House on the question of average weekly earnings. This is the provision in the Bill that will cost the most, and the Upper House has given way altogether. In the explanation he read out, the Minister said that all the earnings of workmen would be included, except trifling matters such as dirt money, car allowance, and things of that type. The Government has won a handsome victory over the Opposition in the Upper House on this score, and I hope the public gets to know about it. The Upper House had the numbers, so it could have blocked this provision, but it did not. It has given way on this issue because it knows that, when the chips are down, it cannot afford to stand up to the Government in the present political circumstances in South Australia. I defy any member of the Liberal and Country League to say I am wrong about this. During the second reading debate, I pointed out that the L.C.L. studiously avoided referring to the extra cost to industry as a result of this legislation, and I believe it is the most important aspect. No-one wants to deny anyone increased benefits of any kind, but we are bound by costs: there must be a balance. However, in this case not much of a balance

has been struck by the L.C.L. I hope that this will not react against the health of our economy, because of the extra cost of workmen's compensation insurance.

Motion carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier) moved: That Standing Order's be suspended,

so as to enable questions without notice to be proceeded with until 8.5 p.m.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): If Standing Orders are suspended, I shall move the following amendment:

That the time for asking questions without notice be one hour.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House, and there being present an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the House I accept the motion for suspension.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran's motion carried

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier has moved that Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable questions without notice to be proceeded with until 8.5 p.m., to which the Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment that the time for asking questions without notice be one hour.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I desire to speak on this matter. Whatever may have been the assurance, counter-assurance and undertakings given between the Australian Labor Party and the Liberal and Country League, no such assurance or undertaking was given by me or by the other member of my Party, nor were we informed this afternoon that any arrangement had been made between the other Parties. I protest (as I protested this afternoon at the cavalier way he treated this place) at the way in which the Acting Premier is treating this place. For reasons that I cannot for the life of me divine, he would not allow questions to proceed this afternoon, even though I now find (I did not know at the time) that, in fact, the conference on the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill did not resume this afternoon until 3.15 p.m., for the very purpose of allowing Question Time to take place in this House this afternoon at the usual time and for the usual length of time. Yet we were denied Question Time and spent the whole afternoon uselessly in this place, without the House sitting at all. If this is an example of the Acting Premier's management of the affairs of this place, it is a pretty poor example indeed.

And now what do we get? The Acting Premier not only moves that Question Time take place at a time when it is far less advantageous to the Opposition for the purposes of publicity: he wants to halve it and give us only half an hour. We all saw how the Acting Premier hesitated before he fixed the time: he was trying to work out what he could do and get away with. It must have been 30 seconds before he—

Mr. Venning: He's a slow thinker.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: He may be, but he is not as slow as that. It was obvious what the Acting Premier was doing then. Not only on the last day that we shall be sitting for three months does he try to destroy the effectiveness of questions by fixing a time when there is far less opportunity for publicity of questions: he now wants to reduce that time by half. Why does he do this, after having made us sit in this House for the whole afternoon quite uselessly? This is not the way a democratic Assembly should be run. It is not

necessary; there is no reason for it; and the Acting Premier has not, even now in this motion, advanced any reason, for reducing the time for questions to half an hour. If any of the Acting Premier's own back-benchers had any gumption—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —they would support the Leader's amendment, because surely to goodness the member for Tea Tree Gully and others will have plenty of questions to ask in this place

Mr. Langley: Who told you that?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I use the member for Tea Tree Gully as an example, because I believe that in Question Time she is the most assiduous back-bencher on the other side, and plenty of others ask questions. Surely to goodness Government members want to ask an additional question this evening. Why should they support a reduction in Question Time by half? If they have any guts at all, they will stand up for this one and stand up for their rights as back-benchers, and not simply go with their Government merely because the Deputy Premier wants to get home half an hour earlier.

Mr. Harrison: Poppycock!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: It is not. The member for Albert Park never asks a question in this place, anyway.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Gunn: Throw him out!

The SPEAKER. The honourable member for Eyre might get that treatment. The honourable member for Mitcham must speak to the motion or the amendment concerning the time for questions. The honourable member for Mitcham.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Yes, and I am chiding Government members in the hope that they will support the amendment and stick up for their rights, because in this case their rights and the rights of members on this side are the same. We all have constituents to represent and matters to bring forward in this place. Members opposite, as well as members on this side, will have no opportunity for three months after this evening to ask questions. If members opposite have any guts at all, they will support the Leader's amendment, or will they tamely submit to whatever comes from the front bench? That is as much as one can say. I think the way the business of the House has been handled is disgraceful. This has been compounded by the fact that the Acting Premier has not seen fit on either occasion today to explain why he is going on in this way.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO (Minister of Transport): We have listened to a great deal of poppycock from the honourable member.

Mr. Venning: We are hearing some now.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: We have heard much abuse from him without much logic, but that is what we normally expect to get from him now that he is a member of the Liberal Movement and is trying to make a name for this rather infamous little group. He has abused the Deputy Premier for observing the Standing Orders which he (the member for Mitcham) was responsible for drafting, a fact that he conveniently forgot to mention.

Mr. Millhouse: I don't know what you're talking about.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is right: the honourable member does not know what I am talking about, because in fact he did not know what he was talking about. For him to say that the way in which the Deputy Premier was conducting the House was disgraceful is typical of the stupidity of his contribution.

Mr. Venning: Get on with it.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If he gets an opportunity (which I doubt, because the time that members were given for questions is rapidly running out, as they have chosen to use that time in this way), the member for Rocky River can give his opinion. The motion moved by the Deputy Premier this afternoon was that the sitting of the House be suspended until the ringing of the bells to enable the conference of managers on the Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill to be resumed. That is why we are here, as the member for Mitcham knows.

Mr. McAnaney: Why were we diddled out of our hour for questions?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I do not know how dumb the member for Heysen really is or how dumb he is making out he is, but he knows that the Standing Orders of the House have been changed, for he was a party to that change. He also knows that we are not following the practice of bygone years.

Mr. McAnaney: You're running your own rules.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member listens for a moment he might wish he could have swallowed his tongue instead of making a fool of himself all the time. We are not following the previous practice of setting up a conference and sitting through the evening, requiring all members to sit around waiting for that conference to conclude. Members opposite have not been able to apply their minds to what has resulted from those changes. It is an enlightening admission for the member for Mitcham to say that members opposite are being deprived of the opportunity to get publicity for the questions they ask.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't be absurd.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: In other words, the honourable member has admitted that he asks questions in this House not in accordance with Standing Orders to get information, but to get publicity for himself. That shows that the questions he asks in this place are contrary to Standing Orders, yet he is a member of the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. Millhouse: No, I'm not, and I haven't been—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Well, the Standing Orders Committee has improved as a result of the honourable member's being sacked by his own Party from that committee.

Mr. Millhouse: Now I'm sure you don't know what you're talking about.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I wish the honourable member had found out a bit about what he was talking on before he started, because he made some stupid accusations which will not hold water and which are completely contrary to Standing Orders. He has appealed to back-bench members of the Government to support him, when he knows full well that the information that back-bench members want, in the same way as the information Opposition back-bench members want, can be obtained just as expeditiously (probably more expeditiously) by direct contact with the Minister concerned.

Mr. Becker: That's not—

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The member for Hanson need not talk too much about it because he knows—

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The motion before the House is that we conclude Question Time at 8.5 p.m., and there is an amendment that Question Time be for one hour. I cannot connect in any way the Minister's remarks with the motion before the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a motion and an amendment before the House regarding the time to be allowed for questions without notice. The debate must be confined to the motion moved by the honourable Deputy

Premier or the amendment of the honourable Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Thank you, Sir. I thought I was speaking precisely to the motion moved by the Deputy Premier, and he was unfairly attacked by the member for Mitcham for moving the motion.

The Hon. L. J. King: You were about to make the point that the member for Hanson doesn't always like replies to be given in the House.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: That is right, because it shows him up for what he is.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Minister must speak to the motion.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I will link up my remarks about the member for Hanson, dealing with him at the appropriate time. Regrettably, time is marching on. However, I think I should point out that the Standing Orders of the House, to which all members must subscribe unless they are prepared to—

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order. The Standing Orders of this House have nothing to do with the motion or the amendment, because those Standing Orders have already been suspended. We are deciding whether there shall be one hour or half an hour for questions without notice.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Standing Orders have been suspended by a decision of the House. I state once again that the honourable Minister must speak to the motion or to the amendment.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The situation is that we have a motion to allow questions without notice to be asked until 8.5 p.m., about 16 minutes from now.

Mr. Millhouse: Do you think you can keep going all that time?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: If the honourable member wishes that, I can do it easily.

Mr. McANANEY: On a point of order. The Minister is not speaking to the motion.

Mr. Venning: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: I have said several times that there is a motion before the Chair that Question Time shall be until 8.5 p.m., and there is an amendment that it shall be for one hour. Those matters are the subject of discussion. The honourable Minister must speak to either the motion or the amendment.

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: Before the member for Heysen took that point of order, I was saying that the Deputy Premier had moved a motion to allow Question Time to proceed until 8.5 p.m., and there was a rude interjection to which I should not have replied, but I did reply. If members study Standing Orders, they will realize that the motion moved by the Deputy Premier completely conforms to Standing Orders and that the undertaking given this afternoon is being honoured. It is for that reason that the motion should be supported.

Mr. Millhouse: What was the undertaking?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment, but suddenly we find a strange alliance between the single member of the L.M. present this evening and the L.C.L. because they are as one. These are purely delaying tactics on their part, and I commend the motion to members.

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

That the question be now put

Dr. Eastick: The little dictator!

Motion carried.

The House divided on the amendment:

Ayes (16)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Evans, Mathwin, and Rodda.
Noes—Messrs. Broomhill, Dunstan, and Hudson.

Majority of 6 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived

Motion carried.

QUESTIONS RESUMED

STRATA TITLES

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney-General investigate the situation and standing of those people who, having sold their properties for a consideration including a strata-title home unit, have not received any title to such a unit, although they may have been in occupancy for a considerable time? Recently, this serious situation has been brought to my attention. A constituent sold her property earlier in the year to a company, Armour Coating Marketing Proprietary Limited, possibly incorporated on Norfolk Island, and transferred the deeds of title to the company, on the understanding that she would receive a strata title to a home unit as part of the arrangement entered into. Although she has been in occupancy of the unit for a considerable time, she has not yet received any strata title; that is, she is not the registered proprietor of the unit, which she has been given to understand is her property as a result of the arrangement made. Her application for concessions in regard to water and council rates is not valid, because she is not the registered proprietor, and, more seriously, she seems to have no legal protection at all at present if the company fails or is wound up. Indeed, she seems to have no valid legal status at all in relation either to the property she has transferred or to the unit she occupies. Were anything to happen to her, her beneficiaries would have great difficulty in establishing any claim to either property whilst no title to either property exists in her name. I understand this is not the only instance of this kind existing in the community, and I would strongly advise anyone who may be in a similar situation, or considering such an arrangement, immediately to seek legal advice, or to contact the Attorney-General's office.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member should not offer advice in an explanation of his question.

Dr. TONKIN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, but I hope the Attorney-General will do the same.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The state of affairs indicated in the honourable member's question is a serious one, and I agree with his suggestion that a person so situated should seek legal advice without delay. I do not know what jurisdiction I may have as Attorney-General in these circumstances. It may depend on whether the persons involved in this scheme are licensed persons (that is, licensed under the Land Agents Act or similar legislation, which would give me some authority with respect to their conduct). If the honourable member will give me particulars of the identity of the people involved, I shall have the matter investigated to ascertain what can be done.

WEST LAKES BOULEVARD

Mr. HARRISON: Can the Minister of Transport say how many houses the Government has so far acquired on the route of the West Lakes boulevard?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: I cannot give the precise information, but I shall be pleased to obtain it and send it to the honourable member by letter.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARIES

Mr. COUMBE: Can the Minister of Local Government say what progress the Royal Commission inquiring into local government boundaries has made and when he thinks that the report of the Commission will be available? Further, will the Minister say whether he intends to release the report, especially as it relates to boundaries, to councils and other interested parties, so that comments or objections may be lodged before a Bill is introduced in this House?

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: The Royal Commission inquiring into local government boundaries is making good progress. The last report to me, which certainly was made no more than a week ago, indicated that at that stage the Commission had completed its consultations with councils in the inner metropolitan area, that it was well on the way regarding councils in the outer metropolitan area, and that it was proceeding well with plans to receive representations from country areas I expect that the Commission's report will be available towards the middle of 1974 and I will certainly make it available for public consideration before I introduce a Bill to give effect to the recommendations.

CREDIT AGENCIES

Mr. WRIGHT: Will the Attorney-General say when he intends to introduce legislation that will protect consumers from false reports by credit reporting agencies? With reference to preparation of the announced legislation for consumer protection and, in particular, to the statement by the Attorney-General reported in the *Advertiser* of Thursday, October 11, 1973, on the matter of the credit bureau in an article headed "Credit mistake destroying man's life", is the Attorney aware that:

- (1) on the admission of a Mr. Darby, Manager of a credit reporting agency, on an A.B.C. television programme, *This Day Tonight*, he or his firm has more than 500 000 individual and business files on South Australian people in Adelaide;
- (2) that Mr. Darby's credit bureau is a wholly commercial organization, which sells its reports for money on a subscription basis, any individual or company being able to become a subscriber and thus have access to more than 500 000 individual and business files;
and
- (3) that the files are compiled without any safeguard for individual privacy, generally by office clerks, mostly junior girls or otherwise unqualified personnel who have no scholastic degree to enable them to report and interpret social and financial facts in an accurate report?

8.5 p.m., the bells having been rung:

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I move:

That Standing Orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice.

I wish to move a motion this evening regarding what has happened in the House during the afternoon. I will, in the

time allowed to me, try to explain to you, Sir, within the strict confines of Standing Orders (which allow me to do so) my reasons for moving for the suspension of Standing Orders so that I can move the motion. Early in the day the Opposition was told that an hour would be allowed today for questions. This information was given by a Minister, I believe in good faith.

Mr. Millhouse: Which one?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: It was given by the Minister of Labour and Industry.

Mr. Millhouse: To whom?

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Kavel has moved for the suspension of Standing Orders to enable him to move a motion without notice. Strictly in accordance with Standing Orders, the 10 minutes allowed to him to speak must be used to explain why he seeks the suspension of Standing Orders, not to debate the subject matter of the motion without notice.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: This is not the subject matter: these are the circumstances that led me to wish to move this motion. The fact is that, as often happens in the workings of this House, a conversation took place between a Minister and a member of this Party, and I believe that, in good faith, this information was to be relayed to our Party. It was relayed and we understood that the House would resume sitting at 3.15 this afternoon.

We came into the House this afternoon in good faith believing that this arrangement would be kept. Then, the Deputy Premier apparently did not agree to this arrangement and it was quickly cooked up that we would have half an hour for Question Time. I do not think you could blame the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, for not being clear about the Government's intentions in these circumstances. This put the Opposition in a most difficult position. Since then we have had a sort of verbal understanding that half an hour would be allowed for Question Time.

Mr. Wright: You didn't support your Leader on that.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: We took what was given in good faith, but that good faith was not honoured. How can the Opposition know how to react when it cannot take the word of a Minister at its face value? I say that the onus for that situation falls fairly and squarely on the shoulders of the Government. If it were not for the petulance of the Deputy Premier which we have seen exhibited in the House this week, the matter could have concluded satisfactorily and, what is more, this evening, if ever we saw an exhibition of arrogance, we saw it when the Minister of Transport deliberately used up half the Question Time that the Deputy Premier had been so good as to shove in front of us as a sop. The rights of the Opposition in this place have been eroded, not slowly but surely, ever since I have been a member of this House. I returned from an overseas trip to find that Question Time had been halved. What are we on this side? Are we merely lap dogs to take what the Government puts in front of us? This is disgraceful.

The SPEAKER: Order! As I have pointed out previously, the honourable member is seeking to move a motion without notice and I repeat that the 10 minutes allowed him to speak now is allowed so that he may give the reasons for seeking the suspension of Standing Orders.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I am linking up my remarks, Mr. Speaker. Although I cannot tell you the subject matter of the motion, what I am saying impinges directly on the subject matter of the motion. If the Government believes it can push the Opposition around to suit its own

petulance and convenience, it has not a realistic approach to the democratic process.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member is going to persistently debate something not closely related to the reason for suspension of Standing Orders, he will not be able to continue. The honourable member for Kavel.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I should like to read the terms of the motion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is nothing to prevent the honourable member from indicating why he is seeking the suspension of Standing Orders, provided that he confines his remarks to the reason for the suspension.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: My motion is as follows:

That the proper working of this House is being inhibited by the actions of the Government.

What I am saying, I believe, impinges directly on that motion. We have seen this high-handed sort of attitude adopted towards us as an Opposition ever since I have been a member of this House. Our right to air matters of interest to our constituents has been eroded. Yesterday, I had four questions to ask, but I could ask only one, and that was in the last 30 seconds of Question Time. Today, when I had other matters to raise, I was willing to forgo those questions just to stand up and have a go for democracy in this House, because this is one of the most disgraceful attitudes one can get from a Government, and I am fed up to the back teeth with it.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): I want to oppose the move by the member for Kavel, and I want to do so in reasoned tones and explain to the honourable member that I am neither petulant nor arrogant. Indeed, I think he himself has given a fair display of arrogance tonight. The matter we are considering tonight is important. I point out that any assurances given to the Opposition are normally given to the Leader of the Opposition. In fact, they are given to the Leader of the Opposition by the Leader of the Government, and I tell the House, deliberately, that no assurance concerning questions was given by the Acting Leader of the Government in this House to the Leader of the Opposition today.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You want to muzzle your Ministers.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The honourable member cannot have it both ways. Will he please let me explain the situation? When I came to this House at about 1.15 p.m., it was clear to me, as the Acting Leader of the Government, what the procedure would be in the House today. We had a conference, which was continuing, and it was proper that the conference should complete its deliberations. Indeed, the only way the conference could do that was for the House, which had to meet at 2 p.m. to deal with formalities, to suspend its sitting until the ringing of the bells in order to allow the conference to continue its work. That was clear in my mind, and that was my intention.

Mr. Millhouse: Why didn't you explain that when you moved the motion?

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not a very experienced member in the terms of experience of some other members. The position was clear to me, and it would have been clear to the honourable member and to the Leader.

Mr. Millhouse: Don't be silly. You could have explained. You had two chances.

The SPEAKER: Order! One speaker at a time.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I moved for the suspension today, and I gave the reasons for the suspension of the sittings of the House; it was to allow the deliberations of the conference to continue—

Mr. Millhouse: You said—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: It was clear to the Leader of the Opposition at the time. I know there was some confusion, but it was clear to the Leader of the Opposition that, if the conference went beyond 3.15 p.m. (and we expected it could), no questions without notice could be asked today. That is provided in the Standing Orders. When I moved my motion, the member for Bragg, I think, came over and said, "We have been given an assurance about questions." I am being completely honest with the House: that was the first I heard of it. Moreover, I am not speaking in derogatory terms of my Minister, because I did not know what had gone on. I cannot be more honest than that.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What about the time your Minister—

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Let me explain what happened.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: When I explain the situation, I believe members opposite will understand the position. The member for Bragg asked me what was going on, saying, "We have been given an assurance that questions will go for an hour at some time of the day." I was caught completely off guard; indeed, it came as a complete surprise to me. I said, "I know nothing of it." They were my words, although I do not want to be held to them exactly. Further, I looked across at the Opposition front bench and members there were saying, "This is the arrangement." I reiterate that, if I had intended that, I would have spoken to the Leader, and the Leader would have passed that information on to his Party. The Leader had no authority, in my view, to pass on anything to the Party concerning Question Time. However, being caught as I was, I said, "I will give you half an hour when I have dealt with this." That was said off the top of my head on the spur of the moment, and that is what I tried to do this evening.

Mr. Millhouse: Ha!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I would not expect the honourable member to understand that: he has never been able to work with anyone, and that is why he is on his own now. I do not want it to be said that I have been petulant and arrogant in this matter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Members opposite ask why not. I am trying to be as reasonable as I can. Evidently, there was an arrangement of some description between the Deputy Leader and the Minister of Labour and Industry. Unfortunately, I was not told about it, although the Leader of the Opposition evidently was. I am not going to blame him. Obviously, he thought that information had come from an official source, and he took it as read. Had I known about it, I would have gone to him and discussed the matter with him, but I did not know. I spoke to the Minister of Labour and Industry and told him what I intended to do. I must say that the Minister did not say to me at the time, "We have arranged something." I do not know what he thought, but he probably imagined—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am not saying that in any derogatory sense: indeed, I am being completely open with the House. For God's sake—

Mr. Venning: That's what we say.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I am trying to give a factual account so that members will realize that there is no viciousness or malice in this. Had I thought it would have served the Leader and his Party, I would have given them an hour: that does not worry us at all.

Mr. Goldsworthy: Ha!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: That does not worry us. They could have two hours! I said I was caught on the spur of the moment. I did not know what to say about the state of the sitting. Indeed, we could have got the report from the conference and been up by 6 o'clock.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: The member for Mallee is a reasonable man. If he put himself in my position, I think he would understand.

Mr. Goldsworthy: The Minister of Transport had the hooks into us, didn't he?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I have tried briefly to explain to the House exactly what happened this afternoon. If the House is not satisfied with that explanation, I cannot help that. However, I do believe it should be perfectly clear in future that, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to be certain of what the arrangements are, he should at least be certain that the Leader of the Government knows what he knows.

Mr. Venning: We know now.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: Had I thought that there was any doubt about procedure, I would have gone to the Leader of the Opposition. I assumed that he would think as I thought about suspending Standing Orders to enable the conference to continue. If he doubted whether questions without notice would be proceeded with, he could have come to me and said, "What do you think about this?" I would have been perfectly happy to discuss it. I was caught short and was a little nonplussed when the matter arose. I said that half an hour would be allowed for questions, and I stood by that this evening. As that is the situation, I do not think that there is any need at all for the suspension of Standing Orders to enable the member for Kavel to move his motion. I hope he will accept the explanation I have given to the House, as I do not see any reason to suspend Standing Orders.

Mr. Millhouse: None of you shows up in a very satisfactory light.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Mitcham claims that he has been here a long time, so it is about time that he knew what the Standing Orders provide. The honourable member for Kavel has moved that Standing Orders be suspended to enable him to move a motion without notice.

Ayes (14)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Dean Brown, Goldsworthy (teller), Gunn, McAnaney, Millhouse, Nankivell, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Noes (24)—Messrs. Max Brown and Burdon, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran (teller), Coumbe, Crimes, Duncan, Eastick, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King, Langley, McKee, McRae, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, Wells, and Wright.

Majority of 10 for the Noes.
Motion thus negatived.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM BILL

Consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's alternative amendment:

Clause 13, line 20—Leave out "Minister" and insert "regulation".

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Development and Mines): I move:

That the Legislative Council's alternative amendment be disagreed to. It seems to be an unusual procedure that one should go through a regulatory process in order to give to the museum this type of research function. As it is hopelessly cumbersome, we should retain the concept of Ministerial direction contained in the present Bill.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the amendment. This has been an area of contention between the two Houses for some time, and it was clearly spelt out previously that this measure, in the hands of the Minister and at the direction of the department, was not in the best interests of the conduct of the board in dealing with the matters set out in the clause. It takes away the opportunity to air matters satisfactorily.

Motion carried.

The following reason for disagreement to the Legislative Council's alternative amendment was adopted:

Because it makes administration of the Act too cumbersome.

Later.

The Legislative Council intimated that it insisted on its alternative amendment to which the House of Assembly had disagreed.

BILL OF RIGHTS

Order of the Day (Other Business) No. 1: Report of Select Committee to be brought up.

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

That the time for bringing up the report of the Select Committee on the Bill be extended until Wednesday, March 6, 1974.

As this Select Committee is still engaged on its deliberations, it has not been able to bring up its report on the appointed day, namely, today. We hope and expect to be able to bring up the report on the day nominated in the motion.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House at its rising adjourn until Tuesday, February 19, 1974, at 2 p.m.

On behalf of the Government, I extend to all members, their families, the staff of the House, members of Hansard, members of the press, the Clerk and his Assistant, the Clerk of Papers, and everyone associated with the House our best wishes for the forthcoming festive season. It seems always to be rather an anti-climax after a long and difficult session to say to members that we are grateful for all the assistance we have received and that we are grateful to the Opposition for its contribution. Indeed, although there are 129 Bills on file, we have been involved not only with the discussion of Bills but also with discussion on many motions and much other business. I sincerely hope that the deliberations of the House during this part of the session will be of benefit to the people of this State. I especially thank anyone who has in any way assisted members, and convey to them on behalf of the Government our best wishes for Christmas and the new year.

Dr. EASTICK (Leader of the Opposition): I support the remarks made by the Deputy Premier and extend the good wishes of members of the Opposition to members opposite, to members of the staff in all spheres, and to the families of all those concerned. I appreciate that, as the Deputy Premier has said, there have been strenuous times

and that several issues have arisen apart from those covered by Bills. One could never say that one was totally satisfied with all the results obtained but, at least, members have generally had an opportunity to express a view on behalf of those they represent. I look forward to meeting all who are associated with this place on our return, and in saying that I remind honourable members and all concerned of the need to be especially careful in respect of road safety.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): This is the third successive year in which in one capacity or another I have spoken to convey the compliments of the season to the Speaker, to members and to the staff. This year I do it in yet another capacity, as a member of one of the (at present) smaller Parties in the House. However, I do it with no less sincerity than I have done it on other occasions when I was Deputy Leader, speaking for one or other of my then Leaders. So far we have had, I think, an enjoyable session, despite our ups and downs which, I believe, are inescapable in the life of Parliament. We have, I hope (although one has doubts in some cases), done good work in the interests of the State. Certainly, we have all tried from our different points of view to forward the interests of all South Australians.

I join with the Deputy Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in expressing to you, Mr. Speaker, thanks for the way in which you have carried out your duties so far and our best wishes for a happy and holy Christmas. I extend those good wishes to every member on both sides (and I say that advisedly, despite our unhappy political divisions on this side). I am sure that what I say will be accepted in the spirit in which it is offered. I wish everyone here, the officers of the House, the staff in the building, whether they be employed by Parliament or by the Government, whether they be members of the press or of the Hansard staff, or whatever they may be, a happy and holy Christmas and a prosperous new year.

Mr. BLACKER (Flinders): Representing the fourth Party in this House, it is my privilege to say "thank you" to all members of all Parties for the manner in which they have accepted me to this stage of the session. When I was first elected to this House, being the only member of my Party I wondered what sort of reception I would get. To this stage I have been pleased with the co-operation I have received from every member. Whenever I have asked a member for advice, I have been given it freely, and I greatly appreciate this. The co-operation of all concerned has made my job just that little bit easier. I extend my best wishes for a merry Christmas and a happy new year to each and every member of the staff, all of whom have been most co-operative throughout the session. To each and every one here I extend the compliments of the season.

The SPEAKER: Whilst this is strictly not in accordance with Standing Orders, if any member challenges me and takes a point of order that I am not complying with Standing Orders, I will rule him out of order. I join in the remarks that have been made. Being a loner in the position of Speaker, I am most interested in the new Workmen's Compensation Act Amendment Bill because, if my voice goes, I can then claim compensation under the Act. I, too, convey to all members and to all the staff connected with the House of Assembly, in whatever capacity they are employed, the best for the forthcoming Christmas season. May the new year be a happy one, and may the future be a holy and healthy one for all. Once again, I say we probably enjoy ourselves on the

surface: forget what went on underneath, and return in the new year happy, healthy and full of fight.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN moved:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. There is still plenty of business on the Notice Paper. It is still only 9.10 p.m. There is no reason why the Government should avoid a debate on Vaughan House or on the other matters. It is obvious that the only reason the Deputy Premier has moved this motion is to avoid a debate on this matter. Mr. Speaker, it is in your hands whether we go on with the business on the Notice Paper

or whether you will allow the Government deliberately to avoid a debate. That is my point of order. I protest most strongly. It was done last night—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr. MILLHOUSE: —and it is being done—

The SPEAKER: Order! We have already forgotten about our eulogistic remarks.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has raised the point of order, which I will not uphold.

Motion carried.

At 9.20 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday, February 19, 1974, at 2 p.m.