HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, February 25, 1975

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

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT: OIL EXPLORATION

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD (Minister of Development and Mines): I seek leave to make a statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: Shell Development Australia Proprietary Limited will soon drill an offshore exploration well costing more than $3 000 000 in its exploration permit SA.5. I am making this announcement as the designated authority for the State of South Australia under the Commonwealth-State Petroleum (Submerged Lands) Act. The well, called Potoroo 1, will be located about 300 kilometres south-west of Ceduna. It is programmed to a total depth of 3 250 metres, in a water depth of 275 m. Drilling, which is expected to commence late February or early March, will be carried out on Shell's behalf by Esso Australia Limited using the drillship *Regional Endeavour*. Seven separate seismic surveys, covering a total of 3 700 km, have been carried out in the permit area. Shell will establish an operations and communications base, as well as a helicopter service point, at Ceduna. Potoroo 1 will be located in deeper water than any well yet drilled by an Australian drillship using a conventional anchoring system. Only the oversea-owned *Sedco* 445, which employs a computer-controlled dynamic positioning system, has operated at greater water depth in Australia. Shell has previously drilled two exploration wells, Platypus No. 1 and Echidna No. 1, in its permits SA.6 and SA.7.

QUESTIONS

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

FISHING LICENCE

In reply to Mr. CHAPMAN (October 31).

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: The allegation made by the member for Alexandra, supported by statutory declarations of Messrs. G. T. and D. G. Rumbelow, has been fully investigated. The Rumbelows adhere to their allegations, but they are strongly denied by Mr. Olsen. There seems to be no way of resolving this conflict of evidence, and I am therefore unable to reach any conclusion in the matter. I do not believe that a charge under the Public Service Act would be justified on the evidence available and, accordingly, no action will be taken.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE

In reply to Mr. NANKIVELL (February 20).

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The assistance made available by the Community Welfare Department to four victims of the New Residence disaster was provided from a relatively small fund ($200 000) which is generally reserved for families (for example, deserted wives) who experience exceptional hardship in providing essential family needs (for example, clothing) from moneys they receive under the normal financial assistance scale. No response has been received to the department's offer for assistance beyond the initial payment of $100 to each family. The normal avenue for assistance in circumstances of this nature is provided under the Primary Producers Emergency Assistance Act and, in fact, the Minister of Lands advised a deputation representing victims of the New Residence disaster to make application to the Director of Lands in accordance with that Act. To date no application has been received.

Assistance under this Act is available by way of a repayable interest bearing advance or grant, covering a wide variety of situations ranging from the loss of income and/or property as a result of drought, fire, and flood, to animal and plant diseases, etc. In certain circumstances the Treasurer has the power to waive the interest payment and defer or remit principal repayments. In providing assistance under this Act the Minister of Lands must satisfy himself that assistance will reasonably ensure the continued viability of the operation, and that the assistance is not available from other sources. In this regard the Government would expect the primary producers to seek normal insurance cover, which can extend to fire and hail damage to cereal crops.

PORTRUSH ROAD INTERSECTION

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many accidents involving damage to the traffic control system have there been at the intersection of Portrush Road and Kensington Road during the 12 months ended January 31, 1975?

2. What has been the cost of repairs and replacements to the traffic signals each time?

3. How many vehicles have been involved in accidents at this intersection during this period, and how many people have been injured, or have died, as a result of such accidents?

4. What investigations have been made into ways of improving traffic control at the intersection, and the structure of the intersection itself, and when is it expected action will be taken to implement any measures considered appropriate?

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

1. Seven.

2. The total cost was $2 791.

3. Of accidents reported, 55 vehicles and one pedestrian involved; no fatalities, nine injured.

4. There are no proposals to modify the signals or layout at present.

MUSEUM

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. Does the Government intend constructing a new building for the South Australian Museum and, if so—
   (*a*) what is the intended site;
   (*b*) what will be the total area of the new building;
   (*c*) when is it expected that construction will commence;
   (*d*) what is the expected cost;
   (*e*) what use is going to be made of the existing buildings and facilities; and
   (*f*) what plans are available for inspection?

2. Does the Government intend moving the museum to the new town at Monarto?

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

1. Yes. The matter is being considered, and discussions are being held with the Minister of Works. No final decisions have been made in relation to the points (*a*) to (*f*).

2. No.

HOUSING TRUST

Mr. MATHWIN (on notice):

1. How many properties in the metropolitan area were purchased by the Housing Trust in the 12 months ended January 31, 1975?

2. Where are they situated?

3. What was the purchase price of each?

4. Did any of these properties need renovating, alterations, or repairs and, if so, how many and where were they situated?

5. What was the individual cost of these renovations, alterations, or repairs?

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

1. (*a*) Special rental houses—323.

(*b*) Aboriginal funded houses—77.

2. They range over the whole of the metropolitan area.

3. (*a*) Average purchase price of special rental houses—$13 374.

(*b*) Average purchase price of Aboriginal funded houses—$20 305.

4. Almost all of the properties needed renovations, alterations and repairs to varying degrees.

5. (*a*) Special rental houses—$4 839 average.

(*b*) Aboriginal funded houses—$2 160 average.

FISHING

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. How many authorities are current for—
   (*a*) crayfishing;
   (*b*) prawn fishing;
   (*c*) abalone fishing;
   (*d*) A class fishing; and
   (*e*) B class fishing?

2. In which financial years have each of the crayfish, prawn, and abalone authorities been granted?

3. Who are the holders of each of the authorities in 2 above and—
   (*a*) have any of them held licences in other categories previously;
   (*b*) when was their application for their present authority first lodged; and
   (*c*) how many refusals did each receive before receiving the present authority?

4. Have any of the licensees in 2 above been suspended or otherwise censured in respect of either their present or previous licences and, if so, what were the circumstances?

5. How many applications are now held for licences for each of the categories in 1 above?

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

1. (*a*) 383 rock lobster authorities.
   (*b*) 52 prawn authorities.
   (*c*) 39 abalone permits.
   (*d*) 416 general A class.
   (*e*) 712 general B class.

2. Rock lobster authorities were granted for the first time in 1968, following implementation of the Control of Crayfishing Regulations, 1968, on February 1, 1968. Prawn permits were granted for the first time in 1969, following implementation of the Preservation of Prawn Resources Regulations, 1969, on April 17, 1969. Previously many fishermen held Ministerial permits for discovery of trawling grounds. Abalone permits were granted for the first time in 1968, following implementation of the Preservation of Abalone Resources Regulations, on February 22, 1968.

3. The holders of rock lobster and prawn authorities and abalone permits are shown on separate lists attached.

   (*a*) Yes.

   (*b*) and (*c*) It is not possible to answer those questions as requested, because the department does not have adequate facilities for the ready extraction of such information from written records. Verbal refusals would also be impossible to determine.

4. Yes.

   1968—using rock lobster pots in closed season for rock lobster: rock lobster authority cancelled for 12 months.

   1973—theft of lobsters from another fisherman's pots—fined. Authority cancelled but reinstated after injunction heard by Full Court.

5. Applications for rock lobster and prawn authorities and abalone permits are not now held. Should data collected indicate that it was possible to issue additional authorities or permits in the future, the department or advisory committee will invite applications from persons interested per medium of the press. Class A fishing licence applications, 38; class B fishing licence applications, 72.

Holders of rock lobster authorities as at February 21, 1975:

Allen, E. J.
Andrianopoulos, C.
Anson, H.
Argyriadis, C.
Ashby, C. J.
Ashby, D. M.
Ashby, I. A. & J. F.
Ashfield, T.
Aston, E. R. & Y., Willoughby, A. & J. L.
Atkins, H. A.
Backler, I. H.
Backman, H. T. & Galpin, H. & W.
Baker, R. W.
Banks, R. & M.
Barker, B.
Barrand, D. R.
Bartels, W. J.
Bartholomew, M.
Bartsch, R. W., Winckel, K. A.
Barwick, C. C.
Barwick, P. C.
Bates, R. A.
Bates, R. C.
Baumann, E. L.
Bauer, E. & J. M.
Beck, D. J.
Bell, D. L.
Bell, R. D.
Bell, V. F. H. & Mrs. M. V.
Bennett, P. M.
Bermingham, M. J.
Blore, W. A. W.
Bodnar, S.
Bott, N. T.
Bowyer, B. J.
Bowyer, W. W.
Bradshaw, C.
Braithwaite, M. D.
Brenton, R. J.
Bromley, R. J.
Brooks, F. S.
Brooks, M. S.
Buckingham, D. W.
Buick, N. R.
Burgess, M. M.
Burzacott, P. A.
Butler, E. H.
Cabot, F. H.
Cadd, R.
Calvert, L. M.
Carrison, C. E.
Carrison, R. A. & Sons.
Carrison, M. C.
Cawthorne, D. C. & B. J.
Cawthorne, D. C. & B. J.
Cawthorne, D. K.
Cawthorne, J. L.
Cawthorne, R.
Chamberlain, G. D.
Chambers, A. G.
Chambers, E. R. & J.
Chambers, K. A.
Chambers, R. A.
Chambers, S. V.
Chambers, V. S.
Chambers, W. S.
Christensen, J.
Clark, J. A.
Clifton, M. J.
Coleman, J. W.
Collins, J. C. & Mathey, W. P.
Conlin, W. M.
Corigliano, F. (Jnr.)

Holders of rock lobster authorities as at February 21, 1975:—*continued*

Cornish, T. F.
Coutts, T. J.
Cox, R. L. & S. M.
Cullen, A. R. & R. S.
Cullen, P.
Curtis, R. D.
Dale, J. J.
Dawson, L. R.
Dawson, R. J.
Deane, W. F.
Dening, A. W.
Dening, J. G.
Dening, R. C.
Dening, R. E.
Dennis, G. J.
Denton, M. R.
Diamond, R. C.
Dodd, T. L.
Dodd Pastoral Co. Pty. Ltd.
Douglass, K. G. & L. D.
Dow, I. M.
Dowsett, E. E. & I. M.
Drewer, B. H. & R.
Dudura, J. P.
Dunsford, R. H. G.
Edwards, N. E. & Uphill, A. C. F.
Elfenbein, L. R.
Elliott, B. J. & M. A.
Elliott, P.
Ellis, J.
Enge, H.
Everlyn, G. A.
Galli & Fabris Bros.
Galli & Fabris Bros.
Feast, D. G. (Jnr.)
Feast, D. G. (Snr.)
Feast, E. M. J.
Feast, R. H. & Co.
Feast, I. E.
Feast, L. W. & K. R.
Feast, R. H. & Co.
Fennell, C. E.
Fennell, G. A.
Fennell, N.
Ferguson, R. H.
Figl, A. & C.
Finlay, J. D.
Fortescue, W. J. & M. A.
Frost, J. R.
Frost, L.
Gale, E. T. & J. N.
Galli & Fabris Bros. (5 vessels)
Gardner, T. J.
Garvie, P. E.
Georgaras, M. & E.
Gerloff, W. J.
Gibbs, C. S. & H. M.
Giles, G. S. & J. L.
Gilmore, T. R.
Goldfinch, J. W.
Goss, R. T.
Grant, M. J.
Granziera, F.
Gray, W. H. & A. V.
Gribble, G. E. & M. W.
Gurr, Mrs. M.
Gurney, R. W.
Hage, V. R.
Hagen, J. K. & H. R.
Haines, B. M.
Haines, L. E.
Haines, R. H.
Hales, S. J.
Hall, D. W. & Y. M.
Harrington, J. N.
Hart, D.
Harvey, P. H.
Hayes, D. C.
Hibberd. C. M.
Higgs, K. C. & Wilson, G. B.
Hofner, J. J.
Holder, T. E. & S. R.
Holman, K. J.
Howard, Mrs. A. E.
Howard, R. M. & B. J.
Howe, B. V.
Howell, J. C.
Hurrell, B. M.
Ievins, A. & M. & V.
Iversen, G.
Iwaszcuk, S.
Jackway, A. L.
James, G. W.
Janssen, P. A.
Jeffree, R. G.
Jenkins, B. R.
Jenkins, R. P.
Jenkins, W. D.
Johnson, E. M. & M. M.
Jones, L.
Jones, L. A.
Kable, W. G. N.
Kavanagh, J. J. & R. E.
Kemp, D. J. C.
Kerr, D. H.
Koennecke, K. R.
Koennecke, T. N. & A. L.
Koennecke, V. W. & D. R.
Lane, T. G. S. & M. J.
Largent, R. L. & H. M.
Larsson, M.
Lawrie, R. R.
Lawrie, W. D.
Lawrie, W. D.
Lawson, R. A.
Leggett, M. K. & G. I.
Lehmann, J. A.
Lennell, R. J.
Lewis, R. J.
Linnett, K. F. & N. Y.
Lisk, S. A. & Gray, J. M.
Lisk, S. J. & E. A.
Lolic, E. & D.
McBain, B. E.
McBain, D. A.
McClintock, H. E. & G.
McDonald, N. F.
McEachern, E. M.
McEachern, S. J.
McEwen, R. F. & M. A.
McGrath, E. W.
McInness, D. J.
McInness, L. R.
McKenzie, G. K.
McKinnon, D. W.
McKinnon, J. M. & M. J.
McKinnon, J. R.
McKinnon, N. C.
McKinnon, R. J.
McQuade, L. R.
McQuade, P. L.
Marben Pty. Ltd.
Mancer, D. J.
Manias, G. C.
Manser, B. J.
Marino, B.
Mattson, N.
Menesdorff, C. T. G.
Miller, D. M.
Miller, F. R. & J. E.
Milstead, G.
Monsoor, F.
Moran, G. J.
Moran, T. J. & J. J.
Mowbray, A. S.
Mules, D. W.
Muller, R. W.
Mundy, A. L.
Murch, B. J.
Murphy, T. A.
Mustart, S.
Nalpantidis, J. & A.
Neumann, G. K.
Newton, L. S.
Norman, B.
Offshore Fishing Co.
Ollrich, R.
Paige, D. B.
Papadopoulos, N. & Dimitropoulos, H.
Pattern, A.
Pearsons, D. C.
Perin, N.
Perryman, B. E.
Perryman, V. K.
Peters, G. R. & H. J.
Piddubny, A.
Pink, B. J.
Pink, R. D.
Pinzone, G.
Plionis, V. & A.
Porter, D. H.
Porter, W. G. & Sons
Prates, A.
Priddle, M. S.
Prosek, R.
Puccetti, E.
Puckridge, L. T.
Pumpa, W. H.
Pye, D. W.
Rayner, B.
Redman, A. H.
Rees, J. R. K. & J. R.
Regnier, I. R. & C. M.
Richards, C. G.
Richards, C. M.
Richards, R.
Ricov, A.
Rigoni, B. R.
Ritter, W. E.
Romanowycz, M.
Rothall, C. E.
Rothall, I. M.
Rover Fishing Co.
Rudd, J. D. S.
Rumbelow, G. T.
Russell, L. R.
Santic, J. & T. & T. M.
Sartori, A.
Saunderson, R. D.
Scabissi, C. A.
Selig, S.
Shannon, J. L. & W. M.
Shannon, T. A.
Shea, R. M.
Sheridan, R. W.
Schultz, E. V.
Shurdington, K. J.
Sims, T. G.
Smith, C. D.
Smith, H. W.
Smith, L. G.
Smith, C. A. & J. E.
Smith, K. C.
Smith, K. D.
Smith, M. R.
Smith, R. G. & M. J.
Southwick, G. B.
Spiridis, C.
Spiridis, S.
Stal, A. & S.
Stanhope, D. J.
H. Stanke & Sons Pty. Ltd. (18 vessels)
Stark, N. J.
Staschik, H. G. G.
Steele, S. M.
Stendt, R. D.
Sturgess, G. A. & W. E.
Sundelius, J. B.
Sutherland, A. G. & R. S.
Sutherland, C. C.
Swaffer, J. W.
Talbot, E. F.
Tapley, M. N. B. & G. M.
Taranto, V. & L.
Taylor, A. J.
Tebecis, T.
Thiselton, W. L.
Thomas, R. McP.
Thompson, A. E.
Till, D. L.

Holders of rock lobster authorities as at February 21, 1975:—*continued*

Timperon, J. L.
Tonkin, L.
Tredwin, T. C.
Tyrrell, R. G. & K. B. Pty. Ltd.
Tugwell, R. J.
Underwater Industries
Vahlberg, L. J.
Virgo, C. W.
Wakelin, I. J.
Waller, D. R. & J. M.
Wallis, A. J.
Wallis, S. A.
Wallis, S. A.
Warren, D.
Watson, R. R.
Wehl, W. R.
Weiland, B. J.
Went, R. C. & Jensen, A. T. & J. H.
Westlake, H. R.
White, E. W.
White, R. C. D.
Whitehead, P.
Whitehead, P.
Whitman, D. A. K.
Whittle, A. T.
Wiese, A. J.
Wilkins, T. O.
Williams, J. R.
Williams, L. C.
Williams, M. R. & E. A.
Williamson, K.
Williamson, F. R.
Wilson, C. E.
Wilson, G. B.
Winckel, K. A.
Woods, T. L.
Wright, L. C.
Wyman, C. A.
Zadow, B. W.
Zwart, M.

Prawn authority holders as at February 21, 1975:

Dunstan, D. R. & R. P.
Degilio, L.
Barreau, R. C. & W. A.
Bascomb, W. T.
Bay Fisheries Pty. Ltd.
Blaslov, A.
Bralic, I.
Brice, R. J. & Black, D. M.
Corigliano, M. J.
Crawford, J. P.
Davies Bros.
Delongville, R. L.
Edwards, R. A.
Farrand, W. R. & Johnson, B.
Franks, A.
Ginis, N.
Gobin, L.
W. E. Gordon Fisheries Pty. Ltd.
Haldane, C. W. & R. J.
Haldane Bros. (Tacoma Pty. Ltd.)
Hansen, W. A.
Haselgrove, N. & Neale, A.
Hood, C. J.
Justice, N.
Kajig Pty. Ltd.
Kemp, L. C.
Kingston Fisheries
Kolega, D.
Laslett, L. M.
Leech, D. M.
Oaro Pty. Ltd.
Martinovic, R.
Mattsson, N. N. & Y.
Mezic, J.
Milton, L. W.
Dalmation Fishing Co.
Palmer, A. N. & M. R.
Perm & Co.
Puglisi, B.
Puglisi Fishing Co. Pty. Ltd.
Sarin, S.
Sarunic Bros. Pty. Ltd.
Santa Anna Deep Sea Fisheries
Simms, B.
Simms, C. G. & F. I.
Skoljarev, S. M.
Smith, A. C.
Spencer Gulf Prawn Co.
Tanisijevic, V.
Valcic, M.
Walker, R. & N.
Waller, N.

Abalone permit holders as at February 21, 1975:

Andrews, C. J.
Brandon, G.
Castle, T. J.
Chapman, G. D.
Craig, N.
Edmunds, C. V.
Edwards, R. A. G.
Eldridge, D. W.
Ellis, J. M.
Ey, E. J.
Farley, E. N.
Fox, R. W.
Galpin, A. A.
Garnaut, T. J.
Hockaday, F. A.
Hopcroft, B. J.
Johnson, R. E.
Kelly, P.
Kroezen, J. R.
Lee, A. J. (Jnr.)
Lee, R. G.
McCallum, G. M.
McGovern, J. R.
Milanovic, W.
Morrison, D. V.
Murphy, V.
Oliver, C. G.
Pluker, M.
Polacco, M.
Pulford, R. C.
Royans, C. J.
Smith, P. E.
Southwell, M. N.
Symons, P. J.
Taylor, W. J.
Thompson, P. J.
Vandepeer, M. R.
Wardle, P.
Williams, D. N.

SPECIAL PURPOSE GRANTS

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has the proliferation of special purpose grants from the Australian Government and consequently the increased demands for specific information on the various projects as a condition of the receipt of those grants been such as to cause concern to the Government?

2. In which specific areas of State Government activity is it possible to quantify the additional costs involved in meeting these requirements, and, for each such area of activity, what has been the percentage increase in the cost of providing such information to the Australian Government over the past three years?

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

1. It is true that much information is required by the Australian Government in relation to these grants, but this is understandable when one considers the sums of Australian Government moneys involved. These requirements are not of undue concern to the State, although some delays have occurred in the receipt of moneys, because queries have been raised by Australian Government officials on information relating to some physical or professional aspect of particular programmes. In those instances the State Government has in effect provided bridging finance.

2. The Treasury in its role as a co-ordinator of the major programmes funded by the Australian Government has increased its staff in this area in the last three years from one to three, and in the near future another officer is expected to be engaged in this activity for 50 per cent of his time. The major increase in demand for information concerning the Australian Government funded programmes has occurred in the area of education. The Education and Further Education Departments increased their staff in this respect from equivalent half-time officer to five full-time officers. There have also been increases in demands for specific information in other areas (Aboriginal affairs, health and welfare). At this point I am unable to quantify the time involved on the part of State officers in those areas.

I might add that the State Treasury is now examining requirements under various Australian Government programmes with a view to taking up with the appropriate Australian Government authority the question of modified procedures in order to simplify the information process, assist the flow of funds, and provide a basis for all State

costs involved in administering the programme being met from the programme funds.

CRANE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. Has the State Supply Department, on behalf of the Engineering and Water Supply Department, placed an order for a crane within the last four months and, if so, when were tenders called and on what date did they close, and on what date was a decision reached?

2. What were the specifications of the crane contained in the tender documents?

3. Which company obtained the contract, for what price, and what is the manufactured origin of the crane?

4. If the crane has been imported what are the reasons for accepting an imported product as against purchase of an Australian built crane?

5. Have any instructions been given either before or since this contract for preferential consideration of Australian built machinery or goods?

6. If instructions were not given, will the Minister undertake to discuss this important subject with Cabinet and make public Cabinet's decision as a matter of public interest?

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

1. Yes—October 7, 1974; October 21, 1974; and December 16, 1974.

2. Copy attached.

3. Noyes Bros. Proprietary Limited—manufactured in Japan. It is policy not to disclose details of the price of tenders.

4. Tenders are accepted on the basis of quality and price.

5. Yes—before this contract.

6. Vide 5.

THE SUPPLY AND TENDER BOARD,
BOX 549, G.P.O.,
ADELAIDE. S. AUST. 5001

Telegraphic Address:
"Statestores" Adelaide

Telephone Nos. 228 2817
(STD 08)

TENDER No. 871

DUE DATE: 2 p.m. 21/10/74
To be lodged in sealed official envelope in TENDER BOX
STATE SUPPLY DEPARTMENT
ADELAIDE HOUSE,
55 WAYMOUTH STREET, ADELAIDE

The following tender is submitted in response to your advertisement for the supply and delivery

PLANT STORE E. & W.S. DEPARTMENT GRAND JUNCTION ROAD, OTTOWAY S.A. 5013

Description	Rate
1 only CRANE 40 000 lb. capacity to specification	CB320A each

Less ..... Government Discount ..... Settlement Discount

Origin of tendered goods	Customs Duty (if applicable)
Country (or)	Customs Tariff Item .....
Aust. State	Rate of Duty .....
Maker's Name	Amount of Duty included in the price $.....
.....	Whether By-Law application will be made .....
	By-Law Determination No. .....

Particular attention is drawn to Condition 6 on back hereof

I/We hereby agree to supply the goods described above at the prices set out opposite the respective items, subject to Conditions of Tendering on back hereof and General Conditions of Contract exhibited, and to deliver the whole quantity.....weeks from the date of notification of acceptance of this Tender under a penalty (as liquidated damages) of 2½ per cent per month, or part thereof.

Dated this.....day of.....19

.....Tenderer's Name
(IN BLOCK LETTERS)

.....Address

.....Post Code

.....Signature

SUPPLY AND TENDER BOARD, S.A.

Conditions of Tendering

METHOD OF LODGMENT. 1. All tenders must be upon the proper forms, which must not be altered, enclosed in an envelope addressed to the Supply and Tender Board of South Australia, and clearly endorsed "Tender No.....".

DRAWING AND SPECIFICATIONS. 2. Drawings and specifications may be seen and inspected free of charge, or may be purchased at the prices stated. When purchased at a cost of $2 and upwards, the amount will be returned to unsuccessful tenderers who have sent in a bona fide tender upon return of the documents in good condition within one week from date of notice of non-acceptance of tender.

ORIGIN. 3. So far as possible the material tendered for should be manufactured in South Australia; should this not be possible, the tenderer must supply particulars of any material to be manufactured outside the State.

TRANSFER OF CONTRACT AND PAYMENT OF WAGES. 4. The contractor shall not transfer, assign, or sublet his contract or any portion thereof, nor assign the deposit security or any portion thereof, without the written consent of the Board. Should it be proved to the satisfaction of the Board that the workmen engaged in carrying out the contract have not been paid their wages, the controlling Minister may authorise the payment of such wages from sums due to the contractor as a first charge against any claim made by the holder or assignee of a procuration order.

ACCEPTANCE. 5. The Supply and Tender Board reserves the right to accept a portion or whole of any tender.

PRICE VARIATIONS. 6. The Supply and Tender Board desires tenderers to submit firm prices in Australian currency and tenders submitted on this basis will be normally preferred. Prices will be accepted as firm unless price variation conditions are stated in the tender documents. Where a price variation clause is invoked the Board reserves the right, before making payment, to check documentary evidence relating to any rise or fall in wages and/or material costs occurring subsequent to the date of tendering. Where a price variation clause is based on fluctuations of commodity prices the base price of such commodity, unless otherwise stated by the tenderer, will be taken as the price ruling on the day the tender was signed, or if not dated, the closing date of the tender. The Board also reserves the right to rescind the contract if the price increase claimed is, in the opinion of the Board, excessive.

PRICE CONTROL. 7. The prices tendered herein shall not exceed the maximum prices at which the goods may be sold subject to the provisions of the Prices Act, 1948-1972.

SALES TAX. 8. Tendered prices shall not include sales tax, unless otherwise requested.

DELIVERY. 9. If the contractor is unable to complete the contract within the period stipulated in his tender, the contractor shall forward a written explanation to the Board, whereupon the Board may determine the contract or extend the period for delivery.

DEPOSIT. 10. Successful tenderers may be required within seven days of date of notice of acceptance of tender to sign the contract and make a deposit, as security for due fulfilment of contract (either in cash, by bank guarantee or such other security as is approved by the Board) of 5 per cent of the contract value up to $10 000; when the total amount of the contract exceeds $10 000 the amount of the deposit must equal 5 per cent on $10 000 plus 2½ per cent of the amount over $10 000 up to $40 000; When the total value of the contract exceeds $40 000 the amount of the deposit must equal 5 per cent on $10 000 and an additional 2½ per cent on $30 000 plus 1 per cent on all the amount above $40 000.

CUSTOMS DUTY. 11. Where a tendered price includes customs duty the tenderer must state the tariff item and amount of duty so included. In all cases where a tenderer is prepared to apply for by-law admission on the Supply and Tender Board's behalf such should be stated in the tender. A copy of any such submission made to the Department of Customs and Excise shall be supplied to the Board.

RESERVATIONS. 12. Neither the lowest nor any tender necessarily accepted.

T. H. PHILLIPS, Director, State Supply Department

ENGINEERING AND WATER SUPPLY DEPARTMENT—CONSTRUCTION BRANCH

SPECIFICATION No. C.B. 320 A

18-20 TON CAPACITY TRUCK CRANE

General

A heavy duty hydraulically operated full slewing truck crane with extendable telescopic boom is required. The crane is to be operated from a cabin located on the upper works and a separate power unit similarly located to power the crane is preferred. The crane is to comply with the Road Traffic Act in all respects, including axle loadings, axle spacing, braking, overall width, height length and lighting requirements. A certificate of approved and accepted design by the S.A. Department of Labour and Industry will be submitted with the tender and the crane shall conform to the requirements of the Australian Code CB 2 of 1960.

Upper Machinery

Engine—(if fitted) is to be a popular make industrial diesel engine of approximately 150 b.h.p. net flywheel fitted with an approved heavy duty dry type air cleaner and pre-cleaner.

Hydraulic Equipment—Pumps, valves, and other hydraulic components manufactured by well known and popular manufacturers are to be used. All hydraulic cylinders are to be fitted with safety check valves, to guard against hose or line failure.

Boom—An extendable boom giving boom lengths from a nominal 25ft. minimum to not less than 75ft. is required. The boom is to be capable of being used at any point of extension within this range and is to be extended hydraulically using controls located in the operators cab.

Lifting Capacity—The crane shall be capable of lifting 40 000 lbs., over side and rear at 10ft. radius and 3 300 lbs. at 50ft. radius in all positions of slew. Capacities are required for over side and rear operation, with outriggers and without, and at 75 per cent tipping load.

Winches—Winches are to be powered by hydraulic motors fitted with fail safe braking equipment and are to be fitted with drums of sufficient capacity to accommodate cable for hook operation of not less than 40ft. below ground level.

Swing Brake—A heavy duty swing brake is to be provided.

Carrier—The carrier is to be a specialised crane carrier vehicle and not an adaption of a proprietary line motor lorry chassis.

Engine—The engine is to be a popular make heavy duty industrial diesel engine of not less than 150 b.h.p. net flywheel and is to be fitted with an approved dry type air cleaner with extension pre-cleaner located at rear cab roof height, and a vertical exhaust system.

Transmission—A transmission giving adequate creeper gears for safe traversal of rough and steep site conditions and adequate suitably spaced highway ratios to permit comfortable road travel at speeds up to 42 m.p.h. is required.

Tandem Drive—A heavy duty tandem drive with suspension suitable for off-highway operation is required. An interaxle differential with locking control remotely actuated from the cab, is to be fitted.

Steering—Full power steering is required.

Brakes—Full air braking is required.

Tyres—Heavy duty lug type tyres are to be fitted to the driving wheels and spare. Front tyres with conventional tread are required.

Cabin—An all steel weatherproof lock-up cab is required.

Outriggers—Hydraulically operated outriggers are required.

Optional Extras—A separate price is required for an extension fly jib of not less than 25ft. Tenderers are to quote capacities applicable to operation with this attachment.

Painting—The bodywork of the carrier and crane is to be painted BS.381C-1964 No. 356 Golden Yellow. Chassis work and mudguards are to be painted black. Wheels are to be painted silver and the boom head and hook block painted white.

Two copies of spare parts, operators and workshop manuals are to be supplied and, after inspection by Engineering and Water Supply Department's inspector, unit is to be delivered to Engineering and Water Supply Department, Construction Branch, Ottoway.

HEALTH PLANNING

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. For what reason has the Commonwealth Government made a special grant for health planning and development?

2. What sum will be received in this financial year?

3. Will additional staff be appointed to the Health Department, or will the work pursuant to this grant be performed by present officers of the department?

4. What is the specific nature of the planning project or projects to be undertaken?

5. Is the grant expected to be a recurrent one?

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

1. To strengthen existing research and planning divisions or to assist in the creation of such sections that had not previously been in existence.

2. $64 000.

3. These resources have contributed to the establishment of the State Health Resources Unit, whose officers will undertake the appropriate responsibilities. One additional research officer has been appointed, and further staff expansion is expected in future.

4. The State Health Resources Unit has been involved in obtaining a wide range of data concerning existing resources in the field of health and health services. In addition, the unit and its staff have been the major point of contact, investigation and assessment in relation to the community health programme, and other developmental projects.

5. It is expected that a similar grant will be made for the 1975-76 financial year.

TRANSPORT DRIVERS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What action will be taken to examine the position of transport drivers who have recently received notices of licence disqualification under the points demerit system in respect of points accumulated for speeding offences committed against the Road Traffic Act, before that Act was recently amended to increase the speed limit?

2. Will an adjustment to the period of disqualification be made to allow for the fact that this penalty is now being imposed at a time when the speed limit has been increased, and, in many cases, is such that the earlier offences would no longer be offences under the Act as amended?

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

1. None.

2. No.

FORENSIC LABORATORY

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. How many people are attached to the police forensic laboratory, and what are their duties, respectively?

2. What are the qualifications of each of these officers?

3. How many graduates in science or related disciplines of study is it considered should be in that laboratory, and, if none are considered necessary, what are the reasons for this view?

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

1. The present Technical Services Division has a total complement of 46 members under the control of a commissioned officer. The division is composed of seven sections, which are listed below with their respective duties.

1.1 Crime scene examiners section:

Comprising 13 members. Their duties require them to attend at scenes of crimes, collect and preserve physical evidence, and take and process such photographs as may be required.

1.2 Laboratory technicians section:

Comprising six members. Their duties entail:

1.2.1 Collation of physical evidence collected in relation to crime investigations.

1.2.2 Liaison with doctors and scientists from other organisations.

1.2.3 Expert examination of toolmarks, shoemarks, tyre tracks and other similar physical evidence.

1.3 Ballistics section:

Comprising four members. Their duties entail:

1.3.1 Investigation of offences involving firearms.

1.3.2 Disposal of commercial explosives and improvised explosive devices.

1.3.3 Training of police personnel in the handling of firearms.

1.4 Document section:

Comprising three members. Their duties entail:

1.4.1 The examination of questioned documents including handwriting and typewriting comparisons.

1.4.2 Police art work.

1.5 Photographic section:

Comprising two members. Their duties entail:

1.5.1 Specialist photographic work.

1.5.2 Maintenance and supervision of police photographic facilities.

1.6 Single fingerprint section:

Comprising three members. Their duties entail:

1.6.1 The compilation and maintenance of the single fingerprint collection.

1.6.2 The searching and identification of latent fingerprints found at scenes of crime.

1.7 Breath analysis section:

Comprising 13 members. Their duties entail:

1.7.1 Conducting breath analyses on suspected drive under the influence and exceed ·08 offenders.

2. Qualifications: The qualifications of members of the Technical Services Division are as follows:

1 Bachelor of Science (Honours) Degree (University of Adelaide).

1 Certificate in Analytical Chemistry (South Australian Institute of Technology).

2 Photographic Science Certificate (South Australian Institute of Technology).

7 Science Technicians Certificate (South Australian Institute of Technology).

15 partially completed Science Technicians Certificate courses at the South Australian Institute of Technology.

6 qualified in explosives disposal.

1 passed two first-year science subjects at the University of Adelaide.

16 passed breathalyser operators courses.

1 enrolled for a science course at the University of Adelaide.

Various members of the division have, as part of their training programme, attended at appropriate sections of interstate and oversea Police Forces.

3. The Laboratory Technicians Section at present employs one graduate scientist. Another graduate scientist is at present undergoing a basic police training course prior to employment within the Technical Services Division. Another member of this division is enrolled at the University of Adelaide in a science degree course. It is considered that this number meets our present requirements. Whenever an investigation requires expertise outside the scope of personnel employed by the Police Department it is the practice to consult doctors and scientists in the following organisations:

3.1 The Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science.

3.2 Red Cross Blood Centre.

3.3 Chemistry Department.

3.4 Botanic Garden.

3.5 Australian Mineral Development Laboratories.

3.6 Museum.

3.7 University of Adelaide.

3.8 Any other laboratory or scientist able to assist because of their specialist qualifications.

This procedure has proved to be impartial, economic, and efficient. The situation is constantly under review.

BREATHALYSER

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has a report been called for on the comments made in the Law Reform Committee report in respect of the accuracy of the breathalyser in determining blood alcohol levels and, if so, when will that report be made public?

2. Is a more detailed inquiry into the accuracy of breathalyser readings considered necessary and, if so, when will such inquiry be held, and what form will it take?

3. Is there any evidence now available to indicate that any miscarriage of justice may have occurred because of inaccurate breathalyser readings?

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

1. and 2. The recommendations of the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee of South Australia with respect to testing for blood alcohol content were referred by me to the Minister of Transport following the release of the report. I am informed that the Minister has sought a report on those recommendations from the Road Safety Committee of the Highways Department, which expects to report to him in the near future. Such a report will no doubt include comment on whether or not a detailed

scientific inquiry should be made into the accuracy of breath analysis for blood alcohol content.

3. Neither I nor the committee has any evidence to indicate that any miscarriage of justice has occurred in South Australia because of inaccurate breathalyser readings. The committee's recommendations were based on criticisms by certain analytical chemists on the use of the breathalyser instrument to determine the concentration of alcohol in the blood.

BALDNESS

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Has an advertisement in the press inserted by Ashley and Martin and relating to treatment for excessive hair loss been examined by officers of the Attorney-General's Department?

2. Is it considered that this is in fact an advertisement advocating treatment to prevent the development of baldness and, if so, what action will be taken to control such advertisements in the future?

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

1. Yes, it has been examined by officers of the Prices and Consumer Affairs Branch.

2. It is considered that the advertisement does in effect advocate treatment to prevent the development of baldness.

3. A committee has been appointed by the Government with the following terms of reference:

> To examine the procedures and activities associated with scalp treatments commonly advertised as purporting to treat baldness and to report to the Attorney-General detailing what action (if any) should be taken to control such activities.

The committee has not yet reported.

MASLIN BEACH

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Is it intended to provide time during the remainder of this session to debate the issue of nude bathing and, if so, when?

2. If time is not to be provided, why not?

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

1. Nude bathing may be debated if there is a time when no other business should take precedence. The honourable member is aware of procedures in this House.

2. See above.

THEBARTON COMMUNITY CENTRE

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. What is the present estimated cost of the intended Thebarton Community Centre?

2. What part of that cost is to be borne by the South Australian Government by way of replacing the existing Thebarton Boys High School with a new co-educational community high school?

3. What firm commitment has the Australian Government made to fund the remainder of the project?

4. When does the Minister now expect that work on the site will commence?

5. What facilities, other than the high school, are provided in present plans for the community centre?

6. What surveys were made into the need for and public acceptance of the centre, what were the results of these surveys, and were the people questioned in such surveys aware at the time that the project would involve demolition of a substantial number of houses?

7. What reasons can be given for the subsequent poor community response to the project, as evidenced in, for example, articles at page 30 of the Thebarton Boys High School magazine for 1974 and in the December 18 issue of *West-Side?*

8. When and how were the occupants of the eight houses falling into category 3 (*a*), as defined in the Minister's reply to Question No. 13 on August 20, 1974, informed that their houses were to be compulsorily acquired and demolished in the initial stages of the project, and what liaison is being maintained with them, particularly to explain the apparent lack of firm commitment by the Australian Government to funding the project?

9. What liaison is being maintained with the occupants of the other 24 houses that the Government plans to acquire eventually to complete the project?

10. How many houses in each category have been acquired by the Government—

(*a*) by negotiation; and

(*b*) by compulsory acquisition;

and what use is being made of such houses pending their demolition?

11. When does the Minister expect that acquisition proceedings will be commenced in respect of those houses not already acquired?

12. Why was the intended centre not designed to use the present high school site and adjoining vacant land without the need to demolish adjoining houses and other buildings?

13. Is the Government entirely satisfied that the value of the intended centre to the local community justifies the demolition of 32 houses?

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

1. The estimated total cost of the Thebarton Community Centre as at December 20, 1974, was $6 585 693.

2. The cost of the school component of the centre which is to be borne by the South Australian Education Department is estimated to be $3 349 842 as at December 20, 1974.

3. A submission will be considered shortly by the Australian Cabinet.

4. Vide 3.

5. The present plans for the community centre provide for the following facilities:

- An administration and maintenance section containing offices and rooms for both professional and maintenance staff.
- Community service facilities such as small rentable spaces, a medical and dental centre, meeting rooms, a community library/resource centre, a cafeteria, extended workshop areas to cater for community use, and an information centre.
- Sports facilities including an indoor swimming pool, squash courts, outdoor playing fields and an increased sports hall to cater for community use.
- Performing arts facilities such as a music centre, an intimate theatre, a drama workshop, a television film studio and an increase of normal school provisions.
- A child care/child minding centre.
- Facilities for the Community Welfare Department.

6. An extensive survey was conducted in December, 1973, to January, 1974, as an initial exercise in the area. The detailed report of that survey is given in the report, "Community Centre Thebarton South Australia". A summation on page 57 states:

> The teams were highly successful in promoting the proposed centres in their respective areas. As a result of their efforts there exists widespread enthusiasm and interest in the proposed centres.

Other smaller surveys have since been conducted by the Thebarton Boys Technical High School and the Thebarton Community Centre Residents' Committee. In both cases the surveys were to gain specific information on issues

related to the community centre and were used to prepare submissions for various grants.

The project team also researched the area to gain information for the architects, and through a series of meetings and interviews with local groups and representatives significant alteration and modifications have been made to the original brief.

When the South Australian Government made the original submission to the Australian Government a booklet was prepared outlining the proposed scheme. Included in that booklet was the statement that certain properties would need to be acquired and an aerial photograph showing the location of such properties (page 6 of the report—Thebarton High School Community Centre). This information was freely available and was first reported in *West-Side* on September 5, 1973.

7. The Leader has misinterpreted the facts in the two articles he quotes. The poor response cited in the Thebarton Boys Technical High School magazine refers to attendance at a meeting on April 2, 1974, when publicity was poorly arranged by a group of local residents. The response to the project was not poor as has already been shown by quoting the report of the survey. The report in *West-Side* on December 18, really states that delays in an announcement about the funding of the project are causing a certain amount of scepticism. Mr. Hedrich the Residents' Committee chairman was requesting local residents to show the strength of their support for the project by signing a petition to be sent to the House of Representatives.

8. Initially a public meeting was held at the Thebarton Boys Technical High School on February 28, 1974, to discuss the question of property acquisition. It became obvious during this meeting that there were a number of quite old residences in the area marked for acquisition and in subsequent discussion the consultant architect considered that he might be able to arrange building sites so that most residents could be allowed to stay if they so wished. As a result a definite policy was determined and on March 22 a letter outlining the position was delivered by hand to each of the residents involved. Since that time six of the eight houses in the category 3 (*a*) have been acquired. The owners of the other properties are at present negotiating with the Education Department over purchase of their properties.

9. Of the 24 properties in category (*b*) four have now been purchased by the Education Department. The owners of the other houses have been advised that their property will be purchased as it becomes available for sale but will not be compulsorily acquired. No other contact has been made with these house owners.

10. At the present time six houses in category (*a*) have been purchased, and in category (*b*) four houses have been purchased. All purchases have been as a result of negotiation, and no property has yet been compulsorily acquired. Of the properties which have been purchased, one is being used by the school; one is being used by the Aboriginal College and Torrens College of Advanced Education; two are being used by the Residents' Committee and the local branch of the Community Welfare Department as offices and a child care centre; one is still occupied by the original owners on a rental basis; one is being held pending a decision to establish a women's medical centre; and the remaining properties are being leased to private citizens.

11. In view of the present position it is unlikely that compulsory acquisition of any property will be necessary. Six of the eight houses in category (*a*) have been purchased and negotiations are proceeding with the owners of the remaining two.

12. The design report of the architects contained in the booklet "Community Centre Thebarton South Australia" gives the reasons why land acquisition was necessary. Briefly, they are:

Thebarton league football oval occupies a central position on the site. Access for large numbers of people and parking of cars must be provided for this facility.

Many parts of the site are unsuitable for economic building, being a brickworks pughole, or recently filled land.

Existing housing borders the site on two sides, restricting visual and physical accessibility.

The present area of the site is minimal for the facilities provided.

Existing educational buildings are, in many cases, suitable for renovation and re-use. The planning of the complex is influenced by the location of these buildings.

13. Yes.

UNLEY TRAFFIC

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. Have investigations been made into the increased volume of traffic now using Wattle Street as a result of the closing of certain streets in Unley?

2. Was this increase in traffic expected?

3. If this increase was not expected, what steps is it intended will be taken to relieve the situation?

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

1. Yes.

2. An increase was expected but preliminary measurements indicate increases insignificant.

3. See 2 above.

FLINDERS HIGHWAY

Mr. GUNN (on notice):

1. When will work again commence on the Talia to Streaky Bay section of the Flinders Highway?

2. Why has there been a delay?

3. Is the Minister aware that this road is deteriorating rapidly?

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

1. It is not known when work will resume.

2. The contractor is in financial difficulties, and the matter is in the hands of the Crown Solicitor.

3. Regular inspections reveal that the road is not deteriorating rapidly. It is being adequately maintained by the contractor and local council.

FRANCHISE TAXES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What is the total amount paid so far in taxation pursuant to—

(*a*) the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Act, 1974; and

(*b*) the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act, 1974?

2. What has been the cost so far of collecting such amounts, and how is that cost made up?

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

1. Nil—Licences are not required to be held under the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Act, 1974, and the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act, 1974, until March 24, 1975, and April 1, 1975, respectively.

2. Direct costs of the Business Franchise Branch of the State Taxes Department have been—

	$
(*a*) Salaries and pay-roll tax (to 21/2/75)	10 174·54
(*b*) Office expenses and equipment	2 573·75

These costs do not include indirect costs for rent, power, etc., met by the Public Buildings Department.

PETRO-CHEMICAL PLANT

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): How much money has been spent by the Government in connection with the Redcliff project, and how is such sum made up?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: An area of 7 149 acres of land, plus several dwellings, were acquired by the Government at Redcliff. The Land Board assessed the value of this land at $122 350, and this amount was paid into the Land and Valuation Court in January, 1974, to compensate the previous owners. I understand that final settlement has not been effected yet with some of the previous owners. From the time that the project was announced until such time as it will receive its official go-ahead, the Government has proceeded on the basis of making use of the resources existing within Government departments rather than creating new bodies or positions to plan for the project. The Director of the Development Division of the Premier's Department has been acting as Chief Project Officer for Redcliff, and will have spent about 40 per cent of his time on the project. A senior Project Officer of the Development Division has been working nearly full-time on the project.

In addition, many other departments had substantial involvement in Redcliff without, however, having created new positions. For instance, officers from the Crown Law Department were involved in the indenture negotiations. The State Planning Authority, the Community Welfare Department, the Environment and Conservation Department, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, the Education Department, the South Australian Housing Trust, and other Government departments were involved in adapting their planning to the impact of the proposed petro-chemical complex. Several papers and reports were prepared as a result of this work. However, these costs cannot be extracted readily from the records of the various departments concerned without a great deal of unnecessary and wasteful effort. Several visits to the site and to Canberra, Melbourne, and Sydney were made. The Director of the Development Division also went overseas twice in connection with the project.

ENVELOPES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. For how long have the letters "O.H.M.S." been printed on envelopes used by Government departments, and why are they so used?

2. Are such letters still being used and, if not, why not?

3. If not being used, when was their use discontinued and on whose authority was such change made?

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

1. The practice was probably carried on from the days of the Colonial Secretary, and it was always thought that the letters meant "On His (Her) Majesty's Service". Other people held the view that the letters had been transposed and should have referred to His (or Her) Majesty's Stationery Office.

2. No. The words "South Australian Government" are considered to be more appropriate.

3. The change was agreed to in June, 1973, by the Premier and the Chief Secretary.

COURT PROCEDURES

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. What special procedural arrangements are to be made to smooth the operations of the new procedures required by the Local and District Criminal Courts Act Amendment Act (No. 2), 1974?

2. What authority, if any, will such arrangements have?

3. From when are they to operate?

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

1. The Senior Judge is in the process of preparing Rules of Court, and the Chief Stipendiary Magistrate will make appropriate administrative arrangements for the hearing of small claims.

2. As indicated in reply to 1.

3. The date has not yet been determined.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice): Has the Government considered the reasons delivered by Mr. J. J. Redman, A.C.S.M., on January 29, 1975, in the Adelaide Local Court action *Boeyen* v. *Fawcett* and, if so, what action, if any, does it intend to take?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Yes: the honourable member is referred to the above reply to another question.

STATE'S POPULATION

Mr. MILLHOUSE (on notice):

1. Has the State Planning Authority prepared projections of the future population of the State?

2. If so, how many times have such projections been prepared and when were they so prepared?

3. What have been the projections each time (if more than one) for the years, 1980, 1990 and 2000—

(*a*) for the whole State; and

(*b*) for the metropolitan planning area?

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

1. Projections of future population have been adopted from time to time by the State Planning Authority for the State. These include projections for the metropolitan planning area and the 11 planning areas in the remainder of the State, defined for planning purposes under the Planning and Development Act.

2. (1) Projections were prepared for the metropolitan planning area, including local government areas, and the State as a whole by the Town Planning Committee in the report on the Metropolitan Area of Adelaide, 1962. This was subsequently authorised under the Planning and Development Act in 1967, as the Metropolitan Development Plan.

(2) A revised projection of population for the metropolitan planning area was prepared by the Director of Planning in 1967 for the purposes of the Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study.

(3) Projections of population for the 11 country planning areas (including major towns) to 1991 were adopted by the State Planning Authority in 1969.

(4) Revised projections of population have been prepared by the Director of Planning for the northern, north-western, and southern sectors of the metropolitan planning area between 1971 and 1974.

3. The following table outlines the projections made for 2 (1), 2 (2) and 2 (3) above in the years 1981 and 1991, where applicable. Projections have not been made for the years 1980 and 1990 or beyond 1991 in these studies.

Source	Area of projection	Date of projection	1981	1991
Metropolitan Development Plan	(*a*) State	1962	1 589 000	1 953 000
	(*b*) Metropolitan planning area		1 099 000	1 384 000
Metropolitan Adelaide Transportation Study	(*a*) State	1967	—	1 960 000
	(*b*) Metropolitan planning area		1 099 000	1 401 000
Projection of country area of S.A.	(*a*) State	1969	—	1 814 000
	(*b*) Metropolitan planning area		—	1 393 000

It is expected that the authority will undertake further projections when the report on the National Population Inquiry is available. It is understood that the report is to be tabled in Commonwealth Parliament soon.

ST. AGNES PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mrs. BYRNE (on notice): On what date was the site for the St. Agnes Primary School purchased or aquired by the Government, and what was the cost of this land?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: St. Agnes Primary School site was purchased in December, 1970, at a cost of $24 500.

MONARTO

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What was the total cost of preparing material (including photographs), compiling and printing the 1973-74 annual report of the Monarto Development Commission?

2. Why was it necessary to print so many coloured photographs in an annual report?

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

1. $12 573 for 4 000 copies.

2. The use of colour in the annual report is intended to present, in a manner to create interest, features of the Monarto site that are not generally known and often misrepresented.

Dr. EASTICK (on notice):

1. On what date was the first annual report of the Monarto Development Commission printed?

2. Was it distributed to the press before being made available to members of Parliament?

3. Is it intended that this will be the style of format of future reports?

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

1. The printing of the report was completed on January 30, 1975.

2. No. The report was withheld from distribution until tabled in Parliament.

3. The style and form of future reports will be determined from year to year, and will not necessarily follow that of the present report.

PREMIER'S OVERSEA VISIT

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice): Does the Premier intend to make an oversea tour during the next 12 months and, if so—

(*a*) when;
(*b*) how long does he intend to be away;
(*c*) what is the purpose of the tour;
(*d*) what staff will be accompanying him; and
(*e*) what countries will be visited?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No plans whatever have been made for an oversea visit by me in the next 12 months.

PREMIER'S STAFF

Mr. DEAN BROWN (on notice):

1. What members of his personal staff accompanied the Premier to the recent Australian Labor Party conference at Terrigal?

2. What travel and accommodation expenses of these staff members were paid by the South Australian Government, and what were these expenses?

3. For what period were the staff members away from Adelaide?

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

1. The Premier was accompanied by Mr. S. R. Wright (Private Secretary) and Mr. P. R. Ward (Executive Assistant) while at Terrigal. He was also attended during part of the conference by Mr. E. Carey (Under Treasurer) and Mr. A. M. Smith (Senior Government Economist) for meetings with the Prime Minister, Treasurer, Minister for Customs, Minister for Transport and Commonwealth and State officials.

2. Accommodation and travelling expenses for all officers will be paid for by the South Australian Government. Accounts are not yet to hand. The Premier's travelling fares and accommodation charges are payable by the Australian Labor Party.

3. Mr. Wright and Mr. Ward for eight and 10 days respectively; Mr. Carey and Mr. Smith for two days each.

NATIONAL HEALTH SCHEME

Dr. TONKIN (on notice):

1. What private and community hospitals have been asked to provide public (standard ward) bed accommodation in relation to the Commonwealth National Health Insurance Scheme?

2. How many such beds has each hospital been asked to provide?

3. What terms and conditions is it intended to offer to each hospital in relation to the provision of such beds?

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

1. All non-profit charitable and religious private hospitals (including community hospitals) in the metropolitan area of Adelaide have been invited to consider a proposal from the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security to make available a declared number of beds as "approved beds" (that is, currently referred to as "public" or "standard" beds) under the proposed Commonwealth National Health Insurance Scheme.

2. The question of the number of such beds to be provided by a specific hospital is a matter for consideration by the hospital board and subsequent determination by the Commonwealth Minister for Social Security pursuant to the provisions of section 34 (3) of the Health Insurance Act, 1973.

3. The invitation extended to these hospitals suggests that, initially, such beds be used for the treatment of pensioners with medical entitlement cards, so that the beds available for the treatment of pensioner patients can thus be better distributed throughout metropolitan Adelaide; it indicates that each hospital board would need to negotiate with attending medical practitioners for payments to be made by the hospital to those who agree to "direct bill" the hospital for the treatment of pensioners occupying the declared beds, on the basis that remuneration would be no greater than the benefits scheduled in the Health Insurance

Act. Payments by the Commonwealth in respect of such declared beds would be in accordance with the provisions of section 34 of the Health Insurance Act, 1973, that is $16 a day plus a supplementary daily bed payment taking into account the loss of revenue and any increased cost resulting from those beds being used to treat pensioners without charge.

Dr. TONKIN: Can the Premier say whether a formal agreement has been made between the Commonwealth and State Governments in respect of the Medibank scheme, when it was concluded, what are the precise details of the agreement, and when will copies be made available to the House? On September 5 last year all Premiers and Ministers of Health received a letter from Mr. Hayden (Minister for Social Security) enclosing an 11-page document setting out broad principles and heads of agreement in relation to what has now become known as the Medibank scheme. The letter written by Mr. Hayden emphasised that the heads of agreement were matters for discussion only. There are many ambiguities in the proposed heads of agreement. Little detail was offered and, as a result, many queries and doubts have been raised by the State Governments of Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland.

Mr. Gunn: What about the Premier of Tasmania?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: Indeed, I understand from those Ministers concerned that they are still awaiting answers to the many questions they have raised. The New South Wales Government has advanced 16 reasons why it will not accept the proposed Medibank scheme. The Queensland Government, as recently as last Friday, was still awaiting answers to questions it had asked about the scheme last November. When he came to Adelaide for a seminar last Friday, Dr. Deeble, the economist in charge of implementing this programme, left most people in that seminar as unclear about the precise details of the scheme at the end of the seminar as they were when they first appeared.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: We in the Opposition are not in a position to know exactly what details have been discussed by this State Government and the Commonwealth Government, but it seems that we can only draw the inference that the South Australian Government has rushed into this agreement with the Commonwealth without the full knowledge of what it will mean to the health of South Australians. In the opinion of many people, the South Australian Government is buying a pig in a poke.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for Bragg knows full well that he has the unanimous leave of the House to explain his question. Comments and debate are not permitted, so I think the honourable member for Bragg should now conclude on the basis of the explanation.

Dr. TONKIN: I was simply making the point that many people had expressed the opinion that South Australia had bought a pig in a poke.

The SPEAKER: Order! Comments of that nature are not necessary and will not be allowed in an explanation of a question.

Dr. TONKIN: It is a great shame that the South Australian Government has put ideological considerations above the welfare of the people of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In a long course in politics in South Australia, of a longevity that appears to excite some disfavour on the Opposition benches, I have never experienced such a disgraceful campaign as that of the Australian Medical Association—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Of which the member for Bragg is a member.

Mr. Gunn: Answer the question!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —against provisions for the better health and welfare of the people of this State and as that to which the honourable member has just given voice—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He's a member of that association.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I have had many doctors express to me their shame at the actions of that association.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: All the decent ones have.

Mr. Gunn: Answer the question!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will answer the question. The member for Bragg proceeded to get into the gutter on this subject—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: —and I am proposing to deal with it accordingly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The provisions of the national medical scheme put forward by the Commonwealth Government are overwhelmingly for the benefit of the people of this State.

Mr. Venning: We'll see.

Mr. Gunn: What nonsense!

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He's talking out of his own pocket.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The position is that a final agreement with the Commonwealth Government has not been signed at this stage.

Dr. Tonkin: I thought it had been.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: In that case, the honourable member was wrong, as he often is. However, the position is that arrangements with the Commonwealth Government, in pursuance of the achievement of such an agreement, are very well advanced and, when the agreement has been completed, it will be published.

Dr. Tonkin: In other words, you don't—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Many details of it already have been made public to both the A.M.A. and the hospitals in South Australia.

Mr. Goldsworthy: What's it going to cost?

The SPEAKER: Order! During Question Time, an honourable member, in accordance with Standing Orders, may ask a question. Only one question will be permitted at a time. There will be no answers to interjections. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The honourable member has suggested that the Government does not know what it is getting into, and I can only tell him that the Government, throughout this matter, has had the advice of Dr. Woodruff, Dr. Shea, and other senior officers, that we have been through the proposals for the introduction of the Medibank scheme in considerable detail, that we are

satisfied that it can come into force on July 1, and that it will provide a very marked benefit for the average citizens of South Australia.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: He's not interested in that: he's interested in the medical profession.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The kind of obstruction and ideological nonsense, and the major campaign of sheer untruth that has come from the opponents of this scheme, are a disgrace to everyone who has been involved in it, including the honourable member.

Dr. EASTICK: Can the Premier say how the Government will use the $20 000 000 given to the State by the Commonwealth Government for selling out the best interests of South Australians by accepting the nationalised health scheme, Medibank? In the announcement that the South Australian Government had agreed to co-operate with the Commonwealth in the Medibank scheme, it was stated that under the formal agreement South Australia would receive an additional $20 000 000 in 1975-76 to be spent on hospitals. The question arises as to how the Government will, in fact, use this money. Does the Government intend to spend the $20 000 000 in upgrading and improving the State's health care programme, especially the provision of low-cost accommodation and services, or does the Premier intend that the money given as an inducement to accept Medibank will be swallowed up in general revenue, so helping to reduce the huge deficit still facing this State? Just what will the Premier be doing with this money, tainted as it is with the smell of the sell-out by this Government to Canberra of the health and welfare of the people of this State?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Premier.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I get a little bemused by the Leader's catchcries, which do not seem to hang together very well. Every so often he plucks one out of the air, putting it together with something strangely irrelevant; he then sits down with the air of someone who has done something wondrous for the people of the State.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I will deal with one area of the Leader's floundering. He talked about the stupendous deficit of the State. Normally, he does not appear to read the numerous financial documents of the State, including those provided to him personally. However, I point out that the stupendous deficit of the State now stands at $2 200 000! I do not know where the Leader proposes that I should use $20 000 000 in order to reduce that figure. His questions often relate in such small degree to the facts of South Australia that it is difficult to follow him. The State has not been sold out in the acceptance of Commonwealth money in respect of Medibank. I do not know what the Leader thinks I have been selling of this State in accepting Commonwealth money which is entirely in accordance with the policy of this State and which simply—

Dr. Eastick: The State or this Government?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is a policy for which people have voted overwhelmingly at election after election in South Australia to cure the utter neglect of Liberal Governments over 30 years.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: We have improved the hospitals in South Australia by a massive expenditure of public moneys, and if we can get some additional assistance from the Commonwealth to upgrade the hospitals of South Australia and provide the new hospitals, which I remember members opposite saying we should have had yesterday just after we came into office, we will be grateful. I can remember members opposite, including the member for Mitcham, asking why we had not already built the hospital at Tea Tree Gully or the Flinders Medical Centre. Let them all go tomorrow to Flinders, and they will see what we have been doing. We have been spending money on hospitals in South Australia, and if we can get help from the Commonwealth Government I shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. GUNN: Will the Attorney-General ask officers of his department to investigate the series of costly advertisements, which are now appearing widely in newspapers and which extol the alleged advantages of the Commonwealth Government's Medibank scheme, with a view to taking action on the grounds of gross misrepresentation and unfair advertising?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Having read the advertisements, I am satisfied that any such action would be bound to fail.

Later:

Dr. EASTICK: Will the Premier indicate that he misunderstood the question asked of him earlier this afternoon, when we referred to a potential deficit in 1975-76 and not a deficit in 1974-75, when he seemed so pleased to hide behind the figure of about $2 200 000? It is all very well for the Premier to try to push aside the criticism of the sell-out by his Government of this State's health now and in the future, and it is on this basis that I ask the Premier to accept that he misunderstood the question previously asked of him.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I do not say that I did. I do my best to understand the Leader, but I confess that at times that is difficult.

PETROL TAX

Mr. PAYNE: Will the Premier consider amending the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Act to cater for possible cases of hardship, as applies in the case of the Business Franchise (Tobacco) Act? Section 12 of the latter Act provides:

(1) Where the Minister is satisfied that payment of a fee assessed by the Commissioner in accordance with section 11 of this Act in respect of a licence would cause substantial hardship to the applicant for, or holder of, the licence, the Minister may reduce the fee.

I understand that certain licensees affected by the Business Franchise (Petroleum) Act face severe financial hardship for reasons that I will state. I know of one case of a man who only last November took over a reselling station. The average monthly sales for that station for the previous year (1973-74) totalled 17 000 gall., that being the figure on which the Commissioner of Stamps will levy the charge of 5·3c a gallon. For the two months of this current quarter (and members will know that the first payment under the Act is due on March 24) this man is averaging sales of 14 000 gall. It can be seen that, if his sales continue at this rate, it is unlikely he will be able to remain a licensee much longer. Is the Premier considering amending the Act to cover cases of this type?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: I cannot promise the honourable member an amendment to the Act. If he will give full details of this case, we shall examine the matter. The provision in the tobacco franchise legislation was included because we were aware of a particularly anomalous situation which could arise and which had been brought to our attention by honourable members and by the industry. A similar submission from the industry in South Australia has not been made in relation to the petroleum franchise legislation.

BREAD INDUSTRY

Mr. COUMBE: My question is addressed to the Minister of Labour and Industry, and I hope at last I can get some information from one Minister. What is the present position regarding the bread industry in this State? Following the release of the interim report on the bread industry last year, I ask whether the Government intends to introduce a five-day baking week throughout the State which will deny people, in the metropolitan area at any rate, the opportunity they now enjoy of being able to purchase freshly baked bread on a Sunday.

The Hon. D. H. McKEE: I think it is very unlikely at this stage that the present situation regarding the bread industry in this State will change. However, the report is still being considered and a further announcement will probably be made later this year.

BEEF INDUSTRY

Mr. RODDA: I wish to ask a question of the Minister of Works, representing the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the statement made by the Chairman of the Australian Meat Board that the negotiated sale of 40 000 tonnes of beef to Russia will return to the producer between $9·50 and $12·50 for each 45 kilograms, against a current cost of production of $25 a kilogram, will State Ministers of Agriculture be discussing with the Australian Minister for Agriculture (Senator Wriedt) the 100 per cent loss which the industry is experiencing and which is underlined by this sale to Russia? Recently, $20 000 000 at 11 per cent interest was made available through the Development Bank for the assistance of beef producers in Australia, and I think South Australian producers received $4 000 000 of that sum. It is an oversea sale and, as the Chairman of the Australian Meat Board has properly said, it puts a floor in the industry regarding sales. This surely underlines the plight of the industry, and the matter can be settled only by negotiation between the State Minister of Agriculture and the Australian Minister for Agriculture.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will take up the matter with the Minister of Agriculture and obtain a report for the honourable member as quickly as possible.

MURRAY BRIDGE PRIMARY SCHOOL

Mr. WARDLE: Can the Minister of Education say whether funds are in hand for the immediate erection of a primary school at what is often referred to as Fraser Park in Murray Bridge? In addition, can he say when the school will be erected if funds for this purpose are in hand? The Minister will be aware that this new primary school began in the grounds of an existing primary school, and I suppose it is somewhat rare for this to happen; at least, I have not heard of it happening before. Obviously, there is an immediate need for such a primary school, the Headmaster and staff of which occupy the grounds and buildings of another school which is operating but which does not have much room, anyway. It will be appreciated, therefore, if the Minister can say when the necessary buildings will be erected.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: The school to which the honourable member refers is planned to be constructed in Demac, but its future depends on the rate at which the Demac building programme can be expanded. I understand that the Public Buildings Department is now producing Demac units at the rate of about four or five a week, and it is hoped to increase that rate to about 500 to 600 units a year. We hope that that increased rate of expansion will take place before the middle of this year. In those circumstances, there will be no difficulty in constructing Fraser Park Primary School this year; however, it depends on the physical problems of the expansion of the Demac programme rather than on the availability of funds. The necessary funds have been approved to expand the Demac programme. The present situation is simply one of ensuring that the expansion in the rate of producing Demac units actually takes place. I assure the honourable member that, of the schools that are proposed to be constructed in Demac, Fraser Park, along with three or four other schools, has top priority.

ELECTRICITY TARIFFS

Mr. EVANS: Will the Minister of Works negotiate with the Electricity Trust of South Australia to alter its rules regarding the supply of J tariff electricity? At present the Electricity Trust refuses to let a person use J tariff power if he installs any other method of heating water (such as solar energy) than electrical power. It is now possible in South Australia to buy panels that will supply a house with sun-power, thus relieving pressures as regards electricity costs and supply for the person concerned, as well as for the State in the long term. The trust will not allow a person to continue using J tariff power where he has an installation using solar energy. It is necessary especially for South Australia to encourage people to use solar energy in future. Unfortunately, the trust's ruling prevents people from doing just that. I ask the Minister whether he will request the trust to change its rule, in order to provide the opportunity to use both methods of supplying power, because it is of benefit to the State and to the individual.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: This question was raised recently with me by the member for Mitchell and I gave him an interim reply. I have asked the trust to re-examine the question as a result of its report to me. Currently the matter is still under consideration. However, I do believe that grounds exist for the J tariff or something similar to apply in cases of this nature. I am awaiting a further report from the trust on this matter, and I will let the honourable member know of the outcome when I receive that report.

PORT AUGUSTA ROAD

Mr. VENNING: Can the Minister of Transport say what are to be the activities of the gangs assigned to work on upgrading of the Port Pirie to Port Augusta highway, following an announcement made by him during the past three or four days that this work will not now proceed because of a lack of finance?

Mr. Gunn: Whose fault's that?

Mr. VENNING: Some time ago I understood that two gangs of men were to be assigned to this road; one was to start from the Port Pirie end and the other from the Port Augusta end.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. T. VIRGO: As this seems to be a demarcation dispute between the member for Rocky River and adjoining districts, I think I had better get the detailed information he seeks and bring down a report for him.

LAND ACQUISITION

Mr. WRIGHT: Can the Minister of Development and Mines, in his capacity as Minister in charge of housing, say whether the South Australian Housing Trust had the opportunity to purchase five houses referred to by Peter Daniels, land agent, on a television programme last week? My concern in this matter is that my constituents are

involved in what could or will be the acquisition of their properties. Some of my constituents have been in touch with me and are concerned about the matter, and I am trying to allay any fears they may have regarding acquisition. If the trust did have the opportunity to buy the five houses, I should like to know. The trust was criticised by Mr. Daniels, because (and this is my experience) the trust is working in reverse. In many cases it is buying properties in the city area, doing them up, and re-housing people in them. It seems strange to me, but there may be some reason why, on this occasion, if the trust was afforded the opportunity, it did not buy the houses concerned.

The Hon. D. J. HOPGOOD: At the end of last week I saw the television interview to which the honourable member refers. True, the South Australian Housing Trust looked at these properties but decided not to acquire them on two grounds: first, because too much public money would have to be spent in upgrading them to the sort of standard that was satisfactory; and, secondly, because the surrounding area was largely commercial and the houses concerned were in a dead-end street, and it was believed that it was not an appropriate place for a trust project involving the upgrading of houses. The trust therefore did not go ahead with the acquisition. However, two of the people involved in the question of acquisition have applications before the trust, and these applications will be dealt with in turn. The other people involved do not have current applications before the trust. I thought that Mr. Daniels was a little cute in the way in which he approached this matter, because he criticised the trust for passing up the opportunity to acquire the properties, hence preventing the people from falling into the hands of whatever sort of developer might like to come along. I point out that some people in the houses have no application current with the trust, and it is not possible for the trust to rehouse people who have not applied to the trust. In short, for the trust to acquire houses from people who, in turn, have no current applications before the trust is, in effect, to put them on the street. I think that very much the same thing applies to both the trust and any private developer who operates in the same way.

CORNY POINT SCHOOLHOUSE

Mr. BOUNDY: Will the Minister of Education say whether his department has plans to provide a departmental house for the Headmaster of the Corny Point school? I have received a letter from the Corny Point School Welfare Club, pointing out that for many years the school council has been applying to the Education Department to have a married teacher attached to the school and to have a departmental house provided for that teacher. The club also has stated that there has been a married teacher at Corny Point for three years but that that teacher is living in a rental house, which is available only until the end of this year. The only other houses available in the district are not suitable for a school principal, and the club is concerned that it will not be able to retain a married principal unless a house is provided for him.

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: I will have the matter examined and bring down a report.

PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION

Mrs. BYRNE: Will the Minister of Education supply me with a progress report, on a State basis, giving details concerning the Tea Tree Gully District, as a result of the implementation of the Australian Government's policy to make one year of pre-school education available to all Australian children?

The Hon. HUGH HUDSON: As honourable members will appreciate, large amounts of money have been made available by the Australian Government, now operating through the Children's Commission, for pre-schools conducted by the Education Department and for kindergartens under the control of the Kindergarten Union. I do not have with me the precise details on a State-wide basis, so I cannot say where all the new pre-school kindergartens and pre-schools will be placed, and I cannot provide a general progress report. As I am sure that such a statement would be of interest to members generally, not only the member for Tea Tree Gully, I will have prepared a reply that deals with the honourable member's district and also provides the information on a State-wide basis.

ABATTOIR REPORT

Mr. McANANEY: Will the Minister of Works ask the Minister of Agriculture when his colleague will table in Parliament a triennial report under the South Australian Meat Corporation Act? I understand that the last report tabled on the abattoir's activities was tabled about five or six years ago, and so the tabling in Parliament of a report is now two or three years overdue.

The Hon. J. D. CORCORAN: I will inquire of my colleague and let the honourable member know what is the position.

SHARK FISHING

Mr. BECKER: Will the Minister of Fisheries say what action his Government will take to control shark fishing from jetties at metropolitan beaches? Last evening at Glenelg jetty a group of young men was fishing for sharks, and I have been told that they tied large chunks of meat to rubber balloons and released the balloons from the end of the jetty. Because of the south-east wind that was blowing at the time, the balloons floated into the general area occupied by many people swimming off the beach. A Glenelg surf lifesaving boat crew training off Glenelg noticed the balloons and warned the swimmers that people were shark fishing in the area. The crew then rowed towards the end of the jetty and warned the people concerned of the danger that they were creating for swimmers. The water was warm and murky and it was difficult for the lifesaver in the control tower to spot sharks. The members of the group retaliated by throwing their lines at the boat crew, thereby causing a verbal altercation between the two groups, as this action could have been dangerous to the lifesavers in the boat. I understand that the police also are concerned at the activities of this group, which is the only group carrying on this practice. The police are concerned about the continual vandalism at the Glenelg jetty, with the disappearance of lifebuoys and people carving their names in the jetty and taking large chunks out of the timber. We also have had reports of more sharks coming close to the shore this summer than there have been previously, and in all sincerity I ask the Minister what action his Government can take to control shark fishing in the area.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I concede that the report that the honourable member has given is serious and certainly warrants close attention. I shall be pleased to discuss the matter with the Fisheries Department to find out what we can do and, if necessary, consider prohibiting fishing for sharks from jetties.

PETROLEUM AND MINERALS AUTHORITY

Mr. MILLHOUSE: Will the Premier (to whom I address my question, as I think it is a matter of policy) say why South Australia has not joined Victoria, New

South Wales, Queensland and Western Australia in challenging in the High Court the validity of the Commonwealth Petroleum and Minerals Authority Act? This legislation, which had been discussed within and outside the Commonwealth Parliament for several years before it finally was passed, was much resented by many people in the States, including State Governments, and it was feared because of the administrative chaos that it would create and also because of the drastic diminution in State powers that it would effect if, in fact, it was valid. My recollection (although I cannot quote chapter and verse) is that members of this Government have criticised the Act and several provisions in it. If I am wrong in saying that, I will withdraw the statement: I am not absolutely certain, but that is my impression. Yesterday three of the four non-Labor States began, in the High Court, a challenge to the validity of the Act. It is noteworthy that neither South Australia nor Tasmania, the two Socialist-governed States, have joined in that action, and I suspect that, as with Medibank, Party or Socialist philosophy is a much stronger motivating force with this Government than is the interest of the State. I ask the question of the Premier so that he may speak for himself, explain why South Australia has not joined in the challenge, in which I am sure it was invited to join, and say whether he thinks that the Act is a good one and that it will operate well in the interests of the State.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, I think that it is a good Act and that it will operate in the interests of the State: already it is operating in the interests of the State. There is a real need for the Australian people to own and control their basic energy and mineral resources. The tragedy of many other countries (and the tragedy enacted in this country under the open-door investment policy of the McMahon Government) was that our basic resources were being sold out to foreign ownership. Australia, from having at one time been an English farm, was rapidly becoming a United States and Japanese mine. The Commonwealth Labor Government was elected on a policy of buying back Australia, of seeing to it that the Australian people retained effective control of their fuel and energy resources and their basic mineral development. That cannot be obtained without an authority such as the Petroleum and Minerals Authority.

Mr. Coumbe: I thought there had been some change.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: The attitude that the South Australian Government has taken throughout in relation to the Petroleum and Minerals Authority has been one of co-operation.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: What happened last year in the Senate?

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: Yes, there was some support of this proposal by a certain former member of this place in the Senate; the Leader of the Liberal Movement said very good things about it. The fact is that this was an issue in relation to which he was at one with the Labor Party in the necessity to maintain the national interest. The Petroleum and Minerals Authority has now provided the necessary finance for the Delhi company to ensure the development of the Cooper Basin field with substantial Australian equity. The people of Australia in every poll that has been taken have shown overwhelming support for just such a policy. There is no need for the South Australian Government to challenge legislation regarding the Petroleum and Minerals Authority, as we welcome it in the national interest. We will co-operate in ensuring that Australians, including South Australians, own their own resources, and that the resources are used to the full benefit of Australians and not simply expropriated to the profits of oversea companies that are willing, in many cases, to exploit our mineral resources in a way that is not to the benefit of Australians but to the benefit of oversea shareholders.

MEDIA MONITOR

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Can the Premier say whether the prescribed duties of Mr. K. Crease, who is employed by the Government to conduct its media monitoring operations, include public rebuttal of criticism of the Premier? We have been led to believe that one of Mr. Crease's functions in running the media monitoring service is to view and record television performances and to give confidential reports and assessments to the Government about the television appearances of Opposition members. However, in the weekend newspaper there appears a letter, signed by Mr. Crease over his official title of "Media Co-ordinator, Premier's Department", and including a rather spirited defence of the Premier. The letter seeks to attack the weekend commentator Mr. Max Harris for what Mr. Crease considers to be criticism of the Premier. Mr. Crease complains, alleging irresponsibility and inaccuracy on the part of Mr. Harris, whereas, in fact, in reading the letter I find that Mr. Crease does not even know the correct title of the major political Party in South Australia—the Liberal Party of Australia (South Australian Branch). Opposition members want to know whether Mr. Crease's official duties, in seeking to extend the protective covering that the Government seems to put about itself, include the public rebuttal of any criticism of the Premier that Mr. Crease may detect in his monitoring activities.

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: No. Mr. Crease undertook personally the letter to the newspaper. In fact, he has appeared in many television programmes with Mr. Harris over many years. He did not need to read from a script during those television interviews. I am sure that, if the honourable member is ever interviewed on television by Mr. Crease, Mr. Crease will deal with the honourable member faithfully without a script. Mr. Crease's duties include answering inquiries not only from the honourable member (and Mr. Crease has answered inquiries from him recently, I understand) but also from the honourable member's political compatriots in other States. I point out to the honourable member that Mr. Lewis has sent his officers to South Australia to examine the media co-ordinating unit with the intention of setting up a far more extensive programme (based, however, on experiments in South Australia) at the expense of the New South Wales Government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D. A. DUNSTAN: It is most interesting that when things are different they do not appear to be the same to members opposite. I wonder whether they will now condemn Mr. Lewis for instituting a Big Brother programme in New South Wales.

ATLAS FUND

Mr. DEAN BROWN: Because of apparently deceitful promotion, incompetent management, and breach of the terms of the indenture of several group syndicates by Atlas Fund Proprietary Limited, Mutual Management Proprietary Limited, and associated companies, will the Attorney-General investigate the extent to which these companies are managed by the same persons who

manage Atlas Property Trust No. 1? I ask this question so that the investing public may be warned of the extremely dubious management record of Atlas Fund Proprietary Limited and Mutual Management Proprietary Limited. An examination of the 1973-74 balance sheets of 14 syndicates within the Atlas group of companies indicates that the return on investing capital was only 2·63 per cent before the payment of interest to unit holders, whereas the initial return promised was 11 per cent. A recent circular letter from Atlas Fund Proprietary Limited indicated that a $1 000 unit in many syndicates was now valued at only between $600 and $700. Many of the flats owned by syndicates have had high repair costs and high vacancy rates. The South Australian Registrar of Companies summarised the situation on February 13, 1975, as follows:

It is apparent that some of the syndicates have not proved to be as successful as the promoters envisaged, and it also appears that the terms of the indenture have not been complied with by the management company in many cases. However, there is no way in which I can intervene to enforce compliance with the terms of the indenture.

I am concerned that the same mismanagement may also be extended to a new venture by the Atlas group of companies, now advertised as Atlas Property Trust No. 1. An examination of the directorships and management of Atlas Fund Proprietary Limited and Mutual Management Proprietary Limited reveals that the same persons are involved in the management of Atlas Property Trust No. 1. The accusations against Atlas Fund and Mutual Management are made, as I said, after careful examination of the company's records. Atlas Fund Proprietary Limited and Mutual Management Proprietary Limited shared common directors as at June, 1974, these directors being Anthony David Roberts, Fiske Chopin Saunders, Robert David Fellenburg and David John Hails. According to the prospectus of Atlas Property Trust No. 1, three of these people are also involved in the management of the trust. Atlas Fund Proprietary Limited was broker for the syndicates and Mutual Management was manager. I should add that Mutual Management has now been bought out by Westralian Trustees. I am not attacking the reputation or integrity of the present directors of Atlas Property Trust, except for one director who was involved in the management of the other companies referred to.

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member sought leave to make a brief explanation and he is getting beyond that now. Is there much more?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: No, Mr. Speaker. It is disturbing to note that the only two States in which the prospectus of the trust has been approved are Tasmania and South Australia.

The Hon. L. J. KING: Inquiries are in progress in relation to the affairs of this group, and I expect to make a statement soon.

PLAYFORD HIGHWAY

Mr. CHAPMAN: Will the Minister of Environment and Conservation, as Minister responsible for the control of roadside vegetation, agree to the removal of all flammable undergrowth, and the continued cultivation of the whole length of Playford Highway? This highway runs east-west via the centre and for the whole length of Kangaroo Island. Many islanders, firefighters, and councillors have expressed their desire to have a permanent firebreak corridor across the island and, recently, have been vividly reminded of the need for this facility. This highway, which is two and in some parts three chains wide, lends itself geographically to this purpose. The undergrowth is recognised as being neither attractive nor of botanical value, and for the future protection of life, and private and public assets, we seek the approval of the Minister (and later the co-operation of other Ministers) to establish this island-long permanent fire protection measure.

The Hon. G. R. BROOMHILL: I shall be pleased to consider this matter and to ask the Roadside Vegetation Committee to consider it also. I would not agree with the honourable member's contention that the roadside vegetation was not aesthetically pleasing or interesting from the botanical point of view. It does not seem to me, from my rather limited knowledge of the area, that this would be so. I should be reluctant to make such a decision without considering other alternatives in order to ensure that what the honourable member has said is correct. However, I will first refer the matter to the Roadside Vegetation Committee so that it can assess the situation, and I will tell the honourable member what is the result of this inquiry.

GLANDORE REMAND HOME

Mr. MATHWIN: Can the Minister of Community Welfare say whether occupants of Glandore Remand Home are to be transferred to Seaforth Home at Somerton, and whether vacancies at Glandore are to be filled by youths aged 18 years and over being transferred from McNally Training Centre? I have been asked by several constituents living in Somerton whether this statement is correct, and I understand from my inquiries that this operation, involving Glandore Remand Home and Seaforth Home, has already started. If that is so, the operation has been kept a better secret than the Allies' plans for landing in France during the Second World War.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The number of children in residence at Seaforth Home has declined steadily in the past few years because of the increased emphasis placed by the Government on foster care outside the institutional setting; indeed, the numbers declined last year until about only six children resided at Seaforth. Consequently, it was decided to change the function and purpose of Seaforth Home. Several members of the staff have expressed their desire to continue their employment at Seaforth, and there are obvious advantages in putting that institution to further use. Therefore, it was decided that the most convenient and sensible course would be to transfer children from Glandore to Seaforth, so that Seaforth could be expanded to a degree that would keep the existing staff employed, and so that the units could be established on a footing that would give the children the closest approximation they could get to a family environment. That is what is taking place at Seaforth Home. This action made accommodation available at Glandore for boys from McNally Training Centre who have responded to the course of training at that centre, who are able to go out to work, but who are in need of some sort of cottage-type accommodation that they could occupy whilst going out to work. Generally, they will not be 18 years of age and over, because most of the boys at McNally centre are under 18 years of age. They will be boys between 15 years and 18 years of age, with a sprinkling of boys aged over 18 years, who have responded to the programmes at McNally Training Centre, who are getting ready to be discharged, and for whom outside employment has been obtained. At Glandore they will reside in a cottage setting, once again in an effort to approximate as closely as possible the family environment. I do not know what the honourable member's reference to secrecy is about: there is no secrecy about it.

LAND SALESMEN

Mr. EVANS: Can the Attorney-General say what actions are to be taken to vary the present charges that land salesmen have to pay to continue in their moderately paid occupation? I read a report today in which the Attorney-General stated that he would introduce a Bill to vary the charges in relation to the $20 that people not in the profession have to pay. I wish to point out that the objections go much deeper than that. The licence fee until this year was $5 and it has been increased to $25, an increase of 400 per cent. The fidelity bond costs $28 a year and no claims have been made against the fidelity fund. The employer has to carry the burden in the first instance where the land salesman acts irresponsibly and the insurance companies do not have to pay. On checking the position with insurance companies, I have been told there have been virtually no pay-outs in this field over the years. The Government has introduced the consolidated bond scheme which it is hoped to use as a different method of fidelity, and in future years the fidelity bond will not have to be carried. However, there is argument to justify the discontinuance of the bond this year. It is considered that the $20 to be paid by 2 000 licensed salesmen or saleswomen would be sufficient to cover the expected demands, because in the past such claims have virtually not been made. The persons are compelled to join the union (the Real Estate Salesmen's Association of South Australia) on payment of a membership fee of $11 or $12, and in all it costs a salesman or saleswoman about $80 or $85 to become licensed. That is a very expensive union ticket to entitle a person to work as a land salesman. I ask the Attorney-General to consider dropping the fidelity bond requirement when he introduces amendments to the Act.

The Hon. L. J. KING: As the honourable member has said, the fidelity bond will be discontinued. The Land and Business Agents Act will substitute for it the new fidelity guarantee fund which is provided by the interest on trust accounts of agents, but in terms of that Act it is supplemented in the early stages by a payment of $20 at the time of renewal of a licence; that is a provision of the Land and Business Agents Act which was passed by this House. It is not done by administrative act: it is a provision of the Land and Business Agents Act. The problem arose when certain people who are going out of the industry this year complained that they should not have to pay the $20. I agree that that is so, and the Act will be amended for that purpose. There is no case, however, for altering the obligations of people who are renewing their licence. The Act provides that the Land and Business Agents Board may determine a stage at which the fidelity fund is of sufficient size to justify discontinuing the $20 levy and, if that happens, it will no longer be necessary for land salesmen renewing their licence to pay the $20; but at present the board is not of that opinion and I much prefer the opinion of the board to that of the honourable member, valuable though his opinion be in certain respects. Yesterday I discussed the whole matter with a deputation from the Real Estate Institute and all the members of that deputation agreed emphatically that there was no case for lifting the requirement as it applied to those continuing in the industry. Members of that deputation agreed entirely with the attitude of the board that the levy is required at present until the fund builds up to an adequate level. The opinion expressed by the honourable member is therefore contrary to the view expressed by members of the deputation. Those members went further and said that, as they had been in touch with land salesmen, they believed they had the feeling of the general body of land salesmen, and they believed there was no objection substantially in the industry to the payment of $20 by those continuing. No doubt there are isolated cases of people who do not want to pay $20, but one will always find such cases. However, members of the industry by and large, both agents and salesmen, recognise it is in their best interests, as well as in the best interests of the public, that there should be an adequate fidelity fund standing as a guarantee and as an assurance to members of the public that they will not suffer loss as a result of wrong doing by participants in the industry. I am told by those authorised to represent them that the great body of agents and salesmen are satisfied there will be no case at all to amend the Act and deprive the board of the judgment it now has under the Act as to whether the fidelity fund has reached an adequate level.

At 3.10 p.m., the bells having been rung:

The SPEAKER: Call on the business of the day.

MINING ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

STANDING ORDERS

In Committee.

Adjourned debate on motion of the Hon. L. J. King:

That the recommendations of the Standing Orders Committee be adopted.

(Continued from February 19. Page 2455.)

The CHAIRMAN: Members will recall that, when the Committee sat previously to consider this report, the Attorney-General moved that the report, including the amendments to Standing Orders, be adopted and he explained the proposed amendments. That motion may now be debated. So that honourable members may have the opportunity to consider each amendment separately, I will ask the Attorney-General, when called on, to move a separate motion on each amendment proposed in the report.

Dr. EASTICK: (Leader of the Opposition): This matter is of considerable importance to all members. In bringing the matter before the House last week, the Attorney-General indicated that discussions between himself and me had led to certain points of view being accepted by both sides. He also said that there was an area on which we could not agree. Members on this side have expressed grave concern that there should be a further erosion of the opportunities available to them as members of Her Majesty's Opposition to challenge the Government at every opportunity, to put the actions of the Government under scrutiny, and to ask questions that are pertinent to the legislation before the House. The fact that a guillotine arrangement written into the altered Standing Orders would preclude members from undertaking that scrutiny and examination of the Government gives the greatest concern to members on this side.

It has been suggested (and I can accept the generality of the comment that commonsense would prevail, but we have to base our attitude to this matter on the way certain members of the Government front bench have approached Question Time. Opposition members have often had to accept a manipulation of Question Time by means of verbose replies, replies completely irrelevant to the question—

Mr. Coumbe: Or we cannot get information at all.

Dr. EASTICK: That is correct, but that is away from the point I am making. Many times Question Time has been talked out by the Government front bench so as to prevent members on this side from putting a question to the Ministry. Many times when members on the Government side ask questions (and I am the first to acknowledge that there have been few questions from them)—

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: They have the right to ask questions.

Dr. EASTICK: They have the right, but there were few questions from them last week and this afternoon. There is the possibility that questions from Opposition members could be virtually blanketed during Question Time.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: One for one!

Dr. EASTICK: Yes: even when Government members do not ask questions. It is not infrequent that, in the time available to members, each Opposition member does not have the opportunity to ask even one question.

Mr. Mathwin: Only seven questions were asked the other day.

The Hon. L. J. King: Name one place anywhere in the world—

Mr. Mathwin: The House of Commons: it has hundreds of members.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. Coumbe: Opposition members had a longer time than that when we were in Government.

Dr. EASTICK: Until the length of Question Time was altered about 2½ years ago the situation applied that, when a member wished to ask a Minister a question (and this applied to members of the Minister's own Party), he could always work on the basis that he could ask two questions each day. The system is now changed because either the scrutiny and examination of the Ministers was too much for them or they found they were being challenged on too many fronts. Apart from that, the opportunity to question Ministers was eroded. If we accept the proposed changes to Standing Orders, especially the amendment relating to the guillotine, a Minister could have his back-benchers debate measures on a more regular basis than they do now. This would further erode the time available to Opposition members.

Many people outside look upon politicians as raving lunatics who sit until 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock in the morning. These same people expect Government mismanagement to be correctly and properly questioned by the Opposition. Will there be a guarantee that, if we accept the amendments, members will be able adequately to examine the legislation before the Chamber, or will we find that Government members will bat just for the sake of batting so as to deny members on this side the chance to have investigated matters on behalf of the people they represent?

I appreciate the opportunity given me by the Attorney-General to discuss so many of these matters in the atmosphere in which they were discussed. The discussions were held without prejudice to either side and were beneficial in that a number of alterations and amendments to Standing Orders are now recommended. However, I cannot accept (nor did the Attorney suggest that I did) that every feature of this report is acceptable to members on this side. As we debate the contents of the report, I am sure that the Attorney-General and other Government members will appreciate just how vigorously members on this side will strive to protect their rights as members of Parliament and representatives of the electors of South Australia.

Dr. TONKIN (Bragg): I agree entirely with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition. This is an extremely serious matter because the changes we are considering have far-reaching effects. Every member in the Chamber (certainly every member on this side) welcomes the provision for a grievance debate, which was suggested as a means of improving the procedure of the House of Assembly: it might make more time available during Question Time. I do not believe that anyone on this side, or indeed any member, should agree to accept a grievance debate as set out in the recommendations in the report at the cost of imposing what we have never had in this Parliament before—a guillotine system. To me this is totally wrong: it is something that is not a matter of balance. A guillotine system is a reduction in the scope of our freedom of speech as an Opposition. It is a reduction not only in a degree of freedom of speech for the Opposition: it also applies to every member of Parliament. The day will come (and I believe it is not far off) when this system will react adversely against members of the Labor Party. Therefore, we must take a balanced view of such a system.

It has been suggested that, to organise the business of the House of Assembly, we shall have a committee that will meet before each week's sitting to look at Government business and decide on a time table which, after agreement, will be set down so that the Minister can take the action as provided by these amended Standing Orders. We will set down a time table for the second reading explanation, the second reading debate and the Committee stage of a Bill. Contained in the report are proposals that suggest there should be a limitation on the time and number of occasions members can speak in Committee. In other words, we will be hamstrung. No-one has said (and I should be interested to hear if the Attorney-General has this in mind) what advanced notice the Opposition is to be given of possibly contentious measures. Will this be used as an excuse for the Government to slip in what might be a potentially contentious matter and say, "This is not really important: it will take only half an hour. Let's just bung it through"?

If these recommendations are to be accepted the least we can expect is a week's notice of the introduction of legislation so that we can consider them before the committee meets to set down a time table. The whole scheme is totally unworkable. It is entirely improper to enact any amendment to Standing Orders that will limit the right of members to ventilate their opinions. Everyone knows that an Opposition is in opposition because it does not have the numbers to win a vote. The only action that an Opposition can take to show its absolute abhorrence of certain legislation that is introduced by the Government is to talk about it and to put a point of view. If necessary, Opposition members can speak to a measure again and again.

I believe there will be an opportunity to speak to each of these amendments as we come to them. However, I do not like them and will not have a bar of any guillotine system. It ill behoves the Government to put this proposition forward. I believe that, from the Government's viewpoint, Standing Orders are there not for the protection of the minority but to facilitate the passage of Government legislation. I consider that, from an Opposition point of view, the position is entirely the reverse, and the Opposition believes that the Standing Orders are there to protect the rights of the minority, so the true position is somewhere near the middle. In other words, the Standing Orders are there to protect the rights

of the minority as well as to facilitate the passage of Government business, and there should not be any abrogation of rights from one side to another. Both sides are equally important, but in the matter that we are considering the emphasis seems to be coming down on the Government side.

The Government wants to destroy some of the rights that we, as an Opposition, have; it wants to facilitate the smooth and easy passage of its legislation. It has been stated that the longer Governments stay in office the more arrogant they become and the less mindful they are of their responsibility to the people and to minority groups. I consider that this proposal is a symptom of that very attitude showing through.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I consider that this matter may have been initiated by a proposal of an Opposition member to have a grievance debate, with half an hour being set aside each day for such debate. I may be wrong in saying that, but I suspect that that opened up this whole question of changing the Standing Orders. Before that time the Government was trying to avoid some of the late sittings of the House of Assembly, and it seems to me that the Government has seized on this opportunity to implement plans to curtail severely the opportunities that otherwise would exist for the Opposition to fulfil its proper function in this Parliament.

If the Government hopes, in this package deal, to sell these changes to us in this way, it has failed rather miserably to convince us that what it proposes will be to the advantage of the Parliament or the people of the State. As has been stated, the proposed changes to Standing Orders were a matter of negotiation, and the Attorney-General has stated that he had lengthy and amicable discussions with the Leader of the Opposition. However, I think he also is well aware that the result of these negotiations, in total, was not acceptable to the members of the Opposition. Notwithstanding this, the Government is forcing through this Chamber further changes of the Standing Orders, on top of other changes that it has made regarding such matters as Question Time. The Government is doing this, to use its words, in order to facilitate the work of the House of Assembly. I consider that those words are ill chosen.

We have heard much about the Government's legislative programme. Last year, before this session commenced, the Premier stated on television that we would have to sit late and that the Government had much business to get through, but the Government arranged its programme so badly that for several evenings members had no business before them. Indeed, the legislation was introduced in a rush long after the session started. If the Government wants to get its house in order and facilitate the handling of business, I suggest that it prepare its legislation, call the Parliament together, and present the legislation in a far more rational way than that in which it has presented its legislation since I have been a member.

At the end of a session we face a backlog of work, involving late sittings, mainly because the Government has not organised its programme satisfactorily. It is all very well for the Premier to state on television that we will have late sittings because the Government has a tremendous legislative programme for the benefit of the State: after that we have nothing for about a month and then the Government starts to pile the work on in the final stages.

Mr. Keneally: It's because about 16 Opposition members say exactly the same thing in debates.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Obviously, the member for Stuart has missed my point completely. Legislation is presented on a time table by which at the commencement of the session we have nothing to do, and then in the closing stages we have much more to do than we should have. For instance, in the closing stages of a session of this Parliament, the Minister of Education introduced a Bill that rewrote the Education Act completely. The Bill comprised 80 pages and had taken eight years to prepare, yet he had the gall to introduce it in the last week of a session.

This is legislation by exhaustion, and it is a procedure of the Government's own making. It does not happen because of the Standing Orders, and it ill behoves the Government to put before us this mixed bag that seeks to change Standing Orders radically and to inhibit, to a large extent, opportunity for effective operation of the Opposition. How do the Ministers behave when Parliament is in session? They have spoken of late sittings. As soon as Question Time ends, if the business of the Chamber does not involve a Minister's portfolio, he promptly goes to his room and goes on with his Ministerial business.

I do not suggest that there is anything wrong in that practice, because we all know that a Minister's job is a big one and that Ministers have much work to do. They do not listen to the debates unless their portfolio is involved, although they may have one ear to the amplifier in their rooms. Excellent facilities are provided in Parliament House for Ministers, and the Ministers use those facilities. At present, as is usual, two Ministers are in the Chamber and usually not more than two are present after Question Time. The Government cannot press the point that it will facilitate the work of Government merely by preventing Opposition members in this place from speaking if they feel obliged to speak on behalf of their constituents.

Members of the Party to which I belong are elected as the representatives of their districts, and we are answerable in the first instance to the people who elect us. The discipline of the Labor Party may be more stringent. Labor members are answerable to the Labor Party Caucus and, if Caucus makes a decision, members of the Labor Party must go along with it regardless of whether they like it. Regarding the shopping hours legislation, the member for Tea Tree Gully and the member for Elizabeth had open to them no course other than to follow the programme Caucus had laid down. We, and the public generally, knew that those two members specifically were not reflecting the thinking of their constituents.

Therefore, debate in this place may be of little consequence to members of the Labor Party. If the legislative programme is cut and dried by Caucus decision, the idea of representative Government carries little weight. Caucus decision is influenced largely by Trades Hall decision, and perhaps one can say that, if it is a Trades Hall decision, it is a Caucus decision. I am making the point that members on this side are here as spokesmen for, and representatives of, their districts and their constituents, and are therefore answerable to the people in their districts, but we know that does not apply to members on the Government side.

I have given the example in the case of the shopping hours legislation, where obviously some members were not acting as spokesmen for their constituents. If that is the type of Government the Labor Party has, it is entitled to have it, but it is not the type of Government that we on this side would have. We are elected as representatives of the people in our district and we consider that, when dealing with legislative questions in this place, we should have the opportunity to say what we believe is the opinion of our constituents. In many cases, members of this Opposition

vote in various ways. Perhaps there is some advantage afforded to certain sections of the Labor Party in having iron-clad discipline; this is assumed by members who join that Party. However, members on this side often vote independently on various matters. We have the right to act as the representatives of our districts. I believe that, in certain circumstances, Labor Party members would welcome a little more of that sort of freedom.

How will this scheme work in practice? What priority will be given to minority Parties? The Country Party has only one member in this Chamber. When the round-table conference is held at the beginning of the week to decide how much time will be allotted to debate (and, of course, the Government will prevail at those conferences), will the Country Party member be able to take part in those discussions? Will the Liberal Movement be represented? Who will decide whether the Country Party member is permitted to speak on every matter before the Chamber? I believe he has the right to speak, as all Opposition members should have the right to speak. However, if the Country Party member is granted the right alone, he will be in a privileged position compared to other Opposition back-bench members. The guillotine provision, which is the most offensive of the recommendations, guarantees that certain Opposition members will be denied the opportunity to speak. Whom will they be? The result could be that there will be two classes of back-bencher, otherwise this procedure would be unworkable.

The Hon. L. J. King: The odd fact is that it works in every other Parliament in the world.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Commonwealth Government has a guillotine procedure, but it is not as tough as what is proposed here. The Commonwealth House of Representatives has about three times as many members as we have, so obviously there is a necessity for them to get on with their business. During the life of the Commonwealth Labor Government, the legislative programme in Canberra has been heavier than the programme here. The procedure in New South Wales is not as tough as what is recommended here, either. Since the election of the shining new Commonwealth Labor Government, there has been a Standing Orders Committee meeting chaired by the Prime Minister. Its recommendation, regarding the adjournment of the House, is as follows:

> The Chairman shall report progress and upon such report being made the Speaker shall forthwith propose the question—That the House do now adjourn—which question shall be open to debate. Provided that:
>
> (*d*) any business under discussion and not disposed of at the time of adjournment shall be set down on the Notice Paper for the next sitting.

That is completely different from what the Attorney-General recommends here. It is all very well for him to say that discussions have been held and that everything in the garden is rosy. The minutes of the meetings of our Standing Orders Committee show the following in relation to more than half of the propositions:

> Question put:
> Committee divided:
> Ayes—The Attorney-General and Mr. McRae.
> Noes—Messrs. Arnold and Russack.
> There being an equality of votes the Speaker gave his casting vote in favour of the "Ayes".

What is this big deal about agreement and discussion? The fact is that the Opposition has not agreed to the major proposals. The Speaker even gave his casting vote in relation to the question of dissent from the Speaker's ruling.

In the Commonwealth House of Representatives, Standing Order 91 relates to the guillotine, which is applied only after a Minister has declared a Bill to be a matter of urgency. The question whether it is urgent is then the subject of a debate. The Attorney-General has referred to other Parliaments around the world where these procedures work. However, I believe it is completely unnecessary for a Chamber of this size to be bound and hog-tied as is sought in these recommendations. We hear talk about government by the Executive; this is a move in that direction. The Government wants to push business through this Chamber as expeditiously as possible. Labor Party members, who do not speak directly for the people who elect them—

Mr. Langley: I represent my district and my constituents.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The honourable member should consider what happened with regard to Tea Tree Gully on the question of shopping hours. The guillotine falls in the Labor Party as soon as a decision is made. These recommendations, put forward under the guise of enabling members to get to bed early, will inhibit the opportunities of individual members to exercise their fundamental democratic right to speak on behalf of the people who send them here. Whether members are poor speakers or whether they are boring or prolix is beside the point. Speeches by members on both sides are sometimes thoroughly boring. Nevertheless, the overriding principle is that a member should have a right to exercise the opportunity of speaking on behalf of his constituents, unless there are pressing reasons (far more pressing than have been advanced on this occasion) why this should not be so.

These proposals should be referred back to the Standing Orders Committee for further negotiation, being later presented in a form that has substantial Opposition support. The Government should put its own house in order, presenting its legislative programme more effectively than it has done since I have been a member. However, we know the way the Attorney-General operates. When he gets something fixed in his tiny little mind, he cannot be budged. The Attorney is the member who is most intractable and least amenable to argument in this place, and once he gets something in his mind the matter goes through, come hell or high water. This charade about nice peaceful conferences has been put up by the Attorney in order to soften up the Opposition to accept what I believe are completely unacceptable changes to Standing Orders. We have criticised the curtailment of time for questions without notice, but the present proposals are dynamite compared to that change, which has disadvantaged the Opposition. We were told that we would be able to ask two questions a day, but, if the Minister of Education replies to several questions, an Opposition member rarely gets this opportunity. I will not have a bar of this steamrolling, heavy-footed, iron-fisted, narrow-minded approach by the Attorney-General. I view this matter with great concern, and trust that the Government will come to its senses and have second thoughts about these proposals.

Mr. MATHWIN (Glenelg): I agree with the member for Kavel when he said that this exercise started when an Opposition member asked for time to be devoted to a grievance debate. We desire that time be allowed for a grievance debate, but it seems that the price will be far too much for the Opposition to pay. The Attorney-General said:

> I think it is fair to say that for a considerable time members of both sides have expressed publicly and privately their concern that the House sits late on occasions and have asked for a change.

I ask the Attorney to name the members who have asked for a change: many Opposition members have not asked for it. Government members may have requested the change, but they do not have to worry. For most Labor seats it would not matter if a pet canary was elected. Many Government members say not one word during the Parliamentary session, because they do not have to express the wishes of their constituents.

The Hon. L. J. King: Your majority might improve if you said nothing.

Mr. MATHWIN: We will see about that. I notice that the Attorney is getting out whilst his plate is clean, and is running away from the District of Coles. I should hate to come before the Attorney if he was a beak in court, and I hope I keep my nose clean. It is suggested that Ministers do much work, but they have public relations officers and script writers (particularly the Premier), whereas Opposition members must do their own research into many problems and, at the same time, help their constituents. I believe that, as a member of this Parliament, I am here to speak on behalf of my constituents at any time. I have never complained at having to stay in the Chamber until the early hours of the morning or until the sun rises. However, I have complained about legislation being introduced a week or so before Parliament rises, because there is no time in which to consider it.

When Question Time was reduced from two hours to one hour in order to make the whole machinery work better, at the end of the session many Bills were still introduced in the last week. This is a Government tactic to put pressure on the Opposition in order to have Bills passed quickly. Why has not the Minister of Environment and Conservation introduced a Bill to prevent noise pollution? Will that be introduced just before the end of this session, and will the Opposition be asked to say how long it will be discussed? This seems to be another method of gagging the Opposition. Who will set the time table? There is to be a conference, presumably with an impartial Chairman, attended by an equal number of members from both sides. The Standing Orders Committee, which considered these proposals, comprises two lawyers from the Labor Party, two Opposition members, and an impartial Chairman, but every proposition now introduced was passed only on the casting vote of the impartial Chairman.

Mr. Langley: Do you remember when the Liberals had an independent Speaker!

Mr. MATHWIN: I can speak on any topic, and that is more than can be done by the member for Unley: if he spoke here on matters that did not follow his Party line, he would be criticised.

Mr. Langley: That's not correct.

Mr. MATHWIN: When the member for Unley wishes to be a candidate for the Labor Party as a member of this Parliament he must sign a pledge, and he would have to get out if he departed from the Party ruling.

Mr. Langley: So do you!

Mr. MATHWIN: Who will be present at this conference, and who will choose the Chairman? Minorities in this State have some rights, but I believe that those rights have been eroded. The Government is now riding roughshod over the Opposition in order to weaken it. The Premier is always trying to gain a political advantage over the Opposition by saying many times that the Opposition is weak. Yet, at every opportunity, with the aid of his legal eye, he takes away every privilege that is possible to be taken from the Opposition. He is ready to kick them as hard and as roughly as possible, and that is typical of a Socialist Government. The guillotine is a shocking thing; I believe it is a disgrace even to have suggested it in these amendments to Standing Orders. The Attorney-General ought to be ashamed of himself. It is all right for the Attorney-General to ask, "Where in the world do you get as many questions during Question Time?" If he is referring to the House of Commons, how many members does it have compared to the number of our members? Perhaps the Attorney-General is referring to the Parliaments of China, Russia, Albania, or Spain. We all know that the Parliament in China meets only once a year. If the Government wishes to have more time for debate, Parliament should sit more often: it should not go into recess at the end of November and not come back until the end of February.

Mr. Langley: The Playford Government met for only four months of the year.

Mr. MATHWIN: I am not worried about the Playford Government: I am worried about eroding the powers of the Opposition. If the Government is concerned about not having enough time for debate and wishes to cut down debating time, I suggest we sit more often. If we wanted a month's rest at Christmas, we could have it and come back in January.

Mr. Langley: But you said we don't sit long enough.

Mr. MATHWIN: If the Ministers want to get into bed by 10.30 p.m., if they must race home with migraines, as they often do (and no wonder they have migraines when we hear the row coming from the Caucus room), and if they are peeved about sitting late, I suggest they lengthen each Parliamentary session. I am not afraid to come here at any time and I do not care how long the sessions last. Parliament can sit for as long as it likes after Easter, so far as I am concerned. That is the way to do it if the Government wants to get the business through and wants to reduce its daily work load. It should lengthen the Parliamentary sessions and be prepared to take the Opposition's criticism, giving the Opposition the right to speak on matters brought before this House. Let us debate Medibank, etc., but come back here more often and let us all have a go. Let us all speak if we want to, and let the Government in its own Party room take off the gag placed on its members and allow them all to speak as well. Let us not have the roughshod way in which the Government is trying to ride over us here; I think it is disgraceful.

Mr. MILLHOUSE (Mitcham): I oppose the motion. I think these proposals are on balance much to the detriment of private members in this place. I must admit, however, that some of the speeches we have heard, especially from the member for Glenelg (and I mention his name because he has preceded me and he is just one), are some justification for some of the proposals inserted in these amendments to Standing Orders. This is the third time since I have been in Parliament that there has been an attempt (and it is always successful, because it is backed by the Government) to cut down the opportunities for members to speak, and on each occasion the justification has been an admitted abuse of the processes of the House as they stood before the attempt was made. I was the Minister who was responsible for the first curtailment of the almost unlimited opportunities to speak which members had in this place, and that was during the term of office of the Hall Government from 1968 to 1970. There was one member of the Opposition at that time who delighted in speaking for many hours, and on one occasion (perhaps two occasions) he spoke for four hours and everyone was heartily sick of him, but he was not the only one. It was because of that sort of

abuse that time limits on speeches were introduced in this place for the first time in its history.

Then, a couple of years ago, we had the curtailment of Question Time. That was because of an abuse, which had started when the present Government Party was in Opposition between 1968 and 1970, of making Question Time last for the full two hours. For as long as I can remember before that, it was most rare for that to happen but, when it did happen and Question Time was deliberately being kept going, inevitably sooner or later it was cut down to a more reasonable length of time so that that abuse could not occur. Now we have this set of suggested amendments that will drastically (more drastically than did either of the other two series of amendments) cut down the rights of private members in this place. As I see it, the amendments put the business of this House entirely in the hands of the Government, so that if it wanted to it could get through all its business for the week in one afternoon. There is no safeguard whatever written into the text of these proposals, and I want to have a look at what is proposed.

I think it is a proper occasion to regard the amendments in the nature of a second reading speech and to look not at the explanation given in the front of the report but at the actual proposals in the text of the amendments. If one looks at the various headings under the report of the Standing Orders Committee, they do not look too bad, although I think one can still take objection to them, as members of the Liberal Party have, but they are far worse when one looks at what precisely is proposed. New or proposed Standing Order 57 is supposed to provide a grievance debate on some occasions. I point out, before I get to the text, that of course it will be in the Government's hands entirely as to whether there ever is a grievance debate. It is unusual, so far anyway, for us to finish before 10 p.m. on a Tuesday or Wednesday and 5 p.m. on a Thursday. Admittedly, the whole idea is to cut down the time so that that will happen more frequently, but it will be up to the Government whether this will happen once a week, once a session, or when it may be.

Little if any safeguard is provided for the private member in what is apparently a benefit for him. I will now develop something that I do not think has been referred to by other speakers: the proposal means that in future the adjournment of the House can be moved only by a Minister. At present any member can move the adjournment of the House and the carrying of that motion, in the teeth of the opposition of the Government, is tantamount to an indication of the loss of confidence in the Government. Once in this place, in my experience, this action caused the Government to resign. That is precisely what we did to the first Dunstan Government in 1968. On the first day that the Dunstan Government met after the election and at a suitable time carefully worked out, the then Leader of the Opposition (now Senator Hall) moved the adjournment of the House. I do not know who seconded the motion, but one of us did. The motion was put to the vote and carried against the opposition of the Government, and the Government resigned.

That was a perfectly proper way of bringing down a Government: it was proper in the Parliamentary sense, whatever may be argued about other aspects of it. Without there being any explanation in the report, that opportunity is being cut out and in its place is being inserted the following Standing Order:

A motion for the adjournment of the House may be moved only by a Minister and shall be moved . . . not later than 10 p.m. . . .

That is, in Parliamentary tradition and history, an important change indeed: it is one that is being made, so far as I know, without any comment from the Government. I would oppose the amendment even if it were on that ground only. I do not believe that the opportunity for a grievance debate, which this Standing Order is supposed to create, is valuable enough for us to give away the opportunities we now have. I do not object to the alteration to Standing Order 59 on the question of urgency: it is reasonable. It has always been accepted that an urgency debate is something of short duration that should be well prepared beforehand and should not drag on. I do not object to the amendment to Standing Order 90, which relates to the routine of business, nor do I object to the question of petitions. At one time we hardly ever had a petition in this place; now we have many of them. I believe that practice started in the 1968-70 period when petitions were tabled especially for and against the abortion issue. The reading of petitions in this place means nothing and just wastes time. It can well be dispensed with, as will be done here. I have nothing to say about the postponement of notices of motion and new Standing Order 119a. As I understand it, it is simply a matter of convenience to stop the rather futile, undignified and sometimes humorous situation that occurs at about 5.55 p.m. on a Wednesday.

Regarding new Standing Order 128, which deals with Questions on Notice, I point out that this will mean that they must be handed in three hours before they are required now, and that is a fairly drastic change. I know that the number of questions has increased tremendously and that this has put a strain on the Clerk Assistant, whose responsibility it is to get them out. Of course, it does not really matter that there should be such an alteration as this on a Tuesday or Wednesday, but it does mean that, instead of being able to put in a question for the Notice Paper for next Tuesday by 3 o'clock on a Thursday, it will now have to be in by 12 o'clock on a Thursday, and that is a considerable inconvenience. Whilst I acknowledge the difficulty faced by the Clerk Assistant and am willing to accept that there should be some curtailment, I believe that this goes too far. If questions had to be in by the time the House sat, I believe that would be sufficient. I cannot support the new routine order. The only point I raise regarding Standing Order 144 relates to grievance debates under 144 (*g*). A grievance debate under Standing Order 288 is to be confined as follows:

One Minister and Leader of Opposition or member deputed by him—30 minutes. Any other member—10 minutes.

That is going much too far, and it prejudices the situation of the member for Flinders, the member for Goyder and me, because the chances of his or our ever being deputed by the present Leader of the Opposition to speak in a grievance debate, and therefore being able to speak for 30 minutes, are nil.

Mr. Keneally: The Liberal Party might accept you on your conditions and you could be Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: That is another matter, which I do not propose to go into now. As things stand we could be greatly prejudiced by this measure. I venture to say that we will never be deputed to speak for 30 minutes; we will only ever have 10 minutes to speak. Whether that was realised or not, I do not know; however, I cannot believe that it was not realised that it would be a great curtailment of the rights of the members to whom I have referred, compared to other members in this place who belong to the two major Parties. Quite apart from the curtailment generally of the opportunity of a grievance

debate, that is a most prejudicial provision so far as we are concerned, and I protest against it.

Regarding the guillotine, which involves Standing Order 144a, there is no provision for any sort of consultation between the Government and Opposition. It may be that, for the purposes of discussion, I am willing to accept that the Attorney genuinely believes that there can be some such consultation. However, he will not always be the responsible Minister; he will not always be in this place, nor will any of us. The stark fact is that nothing has been written into this procedure to provide for consultation or for a minimum time for any of these procedures. There is nothing to stop a Government, if it wishes to be ruthless (whether it is this Government or a future Government), providing five minutes for each of the stages referred to if it wishes. Politically, a Government might run some risk, and there might be protests, which might even get outside, but technically, under these Standing Orders, there would be nothing to stop that sort of thing happening.

I do not like a guillotine, anyway. I am sorry that even a scintilla of justification has arisen for it. I am afraid that there is at least a scintilla of justification, namely, the long-winded speeches that we hear from some members who mistake length of speech for quality of argument and therefore think that if they speak long enough and often enough they are putting up an effective opposition to the Government. That is the sort of thing that lends some justification to the use of a guillotine, but I certainly would not support it, even in the light of the experience that we have had. I certainly would not support a Standing Order such as proposed new Standing Order 144a, which allows a Minister to move a motion or motions, with no amendment or debate being allowed, setting a time table for the debate and providing for no minimum time. I consider that Standing Order to be thoroughly bad. New Standing Order 144a (*b*) provides:

> When any motion of any kind whatsoever has been moved, a Minister may forthwith or at any time during a sitting of the House or Committee and whether any other member is addressing the Chair or not, move a motion specifying the time which shall be allotted to the motion . . .

That means that a Minister may interrupt a speaker, which is something rare now under our Standing Orders, if it happens at all. I see that several Government members are paying me the compliment of listening to what I am saying. Let them remember, however difficult it may seem for them to contemplate it now, that from time to time the position changes in this place and, even if they think that their Government is immortal, that is not so, and sooner or later some members now sitting on the other side of this Chamber will be on this side and on the receiving end of the stick. I suggest that Government members bear that in mind, because I speak from long experience in this place, on both sides of the Chamber. Between 1968 and 1970 I was able to lay down the law, although not very strongly, I must say. During those years we were able to lay down the law effectively from time to time and I was a supporter of a Government that did that, but that Government did not go to the lengths to which this Government has gone to stop the Opposition. I have had it both ways.

Standing Order 164 deals with an objection to a ruling given by the Speaker. I am one of those who take the opportunity to object to a ruling of the Speaker when I consider that he is wrong.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: You take more opportunities than does any other member to flout the Standing Orders.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: The Minister of Education can put that interpretation on what I do in this place if he likes.

The Hon. Hugh Hudson: I reckon I could get about 44 other members who would say that, too.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: I do not knowingly flout the Standing Orders and I protest only when I consider that I am justified in doing so. Other members may say that I am not justified, but I can only say that I do not protest unless I think I am justified. This amendment to the Standing Orders will mean that the debate on a challenge to the Speaker's ruling will be limited to 10 minutes for one speaker in favour of the motion and 10 minutes for one speaker against the motion. The new Standing Order also provides that the Speaker shall be entitled to make a statement in defence of his ruling and then the question shall be put forthwith.

I know that, as a rule, few members speak on a motion to dissent, and that change may not matter too much. However, I should like more opportunity for members to speak, such as provision for two on either side, if there is to be a limit, and in the light of our experience I cannot see any reason for having a limit, because this matter has not been abused. I do not like the inclusion in Standing Orders, for the first time, of a practice that has grown up in recent years whereby a Speaker can defend himself at the stage when he makes his ruling.

Surely to goodness, if we are to permit the Speaker to do that (and successive Speakers have done it in the past few years, as I have said), that opportunity should be given before either the mover of the motion or the person opposing the motion speaks. It seems to me to be absolutely futile for a motion of dissent from the Speaker's ruling to be moved and opposed and then for the Speaker to have the final bite at the cherry. If the Speaker has given a ruling in respect of which a motion to dissent has been moved, he should be willing to support his ruling at first, because in theory anyway what he says may dispose of the motion at that stage. This Standing Order puts the cart before the horse, if I may say so, and I think that not only is the lessening of the opportunity to debate the motion undesirable but also the procedure laid down is positively undesirable. I have had some brushes with the Speaker this session and I have had some correspondence with him about the matter.

Mr. Keneally: Did you win?

Mr. MILLHOUSE: No, I did not win: numbers count here, nothing else. One matter that I raised with him by correspondence concerned Questions on Notice. At present, so far as I can find, there is no way in which a member can move a motion to dissent from the Speaker's ruling when the Speaker has disallowed a question a member wants to put on notice. If a question is asked without notice here and the Speaker disallows it, the procedures in Standing Order 164 can be used and a motion to dissent from the ruling may be moved. However, if, as frequently happens (it has happened to me, and I do not say that I always have been right: I have accepted the decision in many cases, but not in all cases), a member takes a Question on Notice to the table, it is examined, and the Speaker rules that it is out of order, there is nothing a member can do to bring the matter before this Chamber.

The Hon. L. J. King: He can ask it without notice.

Mr. MILLHOUSE: In theory, the Attorney is correct, but in practice, now that there is such a limitation on the opportunity to ask questions at all (at the most we get only one a day), that opportunity is more apparent than real. I may say that the Speaker, when he replied to my letter, stated that there would not be anything that could lead to further debate here, and he was not willing to do anything about the matter. However, there should be a procedure

whereby, if a question a member seeks to put on notice is disallowed, the matter can be debated. This is not a big matter but, as Questions on Notice become more and more important, the matter will attain more significance. I am disappointed that, although the Speaker said the matter would be submitted to the Standing Orders Committee, there has been no reference to it in this report.

I shall deal now with Standing Order 171, regarding the suspension of members. Again, I suppose people can say that I have had more experience of this than has anyone else. I do not seek to hide that or to divorce what I say particularly from my own experience, but I point out that the penalties provided are so much more drastic than the present penalties as to be unjustified. In my experience, a member has not been suspended for longer than the remainder of the day's sitting. At least, that was my impression at the end of November. Not until I read the newspaper next morning did I find out that I had been chucked out not only for the rest of that Wednesday but for the Thursday as well. I believe that I should have been told about that, but I was not told. The proposal now is that, on the first occasion during a session (and I make that assumption) on which a member is suspended, the suspension shall be for the remainder of the day's sitting. On a subsequent occasion, it shall be for three consecutive sitting days and, on the third occasion, for 11 consecutive sitting days. In addition, the member will be deprived of the other privileges of the Parliament, although these are not now taken away, as I understand the position. That is a distinct increase in the penalties for suspension. From Erskine May, it does not seem that the penalties laid down in the proposals are as great as those applying in the House of Commons. However, they are so much greater than the present penalties for this Chamber that I suggest they go too far.

Standing Order 288 deals with grievance debates. In this case, the proposal will reduce greatly the opportunity of members to take part in a grievance debate, as they will be allowed to speak only once on motions relating to the Appropriation Bill or the Supply Bill, instead of being able to speak, as they are now, on each sitting day on which a motion dealing with those Bills is moved. Under this proposal, the Government will be getting away lightly indeed, and it is not giving much, if anything, in return.

I do not have much quarrel with the time limits proposed for Committee debates, as we presently waste an enormous amount of time in Committee. The proposal to allow a member to speak only on three occasions and for up to 15 minutes on each occasion is one about which no member can legitimately complain. If a member cannot make a point in 15 minutes in Committee, he is not doing very well. I have too frequently seen filibusters take place in Committee, and that is the most futile procedure that can be imagined. I hope I have made obvious that, on balance, there are far more undesirable features in these proposals than there are desirable features. The recommendations represent the most drastic curtailment of the rights of private members ever to come before this Chamber. If adopted, they will put the business of this Chamber entirely into the hands of the Government of the day.

I do not believe they can possibly be justified. However, I imagine they will be carried because on this matter, as on any other, numbers count. I am very much afraid that, whatever change of Government there may be in future, once these proposals are adopted it will be much harder to undo them than it is to carry them, because members who have suffered under them, once they get into a position of power, will be only too willing to see those who previously have persecuted them suffer under these provisions. That is human nature amongst members of Parliament, as it is amongst other people. I fear that once we approve these procedures (as we undoubtedly will, for the Government will put them through whatever we say) the Opposition will be far less effective than it should be in any democratic Parliament.

Mr. GUNN (Eyre): I join my colleagues in strongly opposing the motion. From the attitude of the Attorney-General in moving the motion, it is obvious that the Government is determined to gag the Parliament. Because its own members do not want to speak or are incapable of making speeches, the Government wants to deny the Opposition the right to speak. Where else other than in Parliament should great matters affecting the people of the State be discussed? Parliament is assembled so that these matters can be discussed. Even though some matters may appear to the Attorney and his colleagues to be trifling, members often raise matters affecting people in their districts.

Mr. Harrison: You should—

Mr. GUNN: I will deal with the members for Albert Park and Salisbury, as they do little more than warm their seats; rarely do they take part in debates.

Mr. Harrison: You speak too often and say nothing.

Mr. GUNN: The *Hansard* index for the 1972 session shows that the member for Salisbury asked three questions and made one speech.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Crimes): Order! The honourable member must link up his remarks to the motion.

Mr. GUNN: The point I was making—

Mr. Harrison: You wouldn't know how to make a point.

Mr. GUNN: I must be close to the mark, as this is one of the few occasions on which the honourable member has been in the Chamber that he has bothered to open his mouth. I can refer to the number of speeches made by the members for Salisbury and Albert Park. The fact that they have made few speeches in this Chamber shows that the Labor Party either does not want its members to speak or will not permit them to do so. If members opposite prefer to stick to the rigid doctrine to which they all subscribe, that is their affair, but it does not help the democratic process in this State. Part of that process is to allow members to speak on behalf of the members who elect them. I believe that people should come before Parties.

Mr. Jennings: How does what you say about the democratic process apply to the Upper House?

Mr. GUNN: I have not noticed that restrictions under Standing Orders are being applied in that Chamber.

Mr. Jennings: What about the way members have been elected to that Chamber?

Mr. GUNN: I will ignore the honourable member's interjections, because I know he would inflict anything on the people of the State as long as he could maintain his Labor Party endorsement. He is not concerned about the will of the people, but they will soon judge his colleagues and him.

Mr. Keneally: What about Mr. Southey? He clearly said how free you were to vote against Party policy.

Mr. GUNN: I hope the member for Stuart will speak in this debate, because he rarely takes part in debates. I am concerned that the rights and privileges of members will be taken away. All members will be affected by these proposals. The situation now is that some Labor Party members rarely take part in debate, as the *Hansard* records show clearly. If this motion is carried, the Governor will have to approve the alterations to Standing Orders, although

I hope he refuses to do so. I also hope that after the next election, when a Liberal Government has been elected, it will review these oppressive proposals.

Mr. Coumbe: The present Government members would be the first to complain.

Mr. GUNN: Government members seem to forget that their time on the Government side is limited, and that they will eventually suffer under these proposals. The Attorney-General will not be here: he has seen the writing on the wall and is going to greener pastures, like Senator Murphy, and will sit on another bench in a capacity that has yet to be decided. I hope the Attorney-General, even at this late stage, will reconsider these proposals, and try to obtain co-operation and agreement from the Opposition so that democracy will function properly, and so that people in the community will know that members will be able to discuss in Parliament matters that affect them.

Mr. DEAN BROWN (Davenport): I oppose the motion, because I consider it an infringement of democratic government, particularly in a State with a Parliament like that in South Australia. I appreciate that larger Parliaments need to gag the debate because of the number of members, but, in a State with only 47 members of the House of Assembly, I believe that the chance exists for every member to speak on any issue he wishes to speak on.

Mr. Keneally: For as long as he likes?

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I am saying that any member should be able to speak for a reasonable time (and we have a time limit of 30 minutes on speeches in second reading debates now) on a matter before the House. It is a slight on the present Government's view of democracy that it should reduce the time for debate and, therefore, reduce the number of members who may speak, and it will have an unfortunate effect on the democratic procedures of this House. Originally, I introduced the idea of having an adjournment debate specifically to provide further chances to debate matters of grievance. There has usually been no time for a back-bencher to debate a matter of grievance from the end of October until about the middle of July, that is, a period of about 8½ months.

For that period, the only exception has been Question Time. A finance Bill will be introduced later this session, and that will be the only chance for members to air a grievance. It is a slight on democracy and a greater slight on the Attorney-General and his Party that he should now restrict further the time for grievance debates. I introduced a motion to provide for an adjournment debate, and I should carefully restate the conditions under which I introduced the motion. The motion stated:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Standing Orders Committee should be asked to prepare amendments to the Standing Orders of this House to provide for a 30 minutes grievance debate to take place on the motion "That this House do now adjourn".

When introducing that motion on September 11, 1974, I said:

Therefore, it is important at this time that members have a chance on more occasions than are available at present to air their grievances. However, in no way do I suggest that this adjournment debate should replace (and I emphasise that word) other grievance debates now available. This debate should add to the opportunities members have to grieve, and not replace existing opportunities.

Again, I emphasise that I would expect an adjournment debate only on the condition that our other chances to air grievances would not be reduced. Unfortunately, the proposals place tremendous restrictions on the Opposition, and for that reason I urge all members to vote against them. I know that Government members will not give a second thought to the matter, because they have sat there like stuffed parrots during the time I have been a member of this Chamber, and they will continue to sit there like stuffed parrots: stuffed parrots have no guts. I told someone last week that these proposals were one step forward and two steps back and yet another nail in the coffin of democracy in this State. It is the height of arrogance that, because they have the numbers, Government members should alter Standing Orders to reduce the opportunities for Opposition members to grieve against the Government. One would suspect that the reason is that they, as a Government, are not willing to have open democracy or open government in this State, as they are scared of the issues raised by the Opposition and scared of what the Opposition may reveal regarding the faults of Government administration.

Mr. Duncan: You should talk about the height of arrogance! The Party you represent used to sit for about half the time that this Parliament has sat.

Dr. Tonkin: And it imposed no restrictions.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The member for Elizabeth has suggested that a Liberal Government sat for a much shorter period, but the reason for that was that the Opposition in those days was totally ineffective and that it was incompetent to carry on a worthwhile debate. It is only now that we see the time for a debate being restricted to this extent under Standing Orders.

Several of the other proposals brought forward by the Attorney-General have some merit, but perhaps he, with a large personal staff, does not appreciate the further restrictions that are imposed on members. Questions on Notice will now have to be lodged two hours before the sitting commences each day. This means that it will be impossible for a member who has a district office in the suburbs, and who comes in just before lunchtime each day, to submit a question for that day. This will effectively reduce the number of Questions on Notice, because it will be inconvenient for all members to come in every day two hours before sitting time simply to submit Questions on Notice. This blatant arrogance, this lack of regard for the proceedings of this Chamber, and this lack of regard for the issues brought forward by the general public of this State are my reasons for opposing the motion.

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

That proposed Standing Order 57 be agreed to.

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (20)—Messrs. Broomhill and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McRae and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Allen and Evans.

Majority of 1 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 59 be agreed to.

Mr. COUMBE: I move:

To strike out "with the expiration of the time at which such questions would ordinarily terminate" and insert "at 4 p.m."

When this matter was considered by the Standing Orders Committee an Opposition representative put forward a suggestion regarding the latter part of the proposed amendment. This matter has been raised before. Before the length of Question Time was reduced, debate on matters of urgency could continue until 4 p.m. Now that the time has been reduced, one does not always have the opportunity to put forward the proper essence of the motion by having supporting speakers. The Government, having succeeded in having Question Time reduced so that it finishes at about 3.15 p.m., should, in all fairness, seriously consider the amendment.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I oppose the amendment. This proposal was considered by the Standing Orders Committee, but the time provided for urgency motions has always coincided with the time provided for questions without notice. Indeed, any other provision would be unworkable, because, if the amendment were adopted, the Opposition could automatically extend the time on each occasion on which urgency motions were moved. The present provision works because the Opposition elects whether to spend Question Time or a part of it on asking questions or whether to devote that time to what it considers a matter of urgency.

Mr. Coumbe: That's up to the Opposition.

The Hon. L. J. KING: That is right. As long as the time allotted for both purposes coincides, the Opposition can make its election. It would be quite impracticable and unacceptable for the Opposition to be able to elect to extend the time by three-quarters of an hour by adopting the urgency motion procedure instead of asking questions. It would not be a workable proposal, and I oppose it.

Dr. EASTICK: I support the amendment. The Attorney-General has fairly clearly indicated his attitude and probably that of his Government that, if the Government does it, it is all right, but if the Opposition does it it is no good. He claims that the Opposition could interfere with the business of this Chamber simply by moving urgency motions. If the Opposition moves an urgency motion it does it because it believes there is a need for a wide range of discussion on a matter. If one looks at some of the previous minutes of this Chamber, however, one will appreciate that urgency motions are not moved regularly.

The Attorney has said, in effect, that if his Ministers manipulate Question Time by talking for a long time in reply to questions that is all right. It will be possible for a Minister to manipulate Question Time by having some of his back-benchers ask Dorothy Dix type questions. Further, a Minister and his back-benchers will be able to manipulate the time available for debate to Opposition members if the guillotine measure is passed. The Government believes that course is all right. The Attorney has indicated clearly that his Government wishes to dictate completely the activities of the Chamber: it wants to take away from the Opposition the opportunity to fulfil its role.

Apart from what the Attorney just said in relation to the time available for urgency motions, I submit that, when the length of Question Time was reduced, it was not realised by any member of the Standing Orders Committee, including the then Speaker and the Attorney-General, that the length of time available for debating urgency motions would be reduced. It was after that amending Standing Order was passed that it became apparent that the time available to debate urgency motions had been reduced by three-quarters of an hour. If the Attorney can tell me that I am incorrect, I should be pleased to hear it from him. However, it has been stated in this place on previous occasions by members no longer here that the Government received a bonus that it never set out to achieve: it was an issue that slipped under the door when the whole matter was discussed. The effect of it was not appreciated at the time. Unfortunately, matters of this nature do occur.

The member for Mitcham earlier this afternoon indicated a course of action that was taken in 1968 that brought about the defeat of the then Dunstan Government because of a Standing Order that is now to be altered by the general motion we are discussing today. I very much doubt whether the Standing Orders Committee or the Attorney-General were aware when they drew up the alterations to Standing Orders that they were destroying a precedent that was used in 1968 (by virtue of a motion for adjournment) for the Opposition to cause the Government to fall.

I do not suggest that all the measures brought forward on this or any previous occasion by the Standing Orders Committee have not been given a wealth of consideration. I am saying, however, that there is sufficient evidence to show that the wealth of consideration has not always been total and the adverse effects of the failure to look at all aspects have later caused concern to members on this side. I ask the Attorney to reassess the position in relation to this issue and to accept the amendment.

The Hon. L. J. KING: When the length of Question Time was under consideration, I thought everyone assumed that the time for urgency motions coincided with the time for questions. I do not think anyone doubted that, if Question Time was restricted, the time for urgency motions was automatically restricted. I am not aware whether it ever arose for discussion, but it seems axiomatic that the urgency period coincides with that of Question Time. It was treated as being a matter without doubt.

In relation to the other point, attention was directed in my mind and in the mind of others (I am not sure whether it arose for discussion before the Standing Orders Committee) to the effect of providing that only a Minister could move the adjournment. The motion for the adjournment is, of course, a traditional way in which the House can dismiss a Government. However, the system that is contemplated by these Standing Orders would not work unless the motion for adjournment was restricted to a Minister. That is the practice elsewhere, in the Commonwealth Parliament and in other Parliaments: only a Minister can move the adjournment. It was thought by me and by those with whom I discussed it that there were ample alternatives. There are no difficulties on the part of the Opposition, if it has the numbers, in dismissing the Government. There are many ways in which it can be done. The Opposition is losing nothing in that regard. We are here simply adopting a practice that exists in the Commonwealth and other Parliaments.

Mr. RUSSACK: I support the amendment. The Attorney said it has always been the case but, referring to the termination of an urgency motion at the conclusion of Question Time, I think that is no basis on which to rest an argument in this case. Many other things have been in practice for quite a long time and are now being changed by the committee's report. The amendment is quite in order. I have checked Standing Order 59, and although I do not know whether the copy I have seen has been amended it states:

Such motion may not be amended, and at the close of the debate shall be withdrawn.

The words "at the close of the debate shall be withdrawn" have been crossed out and the following words inserted:

the debate thereon shall commence no later than twenty minutes after the time that questions without notice begin and unless otherwise ordered shall cease with the expiration of the time at which such questions would ordinarily terminate and each member speaking (including the mover of the motion) shall be limited to fifteen minutes.

I see no difficulty in deleting the words "with the expiration of the time at which such questions would ordinarily terminate" and inserting "at 4 p.m."

The Committee divided on the amendment:

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

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dean Brown and Evans. Noes—Messrs. McRae and Wells.

Majority of 3 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 90 be agreed to.

The Committee divided on the motion:

While the division bells were ringing:

Mr. RUSSACK: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, the amendment to proposed Standing Order 59 was considered, but was the proposed Standing Order put?

The CHAIRMAN: I uphold the point of order. Call off the division. The question is "That proposed Standing Order 59 be agreed to".

The Committee divided on the motion:

Ayes (24)—Messrs. Boundy, Broomhill, and Max Brown, Mrs. Byrne, Messrs. Corcoran, Crimes, Duncan, Dunstan, Groth, Harrison, Hopgood, Hudson, Jennings, Keneally, King (teller), Langley, McKee, Millhouse, Olson, Payne, Simmons, Slater, Virgo, and Wright.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McRae and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Evans and Venning.

Majority of 7 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 90 be agreed to.

Mr. BECKER: Will we be required to give Questions on Notice to the Clerk Assistant before 12 noon each day, and will the order of business be the presentation of petitions, replies to Questions on Notice, and replies to questions without notice previously asked? In other words, can Questions on Notice be replied to daily from now on, instead of on the following Tuesday as is the practice at present?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not think this differs from the existing Standing Order. The replying to Questions on Notice on Tuesdays is a matter of practice. The present Standing Order 90 reads in the same way and it states:

The House shall proceed each day with its ordinary business, in the following routine:—1. Presentation of Petitions. 2. Replies to Questions on Notice and to questions without notice . . .

Technically, presumably Questions on Notice could be replied to now on any day, but the practice is that they are replied to on Tuesday.

Mr. BECKER: I fear that, where we have a general practice that is not in writing, if we interpret the Standing Order as it is, members could ask Questions on Notice and they could stay on the Notice Paper week after week. I oppose this new Standing Order, because we will have to submit Questions on Notice before 12 noon on each sitting day, and that is not fair to the Opposition. Sometimes a member asks a question before 3 p.m., is not satisfied with the reply, and has the opportunity to follow it up by placing it on notice before 3 p.m. It is then on the Notice Paper for the next day. This can prevent another member from asking a supplementary question before the first member gets the call on the following day.

This matter could be important if the question related to a member's district or to policy for which he was responsible on this side of the House. I see a breaking down of tradition and of something that we have come to accept. A similar thing could apply to the Government. The practice has been that no member interferes regarding another member's district or cuts across another member's question. In the past we have heard much about protocol and practices that Australian Parliaments have carried out. We have also seen how those practices can be dishonoured. I am not willing to give away this sort of procedure in this place.

Dr. TONKIN: Although I agree with what the honourable member says, another matter that should be raised is the order of routine business. It has been the practice, probably by personal decision of the Speaker, that notices of motion are called on before questions without notice. When the time for questions without notice was reduced, an agreement was made that notices of motion would be called on specifically before questions without notice were called on. We now have an opportunity to clarify the position. I am a little at a loss to know why the Standing Orders Committee did not make this recommendation. Therefore, I should like now to move an amendment, so that the Standing Order would provide:

(3) Giving notices of motion. (4) Asking questions without notice. (5) Motions and Orders of the Day . . .

As I believe that should be the procedure, I move accordingly.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I could not agree with that. The present practice works satisfactorily. I agree that notices of motion should be called for before the commencement of questions without notice; that is the practice observed. However, not uncommonly it happens that a notice will come to the Minister at some time during Question Time, the Parliamentary Counsel having had problems. It often happens that, when a Minister takes his place at 2 p.m., he does not have such a notice. It is then necessary for him to obtain the call and give that notice, otherwise the business of the Chamber would be delayed by another day. This is a convenient procedure and does not take more than a few seconds of Question Times. To write this, as proposed, into the Standing Order would create problems that I think are unnecessary. Although the Government intends to adhere to the practice now followed, we do not want written into the Standing Order an inflexible provision that would necessitate a suspension of Standing Orders to enable the giving of a notice of motion at other than the stipulated time.

Dr. TONKIN: Although I am not impressed by the Attorney's remarks, I sincerely hope that the present

practice will continue. In the circumstances, I seek leave to withdraw my amendment.

Leave granted; amendment withdrawn.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 107 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 108 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 109 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 112 be agreed to.

Dr. EASTICK: What will the Clerk say in the Chamber about a petition? In the Senate, when a petition is first received it is read in substance and, subsequently, petitions relating to the same subject are simply noted with regard to their source. I believe that, when a petition is first presented in this Chamber, it would be advantageous if the Clerk read its basic content. If that is to be the procedure, I can see no real argument against this proposal.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The proposal is that the Clerk will indicate the subject matter of the petition, but how he describes the subject matter will be a matter for him to decide. I think he agreed with me that his description should be to the effect that the petition, for instance, opposed the establishment of a casino at Victor Harbor, or supported the licensing of massage parlours. In other words, he would indicate the subject in a general way. That would seem to be appropriate. The Standing Order does not call for the reading of the text of the petition.

Mr. COUMBE: Until now, the procedure has been for a member to seek leave and to read the formal part of the petition. I understand that the Standing Orders Committee is proposing that this procedure should be omitted, with the Clerk reading out the text of the petition, if the petition is being presented for the first time. It is important that this should be done in the interests of the petitioners. When there has been more than one petition on the same subject, the practice has been for the member to say that the petition is in a similar form to that presented by another member. If the Clerk were to adopt this procedure, it would get over the problem of wasted time caused by the member's having to make his formal explanation, and so on. If that assurance is given, this proposal will be acceptable.

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Clerk will simply indicate the identity of the petitioner and the subject matter, saying, for instance, that the petition opposes the establishment of a casino at Victor Harbor. However, the *Hansard* entry will be as it is now, indicating the petitioner and the text of the petition. I believe the matter is adequately covered. Members will be told the subject matter, as I have outlined and as the Clerk has indicated, by the Clerk's giving the general trend of the petition, saying, for instance, that it approves the licensing of massage parlours. The detail of the petition would appear in *Hansard* as at present.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That Standing Order 113 be repealed.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 119a be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 128 be agreed to.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: I move:

To strike out "at least two hours" and insert "at least one hour".

We already have a precedent in connection with matters of urgency where the matter must be before the Speaker by 1 o'clock—one hour before the sitting of the House of Assembly. I see no reason why that precedent should not be applied in connection with notices of questions given to the Clerks of the House. Because the Deputy Premier is frowning, I shall repeat my reasons for moving my amendment. It is inconvenient for a member who has to come from a regional electorate office to provide his notices of questions within the time limit proposed by the Attorney-General.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If the matter is important enough, the member will be here.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: It is all right for the Deputy Premier, who rides around in a chauffeur-driven car and who has public servants to do his messages and research. However, when constituents interview a member because the Government is making such a botch of its administration, it is necessary for the member to do his job as efficiently as possible. I am simply asking that it be permissible for notices of questions to be supplied at least one hour before a sitting, rather than at least two hours before.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I oppose the amendment. The motion has been moved because of the problems that officers of this place have encountered as a result of the considerable increase in the number of Questions on Notice. All such questions have to be checked as to whether they are in order and they have to be processed for incorporation in the Notice Paper. This takes time and gives rise to the need for the officers to have notices of questions earlier than they do at present. It is a matter of practical consideration and makes not the slightest difference to the Government, but it is important to the people who have to do the work; that is why the motion has been moved. I welcome the number of questions placed on notice. I have always strongly expressed the view that many of the questions that occupy the time of members as questions without notice could more properly be put on notice; that practice has been adopted, and I and the Government do not complain about that, but it means that the officers at the table must be given adequate time to do their job. Consequently, the Standing Orders Committee acceded to the view of the Clerk.

Dr. EASTICK: I am pleased to know, and I acknowledge, that the Attorney-General has in the past accepted the principle of Questions on Notice. Of course, it is not a view shared by his Premier, who on occasions has been known to draw the attention of the public and of members to questions that get a little close to the bone. Because he does not want the Government's inefficiency to be exposed, the Premier rubbishes someone for putting on notice a question that might be difficult to answer. I accept that Questions on Notice play an important part in this place, and I trust they will continue to do so.

The Hon. L. J. King: And I trust they are properly drafted so that they can be understood and answered.

Dr. EASTICK: I cannot accept a situation that denies a member an opportunity of getting a question on notice for Tuesday when he believes that he received an unsatisfactory answer on Thursday. Whilst we might accept the situation in connection with Tuesday and Wednesday (and I do not),

with all due respect to the staff members that we now have, I point out that four staff members are doing the work that only two did when I first became a member. There is no reason why the material should not be processed during the period up to 3 p.m. on a sitting afternoon. It is on this basis that I oppose the motion. The Attorney-General referred to one of my colleagues. I cannot accept his suggestion in regard to a time of 1 o'clock. It is the responsibility of this Government and the officers of this place to provide the service to members that is given under the present Standing Orders. I therefore oppose the motion.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: I support my Leader's remarks. The Attorney-General's explanation of his motion states that the new Standing Order is necessary because, since the reduction of the time allowed for oral questions, the number of written questions has increased considerably. However, I believe that is the Government's fault. The immediate remedy is to restore some or all of the previous length of Question Time. The Attorney-General's explanation states that it has become impossible for questions to be checked as to correct form. I usually read Questions on Notice, and I have not detected any glaring mistakes, yet we have here an assertion that it is impossible for questions to be checked properly. The Leader has dealt with the position as to questions put on notice on Thursday. There is Friday and perhaps part of Monday in which they can be checked. So, the Attorney-General's reasoning is not valid. As the Leader has said, a service to members is required and, if there is difficulty in providing that service, some other solution should be sought, other than curtailing a practice that helps members do their job properly. I have seen no evidence of the alleged impossibility of the Clerk Assistant's task. I think the amendment is a compromise, but it is not necessary. There is no compelling argument in the Attorney-General's explanation that would lead me to support this change in Standing Orders.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: In his reply the Attorney-General said that the reason for the motion was that the Clerks could not cope with the problem: the reason is certainly not that the Government has trouble in answering the questions between Thursday and Tuesday. One could give an answer in five minutes in the way the Government answers questions. Questions on Notice are being treated with complete contempt by Ministers. Sometimes I get a worthwhile answer, but generally the answer displays contempt. This shows what little regard the Government has for questions of public importance. The Attorney-General has said that the period must be two hours and that one hour is not enough; he has said that the new Standing Order is being introduced for the sake of the Clerks. The Attorney-General did not consult the Clerks to see whether one hour would be sufficient. This makes me think that the Attorney-General is opposing my amendment for the sake of being cantankerous. The Attorney's stand on my amendment proves that he is not a reasonable man and that the Government is introducing these amendments simply to gag the Opposition and make its life more difficult.

The CHAIRMAN: I will put the question: "That the amendment be agreed to." Those in favour say "Aye", against "No". The "Noes" have it.

Dr. EASTICK: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, can you tell me how the vote is interpreted when one member votes on both sides of the question?

The CHAIRMAN: I interpret the vote on the call.

Dr. EASTICK: In giving that reply, Sir, you have upheld the question I put to you. You have interpreted on the call, which is a recognition of the power of the voices.

The CHAIRMAN: I do not give my ruling on a single call.

Dr. EASTICK: That is the point I wanted to make. The call for the "Noes" was considerably affected by the loudness of the Deputy Premier's voice in recording a "No" vote after having just recorded a "Yes" vote. If you really mean to uphold the point of order that I took initially, Mr. Chairman, it can be done effectively only by resubmitting the vote to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN: That is what I intend to do. The question is as follows: "That the amendment be agreed to." Those in favour say "Aye", against "No". The "Noes" have it.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. BECKER: In opposing the amendment to Standing Orders, I ask the Attorney how much it will save. Will this amendment mean that officers of the Government Printing Department will be able to process the Notice Paper more quickly, and will overtime or any other additional expenses be eliminated? If Standing Orders are to be amended, that should be done by providing that Questions on Notice be submitted not two hours before the House meets but up to two hours after it meets, as this would be advantageous to members.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

Noes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Dean Brown, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McRae and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Evans and Nankivell.

Majority of 4 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 129 be agreed to.

Dr. TONKIN: The wording of the amendment to this Standing Order is terribly vague and open to all sorts of interpretation. I am surprised that it has been left in its present form. The explanation that it is not necessary for questions to be placed at the head of the day's Notice Paper is fair enough. However, what has been conveniently left out of the explanation is the statement that it will be necessary to publish Questions on Notice on the day they are to be answered. Also, when notice of such questions is given, the Clerks are to publish that fact on the day's Notice Paper. But on which day's Notice Paper? Will it be the following day's Notice Paper, the next Tuesday's Notice Paper or, if the Government so desires or if practice changes, will it be on the Notice Paper for Pancake Tuesday? There is nothing whatever to say when it will be done. Doubtless, the Attorney will say that it is the practice for this to be done on the following Tuesday. Then, if that is the practice, why is it not stated? I disagree with any suggestion that Questions on Notice should be left off the Notice Paper until the day they are to be answered, because otherwise members have no way of telling whether questions they wish to put on the Notice Paper have been asked before. This situation could increase the work load of the Clerk Assistant. I believe that Questions on Notice must be on the Notice Paper on each day they remain unanswered. This will save the Clerks much difficulty, and it will serve as a constant reminder to the Ministers, their staff, their secretaries, and research officers that

answers must be found for the following Tuesday. The situation is so widely open as to enable abuse to creep in. The situation must be clarified, and this is the time for clarification.

The Hon. L. J. KING: There is only one change intended from the existing Standing Order, which currently provides:

When notices of such questions are given, the Clerk shall place them at the commencement of the day's business paper.

The amendment strikes out "at the commencement of" and inserts "on", thereby giving flexibility to the Clerk to place Questions on Notice in a more convenient place on the Notice Paper. Regarding whether the question should be on the Notice Paper every day between the time notice is given and the time the question is answered is a completely different question; it has never been raised before. That matter might occupy the attention of the Standing Orders Committee on a future occasion. We are now concerned solely with changes in the Standing Order relating to where Questions on Notice are to be placed on the Notice Paper.

Dr. TONKIN: Will the Attorney explain why paragraph 4 of the report of the Standing Orders Committee, dealing specifically with Questions on Notice, deals with subjects which the Attorney says are not covered? Why was it thought necessary to mention this matter in the report if it is not covered in the amendment to Standing Orders now being discussed?

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Paragraph 4 of the report states:

By this amendment Questions on Notice need only be on the Notice Paper for the day they are set down to be answered, thereby obviating the necessity for members to have to turn over up to five printed pages before the first items of business appear.

Will the Attorney assure members that Questions on Notice will appear on the Notice Paper daily until they are answered? I believe this is essential for the reasons already explained by the member for Bragg. It is wrong that Questions on Notice be incorporated in the Notice Paper only on the day on which they are to be answered. Will the Attorney say that the only change to result will be that Questions on Notice will come at the end of the Notice Paper instead of at the beginning, and that they will appear daily until they are answered?

The Hon. L. J. KING: The Standing Order variation relates solely to the place that Questions on Notice occupy on the Notice Paper. I have just discussed the matter with the Clerk, who says that he has no intention of varying the existing practice, except that these questions will appear at the back of the Notice Paper instead of at the front of the Notice Paper. They will appear daily as in the past.

Dr. TONKIN: I understand that a Question on Notice will now be placed on the Notice Paper for the date of answering. The position is not clear.

The Hon. L. J. King: That is what is stated, but I agree that it is not clear.

Dr. TONKIN: Standing Order 129 is ambiguous. Its meaning would be much improved if it provided: "The Clerk shall place Questions on Notice on the Notice Paper under the day on which the question shall be answered."

The Hon. L. J. KING: The honourable member's Party has two representatives on the Standing Orders Committee and they can cause the committee to look at this matter subsequently. I admit that it is a matter that needs looking at. This amendment simply follows the language of a Standing Order that has stood the test of time. It varies the place at which questions can be found on the Notice Paper, and I will not accept an amendment that has not been properly examined by the Standing Orders Committee. However, I will raise the point myself, if necessary.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 144 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 144a be agreed to.

Dr. EASTICK: Of all the suggested changes, this suggested Standing Order causes the gravest concern to all members on this side. This suggested Standing Order greatly increases the opportunity available to a Government to destroy the Opposition in this State. This measure, in the hands of a Government which is arrogant and which is of the opinion that the Opposition should be crushed, can be used to completely annihilate the opportunity of Opposition members to undertake debate on behalf of the people they represent. This proposed Standing Order destroys the whole tenor of other measures referred to in the committee's report. This is one recommendation I never believed would have been brought forward by a Government that claims that it is interested in everyone in the community because, if it were interested in everyone in the South Australian community, it would not have been willing to suggest this change.

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

Dr. EASTICK: This proposed Standing Order invites opposition, because it is the most obnoxious of all those we have been asked to consider. It is completely contrary to fair play and the understanding that all members have of the manner in which debate should be conducted in this place. Each member should be able to discuss all matters and, where necessary, expose adverse features of legislation. I cannot accept it as being a reasonable compromise or a reasonable attitude for the Government to adopt. The member for Kavel has said earlier that it goes much further than the Standing Orders of the Commonwealth Parliament. It does not require that the Minister determine that a matter shall be a matter of urgency and that on that matter of urgency a guillotine procedure will follow: it can be used on every measure that is before the House. It is far too wide, and it is against the best interests of proper government in South Australia. I have no hesitation in saying that I shall oppose the motion at this stage and, if necessary, at a later stage.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Attorney has probably gleaned that this proposal is the one that we most violently oppose. I hope that the Attorney will reply to the points that have been raised. I believe that the Government should first seek to arrange its affairs more satisfactorily. Earlier today I said that the Premier on one or more occasions had gone on television before the opening of a session trying to score a few political points for himself and his Ministry by saying how hard he and his Ministers were working and that Parliament was again having to work hard and sit late into the evening because of the heavy legislative programme proposed. However, later we find that the Government has not got its legislation prepared, and it is not prepared until several weeks into the session. We are then forced to sit late, sometimes into the early hours of the morning, simply because the Government has not put its legislative programme in order. The classic example arose when the Minister of Education tried to rewrite the Education Act in the last week of the session.

No alteration to Standing Orders will remedy that situation: it is a farcical situation that the Government has brought on itself.

No agreement was reached with the Opposition regarding this amendment, which I believe is the major amendment to Standing Orders. The Attorney-General likes to come into this Chamber and say, "We have been able to accommodate the Opposition in relation to the adjournment debate." The Opposition will not trade an adjournment debate for this calamitous proposal we are now considering; no agreement has been reached. It is against the strongest opposition from this side that the Government will force it through if it is hell bent on this course.

I do not believe any real precedent exists for the Government to introduce this change. It is fairly obvious, from a perusal of the minutes of the Standing Orders Committee, that the Attorney had no indication that the Opposition would entertain it for a moment. The House of Representatives, which has a membership about three times as great as that of this Chamber, does not have a guillotine procedure that is anywhere near as tough as the one now proposed here.

Mr. Langley: You must be joking.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: For the benefit of some members opposite who do not know what the Standing Orders of the House of Representatives provide, I will read Standing Order 92, which is the one dealing with the limitation of debate and which provides:

(*a*) On the reading of a message from the Governor-General recommending an appropriation in connexion with any Bill, on the calling on of a motion for leave to introduce a Bill or a notice of presentation, on the consideration of any motion preliminary to the introduction of a Bill, at any stage of a Bill, or on the consideration of Senate amendments or requests for amendments to a Bill, a Minister may—

It is not mandatory. In South Australia there is to be no option: the programme for the week will be decided at the conference table on a Monday.

Mr. Evans: Regardless of what happens in debate.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: That is so. The guillotine will be applied so that the time table will be adhered to. Standing Order 92 of the House of Representatives continues:

. . . declare that the Bill is an urgent Bill, and on such declaration, the question "That the Bill be considered an urgent Bill" shall be put forthwith—no debate or amendment being allowed—and on such question being agreed to, a Minister may forthwith, or at any time during any sitting of the House or committee, but not so as to interrupt a member who is addressing the House or committee, move a motion or motions specifying the time which shall be allotted to all or any of the following:

So Ministers cannot interrupt. In South Australia a Minister will have to interrupt so that he can get his motion considered in time. The Commonwealth Standing Order goes on to deal with the stages of the Bill at which such a motion specifying the time can be moved. That Standing Order is nowhere near as tough as that proposed by the South Australian Government. In addition, I draw attention to a report and recommendations of the Standing Orders Committee of the House of Representatives. One of the provisos recommended by the committee (and the much vaunted Prime Minister of this country, Mr. Whitlam, was Chairman of the committee) in relation to grievance debates states:

Adjournment of the House to be proposed at 10.30 p.m.: That the following new Standing Order 50A be adopted:

50A. Unless otherwise ordered, at half-past ten o'clock p.m. on each sitting day, the Speaker shall propose the question "That the House do now adjourn" which question shall be open to debate; if the House be in committee at the time stated, the Chairman shall report progress—

a member cannot be cut short in his tracks—

and upon such report being made the Speaker shall forthwith propose the question "That the House do now adjourn" which question shall be open to debate. Provided that:

(*d*) any business under discussion and not disposed of at the time of the adjournment shall be set down on the Notice Paper for the next sitting.

That is somewhat different from what the South Australian Government, which deals with about half as much business as is dealt with by the Commonwealth Government, seeks to push through in a Chamber with about one-third as many members as the Commonwealth Chamber has. The Attorney says that the problems we are going to face with the minor Parties can be resolved elsewhere. Let him show what precedent the Government has for forcing through this Committee this extremely restrictive proposal. It makes a complete farce of the idea of representative Government, under which members come to this place and are given a forum to speak on behalf of their constituents, to whom members on this side are answerable. We know perfectly well that debate from back-bench members of the Labor Party is completely meaningless. Once Caucus has made a decision, that is the end of the matter. They go along with it. I mentioned earlier the dilemma of the member for Tea Tree Gully and the member for Salisbury when the matter of shopping hours was debated in this Chamber. I have never seen the member for Tea Tree Gully look as worried as she did when she was compelled, by a vote of her Party, to vote in favour of Friday night closing. She knew she was out of step with her constituents. Fortunately, members on this side are not subjected to the same iron-fisted discipline as are members of the Labor Party, and that is the sort of discipline the Attorney and his Government seek to force on this Parliament.

Because the Labor Party conducts its affairs in this fashion, treating its members as a tiny cog in the wheel, that does not mean that the public of South Australia is satisfied with this procedure. Certainly, it does not mean that we in Opposition, elected to this place to speak on behalf of our constituents, should be gagged daily at every stage of a debate without expressing our complete and utter disgust at what the Attorney and his henchmen seek to force through in this place. I am totally opposed to this proposal. It is one of the more scandalous of the Government's proposals, and I hope sincerely that the Government will see fit, at the end of this debate, when this has been dealt with, to withdraw its proposals and look at them again, in the interests of democracy in South Australia.

Dr. TONKIN: I wholeheartedly associate myself with the expressions of the member for Kavel.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Dr. TONKIN: I am amazed at the attitude of members opposite. If they believed they were on firm ground, and if they had no motive other than political gain for moving these amendments to Standing Orders, I should have thought they would be prepared to listen to a point of view from this side without indulging in inanities, *non sequiturs*, and braying interjections. The Attorney and other members opposite cannot deny (if they could, we might hear some rational debate) that this will take away the rights of members generally in this Chamber to speak on matters concerning their districts and their constituents if the Government says they may not speak.

Members interjecting:

Dr. TONKIN: I do not regard it as an expression of democracy to have free speech attacked not only by means of Standing Orders but also by loud and vociferous interjections from members opposite. As far as I can see, they are not interested in democracy. In spite of what the Attorney says, it seems there is no hope of having anything other than a token meeting between representatives of the Government and representatives of the Opposition at the beginning of each week's sittings to arrange the business of this Chamber. What on earth will that do? Who will make the decision? It will not matter whether the Opposition is there or not; the Government will do what it wants to do.

Mr. Duncan: It is not what this Chamber decides but what DeGaris decides.

Dr. TONKIN: There is another *non sequitur*. How could we look on this suggestion as anything other than a bare-faced sham? It is a sop, designed to make us feel good. We are supposed to say, "Isn't the Government good, taking us into its confidence? We are allowed to hear what business it has and we are even going to be allowed some say on how long we can speak on it." I could be very rude, but I will not be. However, it is a whole load of cods wallop; it is window-dressing and nothing more, designed to take the emphasis away from the fact that it is destroying the right of the Opposition to free speech. I will not labour the point. This matter will come to a vote, and members opposite have indicated that they will vote against freedom of speech and democracy. The Attorney has not accepted one amendment or one suggestion, so we shall be rolled, and it will be a sad and sorry day for the democratic process in this place when these new Standing Orders are brought into operation. I do not think the Attorney is proud of this. I will pay him the compliment (if it is one) of saying that I think he does not especially enjoy what he is doing. I strongly oppose this move. Some of the other changes proposed are perhaps desirable, whilst some are not; this move, however, is utterly abhorrent.

Mr. GUNN: This amendment is the most obnoxious of all we have dealt with so far. I can foresee the situation where Ministers will be getting up in their usual fashion and making completely unfounded attacks on members of the Opposition; a Minister will then gag the debate. Obviously, this Government does not like and cannot take constructive criticism. It has built up in this State the best organised press coverage machine the country has even seen, not for the interests of the people (that is secondary in its consideration), but to promote its own political Party. Having set up a propaganda machine, it then wants to deny the properly elected members of the Opposition the right to put the point of view they were elected to put. Members opposite, such as the member for Spence, write, under a pen name, completely untrue statements about members on this side. Under this provision, Ministers will make unfounded attacks on Opposition members.

Mr. Langley: He doesn't hide behind a pen name.

Mr. GUNN: Of course he does, and he makes unfounded charges against members on this side, not having the guts to put his name to the articles. Although many members opposite do not take the opportunity to speak in debates, they now intend to deny us the opportunity of speaking. Earlier today I quoted from the *Hansard* index. That index for 1972 shows that the member for Harrison—

Mr. Harrison: Albert Park.

Mr. GUNN: —made only two speeches; he has just made his third speech.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I ask the honourable member to confine his remarks to the proposed Standing Order before the Committee.

Mr. GUNN: I think I have made my point. I agree with the member for Kavel, who said that democracy itself was being threatened by provisions such as this. If representatives of the people are not allowed to debate, on the floor of this Chamber, the great issues affecting the people, where else should these matters be discussed? The people of the State have the right to have their representatives discuss matters freely and openly in this place. If proposals such as this are accepted, members will be denied this opportunity.

Mr. Jennings: Hear, hear!

Mr. GUNN: The honourable member wants to see people trodden on in the typical Socialist fashion; he wants rights destroyed. He can tell the public that he does not believe members of Parliament should have the right to express, on behalf of the people, their views on various matters that arise. Labor Party members should be ashamed of this proposal. Despite the fact that many of them are not permitted to speak in debates, they should not deprive us of our right to speak.

Mr. MATHWIN: I oppose the motion. This is the basis of the dirty deal that the Government has offered the Opposition, saying, "We will offer you a grievance debate, but the price you will pay is the guillotine." This proposal represents an erosion of democracy in this place. Since I have been a member, the Government has restricted the rights of the Opposition in Question Time, and so on. Now we have this shocking provision which the Government has the numbers to push through and which will be to the disadvantage of minority Parties in this State. The Attorney-General has said that, at a meeting, a time table will be prepared setting out what the Government wishes to do, but this will allow the Government to do what it wants.

I believe that the Government's tactics will be to take any difficult legislation it has and put a limit of one week on the time available for debating it. Thus, the Government can get rid of all its nasty legislation, without much opportunity being given to representatives of the people on this side to oppose it. The term "guillotine" comes from France and means sudden death; this provision will be sudden death for the Opposition with regard to legislation the Government introduces. I should be surprised if members opposite were proud of this proposal; I do not think they would be truthful if they said they were.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: What is done in the House of Commons?

Mr. MATHWIN: That is a different situation altogether. If all the members of that House went into the Chamber together, there would not be enough seats for them. Therefore, it would be ridiculous for all members there to speak on legislation. The Attorney has come up with this great democratic idea of getting around the table and talking about Government business. I presume that an equal number of members from each side of the Chamber will be present but there will be a casting vote of the Chairman who, I suppose, will be the Premier. Therefore, it is easy to imagine who will decide what is a reasonable programme. We know that the minority Parties will be ridden into the ground, because the Government will decide what legislation will be introduced and how long will be allowed for debate. The Ministers, the sly foxes opposite, will introduce all the hardest legislation at the same time, thus limiting the Opposition's opportunity to

debate it. This proposal is an absolute disgrace; the Government should be ashamed of itself for introducing it.

Mr. COUMBE: I completely oppose the motion and commend my colleagues for covering the ground so well. As they have dealt with many matters adequately and pungently, I shall not repeat what they have said. However, I invite Government members to examine these proposed Standing Orders more closely. I think that the Minister in charge of these proposals would be the first to rue the day that proposed Standing Order 144a (*c*) came into operation. In terms of that, no amendments can be discussed unless they have been received at least one hour before the guillotine is to apply.

Members who have been here for some time know that one of the great values of the Committee stage is the opportunity to move amendments. Normally, it is the only time that an amendment can be moved. Ministers move them when they see faults in legislation and the Opposition can also move amendments. Apart from being completely unfair and completely fettering the rights of members, this provision will be unworkable and probably the Government would suffer most from it. If a member could not get his amendment in by the stipulated time, he would not be able to explain it and the vote would have to be taken on it forthwith, without debate.

I ask you, Mr. Chairman, as the custodian of members' rights and the person under whose guidance amendments are discussed in Committee, whether you are pleased with that provision, because you have the duty and obligation to see that every member of the Committee gets fair treatment. This provision strikes at the basic worth of the Committee stage of any Bill. Therefore, I consider it a completely retrograde step to introduce it, and it should be thrown out.

Mr. EVANS: I oppose the proposal. I do not consider that any of us is genuine in talking about a shortage of time in this Chamber. We are short of time because we try to cram into a few weeks matters that should be spread over a longer period. We are trying to limit the speaking time for members because in the past it has been possible to pass, in no more than 24 weeks each year, the legislation that the Government has considered it possible to pass. This Parliament does not sit for about 28 weeks a year (on average), and there is no need to limit the rights of the individual to speak.

One freedom that the individual member has had until recently has been the right to speak in this Parliament on an unlimited basis. It has been stated that members have spoken for three or four hours so as to clutter up the debate, and so the time allowed was reduced to half an hour, except for those who lead in the debate. We sit for no more than about 72 days a year, in 24 weeks. If we sit for three weeks and adjourn for one week and if we adjourn for six weeks at Christmas time, for four weeks during May, and for two weeks during September, we still will have 40 weeks of the year in which to sit.

If we sit for three weeks and adjourn for one week, we will be sitting for 30 weeks and we will have another 10 weeks off to do our normal electoral work. That would mean we would sit for 90 days a year, 18 days more than we sit at present. Further, if we wished, we could sit for four days a week, or on a total of 120 days. At one time the salary of a Parliamentarian was not high. It may not be high today, compared to the salaries in some professions, but it is a wage on which any person with a family of average size can live.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: Speak for yourself. If you have a supplementary income, it may be all right.

Mr. EVANS: We can put all our time into this job.

Mr. Harrison: Not only here, but also in our district offices. Don't forget that.

Mr. EVANS: I think we do our job in the district offices, but it is possible to sit for those additional weeks and not to have to sit later than possibly 9.30 p.m.

The Hon. J. D. Corcoran: If you represent a near metropolitan district, it is all right, but it is not so good if you represent a country district.

Mr. Goldsworthy: You go on with that one vote one value nonsense, and you are leaving a country district.

Mr. EVANS: The other area where all Governments have fallen down is the method of introducing Bills. In this respect the Government has no real programme. Possibly the Government does not have enough Parliamentary Counsel to keep up with the programme it would like to adopt. Often, when a session commences, we find that the legislation is not ready, and then in the later part of the session we find that sittings last until the early hours of the morning. If the Government planned its programme before a session commenced, the majority of Bills could be introduced in the first three weeks of the session. In those circumstances Parliamentarians and the community would have the rest of the legislative year in which to consider the Bills. Surely that method is not impossible under present-day conditions with all the personnel avaliable in Government departments to assist in handling the Government's programme. That is all we have to do to remove some of the bottlenecks that are encountered in this Parliament.

Let us imagine Opposition members of the proposed committee to draw up the programme going along on a Monday to meet with Government representatives. I do not know how the Opposition representatives will be selected, but all the representatives will sit around a table and decide how much time will be needed on a Bill that may have been introduced on the previous Thursday. There may not have been an opportunity to get the community's views and to ascertain the pitfalls of the Bill. We will be asked to decide how much time we need to debate a Bill in the second reading stage and in the Committee stage. We had one case recently where the Government had to change the name of a Bill because even the name was wrong. Yet we are now asked to consider a time schedule. When the Government representatives come to a meeting of the proposed committee, will they put forward a Caucus decision on how much time is to be spent on a Bill, will it be a Cabinet decision, a Ministerial decision, or will it be the decision of the Government representative on the committee? Will the decision be cut and dried before the committee members get into the room to discuss it? Will the Government representative say to himself, "Cabinet or Caucus has suggested that I should allow the Opposition five hours, so I will offer three hours. The Opposition will ask for 10 hours, and we will, by bartering, decide on five hours."? If South Australia had a population of 10 000 000, with many large cities, the situation would be different, but South Australia has only a small population.

Like the member for Mitcham, I have seen a time limit on speeches introduced, and I have seen the period for Question Time reduced. If Parliamentarians enjoy the privilege of being able to ask parochial questions that do not interest the media or most members, why should those Parliamentarians not ask such questions in Parliament? I remind members that a Parliamentarian represents the people in his area; that is his job. His job is not simply

to talk about matters of State-wide importance. The Parliamentarian represents the individual as well as the community collectively. I know that most of the people employed here would think it advantageous if we adjourned at 10 p.m. The press would think it a great idea, too, but we are not here to consider ourselves: we are here to consider the processes of the Parliament and the representation that we give to people. I do not doubt that many of my speeches have meant nothing to some people, but I expressed the thoughts that I had in my mind.

Mr. Harrison: You always enjoyed your full time.

Mr. EVANS: When I first came here I enjoyed unlimited time. I have not always spoken for the full time.

Mr. Harrison: Some people make as many points in 10 minutes as you make in 30 minutes.

Mr. EVANS: Perhaps that justifies my argument. Each member has a duty to represent his constituents and, if it takes him 30 minutes to make his point, he ought to have the right to do it. Why should his time be limited if he does not have the capacity to make his point in 10 minutes? The member for Albert Park is suggesting that a member should be so limited. We have the time if we wish to make use of it. However, whether we like it or not, this proposed Standing Order will be thrust upon us. The Government does not like sitting at night; nor does the Opposition. If the Government takes up the challenge, it can properly prepare for its legislative programme so that the reporters and staff do not have to sit late, and Parliamentarians may have to front up for a few more weeks in each year without anyone suffering any inconvenience; that shows how ludicrous this whole debate is. The Government is not looking at helping the processes of Parliament: it is attempting to deny members the right to speak, and all Government members know it, including the Attorney-General.

Mr. McANANEY: One Standing Order that should be corrected is the rule stating that a member takes his turn when called on to speak in the Committee stage. He should not have to bob up and down like a yo yo. Members of my Party will be surprised when I say that I am going to oppose this provision. I believe that we should finish a sitting at 10 p.m. and that the business should be organised between the Parties. This proposed Standing Order, which is completely wrong and undemocratic, asks the Opposition to give up everything. If we are to finish a sitting at 10 p.m., we ought to come to some agreement between the Parties. However, this proposition goes too far. This Government and the Commonwealth Government, instead of proceeding gradually, approach a matter like a bull at a gate, and the gate gets smashed up and no-one is better off. I am happy that I will be retiring at the end of this Parliament. I wake up in the morning thinking about the young people who have been kicked around through the actions of the Government. This Government has indeed been incompetent in organising its programme. Although it has been in office for about seven years since I have been a member, it has not yet organised its business programme in a session. Perhaps for the first one or two years after it assumed office the Government got into some of its business fairly quickly in the session, but now it is getting worse, always trying to rush legislation through the Parliament. Members and Ministers must get out and talk to the people. Then, they might be a little wiser and better informed regarding the wishes of the community. I have probably been one of the worse offenders in this House in relation to speaking at length, having spoken several times for, say, three hours, after being told to fill in time. However, if one referred to *Hansard,* one would see that the world would be a little better place in which to live had I been listened to a little more often.

I do not think any Opposition could be expected to accept this new Standing Order which, if it is promulgated, will give the Government full command on any matters introduced in this Chamber. I believe, as I have told my colleagues, that the Opposition could come to some arrangement with the Government. I understood from what the Attorney-General said that there could be some form of co-operation to enable us to work together and conclude the sittings of Parliament at a reasonable hour. I agree that 20 minutes would probably be sufficient time for a member to speak on a Bill. One could solve the problem in that way.

However, the proposed Standing Order now before honourable members amounts to a straight-out dictatorship. I believe that the Attorney-General is a real little dictator, as he never concedes a point. True, he is a brilliant man, but he has no time to work out what is common sense: he just goes along his rigid route. I believe we should adjourn at 10 o'clock each evening but that such an end could be achieved by other means. The Opposition should have some say in how the Parliament is to be run. However, the Government, if this Standing Order is carried, will control completely the business of the Parliament and repress the Opposition. I will certainly vote against this Standing Order, believing as I do that sensible, rational people should be able to work out how the business can be run efficiently.

Mr. RUSSACK: I have decided to speak because, after this evening, I may not get an opportunity to do so for a long time. In future, to be able to speak from the Opposition side will be a privilege that will be much sought after. There is an old saying that children should be seen and not heard: I think the Government is treating the Opposition like children, as I think it is saying that the Opposition should be seen and not heard. I agree with the member for Heysen that the long sitting hours should be shortened, but I do not think this should happen in the way in which the Government is doing it. In this instance, the Government seems to be going from the sublime to the ridiculous. The more I read proposed new Standing Order 144a (*a*), the more restrictive I find it to be. Paragraphs (i) to (v) of the proposed new Standing Order specify the time that shall be allotted to the various stages of a Bill, after which the following appears:

. . . . and the order with regard to the time allotted to the Committee stage of the Bill may, out of the time allotted, apportion a certain time or times to a particular clause or clauses or to any particular part or parts of the Bill.

I understand that this would happen before the debate proceeded on a clause or certain clauses. If a Bill contained a contentious clause, the Government could restrict debate on it, thereby stifling the Opposition in its attempt to debate an important part of the Bill. The more one examines this Standing Order, the worse it becomes. The report sets out how a conclusion can be effected so that a Bill, motion or debate can be brought to a sudden halt. It then sets out the time limits within which certain Bills or motions can be presented, so that all other proceedings must take second place. Whether or not a member is speaking, the Minister can move a motion, and no member has the right to move an amendment or oppose that motion.

Mr. Jennings: How did you get on in the Upper House then?

Mr. RUSSACK: When I became a member of the Upper House, the honourable member said:

What about the House of Review (and I mean "revue" and not "review")? Take those members up there who have tried to gain entry into this House.

He then named them, and continued:

Now, take the latest acquisition (if you can call him that)—

referring to me—

a man who was so ignominiously defeated in his own town, and now he is safely ensconced in the haven of rest.

I now challenge the member for Ross Smith. That honourable member to whom he referred has now come down into this House and is able to take his place in this Chamber, but the Government is denying him the right to speak! I am the only person in South Australia in 58 years who can say that I have sat in another place and then came down to the Lower House. I am only one of six in the history of South Australia who have done this. I have had experience in both places and, in reference to the bicameral system, from my experience I say that I stand firmly behind the bicameral system. I stand firmly for democracy; I stand firmly for freedom of speech. This Standing Order denies every member of Parliament his democratic right and his freedom of speech.

I believe that this proposed Standing Order could affect private members' time. I recently saw fit to give notice of motion in a certain matter which was of great importance to my constituents. I desired to handle the matter in what I regarded as the most beneficial way, gaining information and debating it over a period. However, the Minister of Transport rose on the afternoon allotted to private members' time and said, "If it's private members' time it is also under the control of the Government. The Government must have control of the business in this House." He then insisted that the motion be debated on that afternoon, in accordance with his wishes. Therefore, I say that this proposed Standing Order will affect private members' time if the interpretation of the Minister is accepted by the Speaker. Private members' time will be restricted if that principle applies. I am violently opposed to this motion because of the reasons I have given, and because the rights of Opposition members are being denied, so much so that they will not be able to speak effectively on matters that affect their constituents and the South Australian population generally.

Mr. BLACKER: I express my opposition to this motion. It does not do the Government any good. The Government has to stand before the public and say, "We are taking that democratic voice from the Opposition." That is what it is doing. The Government is taking the opportunity from each member to express his opposition to any clause. This is most disturbing, and it is a sorry day when a Government cannot be challenged about its actions and its failure to act in a responsible manner. In the short period since I have been associated with this Parliament we have seen the right of Opposition members to voice their opinions progressively reduced. The time limit allowed for speeches has become shorter. I am not necessarily worried about this, because I believe one should be able to express a point of view in half an hour. However, when the Government can stifle the remarks of the Opposition and gently sideshift the voices of the public as they are channelled through the Opposition benches, then I am gravely concerned. I do not believe that the Government has set about implementing this report with any ideas of compromise. With the acceptance of the 10 o'clock adjournment I believe we should sit an additional number of weeks throughout the year. Personally, I favour sitting for three weeks and then having one week off, during which time members can go back to their districts.

Dr. Eastick: That is the Eastick system.

Mr. BLACKER: I do not know who suggested the system, but I think it is valid. When members are expected to debate issues late at night and early into the morning, they cannot be true representatives of their constituents and live up to the expectations of their electors. I reaffirm my opposition to this motion, because I believe it does great injustice and reduces the rights of people, as it cuts across the channels presenting Opposition views in the correct and proper place.

The Hon. L. J. KING: First, I should like to put right one matter of fact in respect of the remarks of the member for Torrens. I believe he read the explanation conerning the adoption of the guillotine and said that unless an amendment is submitted within one hour before the closing time for acceptance of amendments, an amendment cannot be discussed. In fact, that is not what the Standing Order provides. The position is that even though the guillotine is moved and adopted, the procedures of moving amendments and voting on them in Committee continue until the time designated as the closing time for the Committee stage of the Bill. The Chairman is then required to put the remaining clauses of the Bill and any amendments which have been received up to one hour or more before that closing time—

Mr. Coumbe: Without discussion?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Without discussion once the closing time is reached.

Mr. Coumbe: One cannot then introduce any new amendments?

The Hon. L. J. KING: Once the closing time has expired under the guillotine there can be no discussion or introduction of new amendments. All remaining clauses have to be put, with any amendments received more than one hour before. The point is that until that expiry time arrives the ordinary procedure of moving amendments can work. I make that point only because I understood the member for Torrens to have read the explanation as though it precluded the ordinary process if the time had not expired. Having put that right, if there was any misconception about it, I suppose that Oppositions must say the sort of things that have been said tonight. I suppose that some Oppositions feel that there is some political advantage in talking about, and using such phrases as, the end of democracy, as we have heard tonight. Nonetheless, it is disappointing that a more constructive approach has not been adopted by members of the Opposition to what is a real problem. I know that members who are now interjecting see this debate as an opportunity not to contribute towards devising constructive procedures for the efficient discharge of business in this Chamber but to make some sort of political point which, I am afraid, is wasted completely because, believe me, the public regards the sort of procedure that we adopt here as foolish to a degree they would not tolerate in their own affairs and in the affairs of their own associations; they look down on politicians who tolerate such procedures in this Parliament. They look on us to organise our affairs in a way that will produce the efficient discharge of the business that Parliament has to transact. One has only to talk to one's constituents to understand that.

The Leader of the Opposition correctly said that people outside regard us as fools to sit here into the early hours of the morning pretending that we are deliberating on the business of the State when all we are doing is getting up,

one after the other, and repeating the same threadbare phrases that contribute nothing to the welfare of the State.

Dr. Eastick: At what point do you cease to paraphrase what the Leader says?

The Hon. L. J. KING: If the Leader listens to me, he will understand my point at least as well as I understood his. True, as the member for Fisher said, when he first came into this place as a member there were virtually no restrictions under Standing Orders at all. What has happened over the years is that the Chamber has had to accommodate itself to changes that are taking place in the State. Obviously, the first change is that, in the last five years, the number of members has increased from 39 to 47. More importantly, one has only to look at the volumes of Statutes to see what else has been happening; the volume of business that this Chamber has had to transact has increased year by year.

Mr. Becker: You had something to do with that.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I have played a small part, of which I am not ashamed. What has happened is that the Chamber has had to accommodate itself to these circumstances by introducing time limits on speeches, by restricting the length of Question Time, and by adapting Standing Orders to a situation in which more and more business has had to be transacted. In latter times what has happened is that debates have gone on late into the evenings because we have been trying to stick with practices which, although appropriate in a smaller Parliament dealing with a smaller volume of business, are inappropriate in a larger Parliament dealing with a much larger volume of business.

Parliaments everywhere else have had to face this situation. In every great Parliament in the world there is a system by which time is allocated to the business that has had to be transacted: that is inevitable. It is wrong for members to talk about some mythical right of unrestricted discussion for each member on each measure; that does not exist in any large legislative body anywhere. It could only exist in a small Chamber dealing with a small volume of business. The proposals before the Committee are constructive attempts to reach in this place a reasonable and sensible approach to organising the business that we must deal with. What has been put before the Committee as a reasonable, sensible approach to the situation is that the Government should look at the business on the Notice Paper at the beginning of each week, consider what further business is to be introduced in the ensuing few weeks, and decide what must be got through in that week.

Governments everywhere have to decide what business has to be transacted by Parliament. That is the prerogative of Government, as it must always be. What then is proposed? I do not want there to be any misunderstanding about this. Some members have seemed to be under a misapprehension about what I said I intended. What is intended is that there should be a meeting between representatives of the Government and the Opposition. I foresee not a round-table conference with an impartial chairman, as one member suggested; that would be inappropriate. It was rightfully said by Opposition members that the Government was in control of the business of the Chamber and that that situation should continue. The Government does not shrink from that: it has to take the responsibility of getting business through the Chamber.

The meeting with the Opposition is intended to be held to hear the Opposition's views on how time should be allocated. Whereas, it is the Government's concern that a certain amount of the Government's legislative programme should be got through, the Government takes the view that the Opposition has a primary interest in the amount of time that should be allocated to each item of business. Hence, it seems to me that the proper course (and this is what is proposed) is that a representative from the Government (say, a Minister) and the Government Whip should meet with the Leader of the Opposition or his nominee and the Opposition Whip to discuss the Notice Paper and what business the Government wishes to deal with, and to express views on the time that should be allocated to debating that business. It is a matter for the Opposition whether it wants to take part in that exercise.

Mr. Mathwin: Of course, you'd rather we didn't.

The Hon. L. J. KING: It is not a matter of concern to the Government, but personally I think it would be a great disservice to the Chamber and not in the best interest of conducting the business of the State if the Opposition were not willing to play a constructive role in managing the affairs of this place. Oppositions do this in other Parliaments, and they do not see any inconsistency at all between playing that constructive role in managing the affairs of the Parliament and conducting their business as Oppositions. It does not restrict those Oppositions in any way in their opposition of the Government or their criticisms of business before the Chamber.

However, every member of this place, whether in Government or Opposition, has some sort of responsibility to the democratic process of the Parliamentary system to try to make it work as well as it can be made to work. That is why it seems to me that the suggestions we have put forward are sensible, reasonable and practical. I point out that the Government could not be bound by the views of the Opposition as to the allocation of time.

Mr. Dean Brown: Admit it, you won't even listen to the Opposition.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I regret having to say this but, if the business of the Chamber were in the hands of people with the same attitude as that of the member for Davenport, Parliamentary democracy would be unworkable. However, it is not, because senior members of political Parties in every Parliament in this country, whatever differences may exist and however bitter the political controversies may be, do co-operate to a large degree in facilitating the passage of public business. It happens in this Chamber and everywhere else. The member for Davenport, by using expressions such as the one he has used, demonstrates that he has little experience in dealing with this type of situation. It is an immature approach to the management of Parliamentary business.

Mr. Venning: He stirs you now and again.

The Hon. L. J. KING: No doubt that is true. If one sees his task in Parliament as stirring and being a stirrer, and one judges his success as a legislator by the degree to which he stirs, that confirms the point that I was making: that members who see themselves in that role simply are not contributing significantly to the welfare of the State and are certainly not contributing to the way in which business is organised and discharged in the Chamber. We look for something better than that and we should be able to get it in a place such as this. After discussing the business to come before the Chamber, the proper course is then for the Minister in charge to make a Ministerial statement on the Tuesday of each week indicating the time table of business for that week. He should give as much detail as can be provided so that everyone in the Chamber knows, as far as can be known at that stage, what business will be transacted and when it will be transacted. This assists members in being

ready to participate in debates and divisions, also enabling them to have present in the Chamber at the appropriate time their constituents or outside bodies interested in the debates. From the Government point of view, it facilitates the business of having present in the Chamber the public servants responsible for the various pieces of legislation falling for consideration.

It seems that we have reached a stage where that sort of organisation, which exists in all the great Parliaments of the world, must come to this Chamber. Some members may have misgivings that their right to jump up and down whenever it suits them and to say the first thing that comes into their head may be restricted. With a time table, it is likely that the political Parties will get down to the solid business of working out who should speak for them on the issues involved and expect those members to put in the preparation that enables them to make an intelligent and proper contribution to the debate.

That is one of the important spin-off benefits in such a time table: members, I expect, will be deputed by their Parties to speak and will have an opportunity to do their homework, and therefore they will be expected to have done it. A higher standard of debate than we have seen in the past will be expected of members. Some odd expressions were used by Opposition members. Someone suggested that the Government (or I personally) should be ashamed of these proposals. I view these changes to Standing Orders as a most important step forward in the organisation of the Parliamentary system in South Australia. When they are adopted and put into practice, and when they have settled down, I think they will make the biggest contribution to the standard of debate and the deliberations in this Chamber of any move made, certainly since I have been here and, I suspect, for a long time before that. This is a means by which we can raise the standard of debate, deliberation, and the consideration of the business before us.

One further point raised by some members concerned the minor Parties in this Chamber, those members on the Opposition side who do not acknowledge the Opposition Whip. It is obvious that, as there is no recognition by the Chair of minor Parties in this Chamber, there is no basis for their formal inclusion in discussions. However, I believe it is important that their views should be known, if they have any views, as to what time should be allotted for certain measures, and I can only invite them to submit their views to the Opposition Whip, if that is suitable, to be conveyed to the meeting. If they prefer not to do that, I am sure that the Government Whip will be happy to hear their views and convey them to the meeting.

Mr. Evans: The Country Party member co-operates with the Opposition Whip.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I am informed by the member for Fisher, who is the Opposition Whip, that the Country Party member for Flinders does co-operate with the Opposition Whip, so I assume he will make known any views he has through that avenue, and the Liberal Movement members will have the choice of the member for Fisher or the member for Unley, according to their inclination. I hope that this procedure, when adopted and implemented, will produce a great improvement in the way in which business is transacted. Far from restricting freedom of expression, I have no doubt that it will result in the various points of view about the Government and about legislation being put more forcefully, more intelligently, and more thoughtfully than has been the case in the past.

Assuming this Committee adopts these proposals tonight, I expect that the necessary message will be available back in this Chamber by Tuesday next, so that the new procedures will take effect in that case from next Tuesday. I should hope (and certainly this is my invitation) that the Leader of the Opposition or his nominee (one or two nominees, if he prefers, because it is not a matter of concern as to how many) and the Whip, or anyone else the Leader cares to nominate, would meet with Government representatives on Tuesday at a suitable time to consider the business of the Chamber for the following week. If members on both sides accept the responsibility for making maximum use of the time available for debate, I hope we can see a great improvement in the standard of debate and in the way in which business is conducted in this Chamber.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: Although the Attorney has made several assertions in attempting to reply to the points raised by the Opposition, he has given little evidence on which to base those assertions. The tenor of his argument has been, "Because I say it will be an improvement, it will be an improvement." He has made vague references to the fact that, in other Parliaments, there is some measure of co-operation. This was a vague explanation to give force to the assertion that this change would bring about great improvement in the operations of this Chamber. He said the workings of any Parliament must involve co-operation. At present there is co-operation between the Government Whip and the Opposition Whip. There must be a measure of co-operation for the proper working of any Parliament, but the Attorney did not attempt in any way to refute the points made by the Opposition as to the stringent nature of these provisions and the way in which the Government intends to curtail debate in this Chamber. Someone called the Attorney a little dictator. I think that title would be amply justified if we were to take as typical the rebuttal he has given this evening. His opinion is not the opinion of Opposition members, and we are not seeking to make cheap political points, as he asserts. In my opinion, the price being paid so that the Government can organise the operations in this Chamber is far too high.

It is all right for the Attorney to assert that most of the speeches made in this place are worthless. I do not believe that is so. If a member wishes to speak on a matter he considers to be of some importance to his constituents, it should be his right to do so unless there is some reason far more pressing than the convenience of the Government to deny him that right. I am not seeking to make a cheap political point; I am giving my view of the proper role of democratic Government in a State the size of South Australia, with a legislative programme of the size the Government seeks to implement, in a Chamber containing the number of members we have. These procedures are far more stringent than Standing Orders applying in the largest Australian Parliament, the House of Representatives. The Attorney's own Labor Party Prime Minister last year was a member of a committee that recommended changes to the Standing Orders of the Commonwealth Parliament that were not nearly as severe as those that the Attorney has tried to justify in his airy-fairy rebuttal. He has made allegations without having one scintilla of evidence to support them.

The standard of debate from the Government back bench may improve, because those members rarely speak now. At present there is pressure on the Government to get its legislation through. Part of the reason for that is that the Government does not present that legislation in a

proper way and in a logical sequence. With the limitation on debate, Government back-benchers will claim their half of the debating time and some of their more ambitious members will speak in debates.

Government members became sensitive about what the member for Eyre said. However, I remember that the member for Tea Tree Gully made slighting remarks about the Upper House and spoke about that place in the most slanderous terms. Whoever is deputed to set the time table will go along and the Whip will listen to him but, if the Government wants a Bill through one evening, it will be through by 10 p.m., and Government members will be able to go to bed. Those back bench members on the Government side who are not too tired to read their Bills will be able to do their homework. There is no benefit in what is being proposed in this Standing Order. It is the sort of fatuous nonsense that we get from the Attorney, with his glib phrases and a silver tongue to make those assertions.

Dr. Tonkin: That's going a bit far, silver tongue.

Mr. GOLDSWORTHY: The Attorney-General is not stuck for a word. He has the facility, not uncommon in some lawyers, to take the most tenuous case, build a fabric of argument around it, and make black look white. He has not quoted precedents, and the nearest approach to a provision such as this would be found in a totalitarian State. It is utter nonsense to say that this Standing Order will benefit South Australia, and I am still violently opposed to the alteration.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I register my opposition to at least part of the proposals. I oppose proposed Standing Order 144a, in which the Attorney has tried to protect the Government against procedures that would be allowed at any democratic meeting. He is taking away from members of this Chamber the right to do what they normally would do at any meeting at which democracy was recognised.

Mr. Coumbe: This evening could be your last chance to have that opportunity.

Mr. CHAPMAN: I do not necessarily want to take advantage of the last chance, but I point out how unreasonable the Attorney has been from the outset, particularly in regard to proposed Standing Order 144a, which his colleagues on the committee have supported, irrespective of the arguments put forward to the committee by members from this side. I ask the Attorney to tell me of any real contributions that members from this side have made that have been recognised by him. It seems that, unless the proposals suited the Attorney, they were not accepted, and he is using the walls of this place to protect his Party in future.

I have never known such restrictive barriers as are contained in this Standing Order to be placed on the members of any other organisation and, when I became a member of this Chamber, I did not think that one man could govern and dictate our procedures. He happened to be the third member of a five-man team in which there were three of one political colour and two of another. He has exercised ultimate control over the amendments and procedures of this Chamber from that time onwards. Even at this late stage, his own conscience, if he has any, ought to dictate to him what is reasonable in this regard. He should accept amendment of this disgraceful barrier placed on the liberty of members in exercising their rights.

I simply wish to register my disapproval of the manner in which this matter has been handled. I protest at the principle on which the Attorney-General claims to stand; it is outrageous. If I was not aware that the Attorney-General planned to retire at the end of this Parliament, I would have more to say. As my colleagues have said, he is on the way out, and he probably does not really care. He is so politically biased that he is setting up a situation for his colleagues that cannot be broken from now on; it is unfair and unreasonable. I oppose the motion.

Mr. DEAN BROWN: The Attorney-General has based his self-righteous defence on two grounds; first, that the Opposition has failed to put forward constructive ideas. I ask the Attorney-General to consider the area for those constructive ideas—the Standing Orders Committee. I understand from a member of that committee that the Government members of that committee would accept only two minor amendments; that is where the Opposition put forward its constructive ideas, and that is where the Government overrode them. We know that the Government is not remotely interested in listening to constructive ideas. We know that the Attorney-General is not a reasonable man. He has not listened to one idea this evening, yet he makes a plea for constructive ideas from the Opposition. Constructive ideas are useless if we have an uncompromising Government, as we have in this State.

The second ground of the Attorney-General's defence is that it is the view of the public that sittings should not proceed late into the evening. He suggested that it was the Liberal Opposition that was forcing these late sittings. Who has the power to adjourn the Chamber? It is the Government front bench. Who, therefore, is responsible for the late sittings? It is the Government front bench. Why do we sit late? It is because of the bloody-mindedness of the Government. I well remember when the Premier, because the Opposition had atttacked a proposal, sent in a message that we would sit late. And we sat late—until 4 a.m. Was that due to the Opposition? It was due to the bloody-mindedness of the front bench. The Attorney-General is trying to turn attention away from that bloody-minded attitude, but the public realises that the front bench controls this Chamber. It is the Government that is responsible for these late sittings. So, the grounds of the Attorney-General's defence are completely baseless.

The Attorney-General talked about the increased volume of business going through the Chamber. If there is an increased volume of business, what are the alternatives? Either we can cut back on the amount of debate or we can ensure that there are more sitting hours in which to process the extra material. Any member with respect for democracy (obviously the Attorney-General does not have any such respect) would have allowed an increase in the number of sitting days. However, we see no increase in the number of sitting days, even though the amount of business is increasing. Again, we see the bloody-mindedness of the Government. It seeks to stifle the Opposition to the greatest possible extent. I think the Attorney-General has made a fool of himself this evening. The Government, including the Premier, who has just left the Chamber, has made a fool of itself in the eyes of the public. I hope that the Government feels ashamed, and I hope that it appreciates the slur that it is casting on democracy. I oppose the amendment.

Mr. MATHWIN: I support the remarks of my colleagues. I am surprised that the Attorney-General had the audacity to say that he wanted to organise members. He may want to organise members of his Party, but he is certainly not going to organise Opposition members; certainly not me. He will not regiment me in the way in which he regiments his own Party members. Opposition members have independence. We will oppose this proposal

to the last, because it is a shocking situation. The Attorney-General has been trained to talk smoothly; he has been trained to make white look black and black look white. I am an independent member of this Parliament, and I claim my right as a member of the Opposition to speak when I wish to speak.

Mr. Keneally: All you've said—

Mr. MATHWIN: It is a pity that the member for Stuart, who has had so much to say by way of interjection, is unable to contribute to this debate, in defence of his master.

Mr. COUMBE: The Attorney-General referred to my comment on amendments in Committee. I was perfectly aware of the procedures set out here. I have studied the alterations and the Attorney-General's explanation. The following are the last words in paragraph (*c*) of the recommendation:

No other amendments, new clauses or schedules may be proposed.

That means that, after the stipulated time that has been agreed to is reached, no other amendments, new clauses or schedules may be proposed. This means a complete prohibition—

The Hon. L. J. King: It is the standard guillotine provision.

Mr. COUMBE: —except that amendments circulated one hour before the stipulated time may be put to the vote without debate. I know from experience that, when Government Ministers have introduced hastily-drawn legislation, they have had to move amendments to it almost at the last minute. Pertinent points which have not been considered previously but which have been raised constructively by the Opposition have sometimes been accepted by the Government. In future, we will be unable to discuss such points and the Minister will be unable to move and explain late amendments. Therefore, if a Bill before the Committee is faulty or remiss in any respect, the Government will have to rely on another place to carry amendments, a practice that the Attorney-General and many of his colleagues have in the past deplored. Indeed, they have denigrated the value of another place.

When these time limits apply you, Mr. Chairman, will have to put the question, after which the Bill or motion being debated will be steamrolled through. The remaining Committee stages of any Bill will pass quickly and, if the Minister has an amendment on file, he will have to move it without explaining it. The same will apply to Opposition members. Although we may have a valid point to put, Opposition members will not have an opportunity to explain it to the Minister who, having seen the merits of it after it had been explained to him, might have accepted it. This is a derogation of the valuable work done in Committee on any substantive motion or Bill.

Mr. ARNOLD: Being a member of the Standing Orders Committee, I have listened with much interest to the contributions that honourable members have made to the debate. The proposed Standing Order which the Committee is now debating is undoubtedly the key to the whole matter. The Government's attitude in this respect makes a farce out of Parliament. The Government will prepare and introduce legislation, knowing full well that a time limit will be set on the various stages of debate on it. There will be little opportunity effectively to amend a Bill. The Government is virtually using Parliament to try to gain a little respectability for the dictatorial attitude it is adopting in forcing Bills through the Chamber.

Many members have spelt out the problems that will have to be solved when legislation is introduced in this place. No matter who draws up a Bill, the debate on and consideration of it usually results in the finding of faults that must, in the interests of the people of this State, be corrected. Time and time again, no matter how much the Government may dislike it, the Upper House returns Bills to this place with amendments that are undoubtedly in the best interests of the people of South Australia. If we are to be limited in relation to the number of amendments that can be moved to any Bill, it will not be in the interests of the people of South Australia.

True, the public regards late Parliamentary sittings until, say, 3 a.m. as ridiculous. By the same token, however, we do not want the people being forced to live under legislation that was left as it was solely because insufficient time was allowed by the Government effectively to amend and make good legislation out of what was introduced. For this reason, I strongly oppose this proposed new Standing Order.

The Committee divided on the motion:

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

Noes (18)—Messrs. Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Chapman, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. McRae and Wells. Noes—Messrs. Allen and Dean Brown.

Majority of 3 for the Ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 164 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 171 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 186 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 187 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 229 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 231 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 243 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 245a be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 288 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 302 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. J. KING moved:

That proposed Standing Order 422 be agreed to.

Mr. COUMBE: Will the Attorney explain the reasons for this change?

The Hon. L. J. KING: I do not believe any disagreement on this Standing Order was expressed by members of the committee. Certainly, there was no great discussion about it. It appeared to the majority of members of the committee that it was desirable to have some limitation of debate in Committee, because it is theoretically possible for a member to speak many times and occupy the attention of the Committee for a considerable period. This is bad enough at any time, but it would be grossly unfair if a guillotine time table were in operation limiting the total Committee time. If two hours had been allowed for the Committee stages of a Bill and on some early clause a member kept occupying the time of the Committee, speaking several times and at length, he could occupy much of that time and leave only a restricted amount of time to members to deal with the remaining clauses of the Bill in Committee. This could possibly lead to the situation postulated by the member for Torrens: a number of clauses and amendments could be dealt with without debate.

It is generally desirable to have some limitation of time in Committee, such as that applying in the second reading debate. It is absolutely necessary where one is operating to a time table, as is intended under this Standing Order. It is grossly unfair for a member to take up time on a clause depriving other members of the opportunity to debate other clauses of greater interest to them.

Mr. BECKER: I oppose this Standing Order, because it does not give sufficient opportunity to the Opposition member in charge of the Bill. He does not have the opportunity to press home certain points. I understand that the member in charge of the Bill may speak more than three times, but that person is the Government Minister. This Standing Order offers nothing at all to the Opposition. As Standing Orders have been changed in respect of the limitation of time, we will find that the Opposition spokesman on a matter will be the member who wants to question the Minister in charge of the Bill. Therefore, we are undermining the rights of democracy and the Parliamentary privilege we have come to respect in this place. We hear so much about tradition, and it is this Government that is really throwing tradition out of the window.

Motion carried.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion before the Chair is "That the report be adopted."

Dr. EASTICK: I move:

To strike out "adopted" and insert "withdrawn and referred back to the Standing Orders Committee for further consideration".

The amendment indicates that Opposition members are not satisfied that the deliberations of the Standing Orders Committee have adequately covered all the measures before it. Many suggestions have been made to the Attorney-General as one member of the committee. Several issues raised should go back to the committee for consideration before this measure becomes a permanent part of the Standing Orders of this place.

The Attorney-General indicated to members that, if his substantive motion was carried tonight, he hoped that it would operate from Tuesday next. I suggest that shows an indecent haste. There are measures associated with these alterations which it has been clearly indicated are against the best interests of the people of South Australia. Actions undertaken in accordance with these alterations will destroy the opportunity for many members to canvass effectively the opinions of their constituents. I believe that, having regard to the debate that has ensued since the matter was brought on this afternoon, it is conceivable that, on reflection, the Attorney-General and members of the Standing Orders Committee would agree that there is a need for an amendment to the proposed alterations to Standing Orders, most certainly a need for a complete withdrawal of the obnoxious proposed Standing Order 144a. It is with this in mind and so that there will be no haste that I call on the Attorney to accept my amendment.

We should recognise that, because this motion relates to the Standing Orders of the House of Assembly, it is unlike matters which are aired before and which are contained in a Bill or motion requiring endorsement by another place. These measures will not be canvassed elsewhere: they will be laid before His Excellency the Governor for his approval. I look forward to the support of all members in having the amendment carried. In due course we shall have an opportunity to consider the review of the matters now before us that I hope will be undertaken by the Standing Orders Committee.

Mr. COUMBE: I second the amendment. I concur entirely in what the Leader had to say about next Tuesday. To use a colloquialism, that will be the "crunch" day. It will be not only the crunch day but the death knell as far as the Opposition is concerned regarding the procedures adopted in this place. Throughout this debate it has been clear that the Opposition is willing to accept reasonable suggestions or amendments that might be put forward by the Attorney-General. However, the Attorney has been inflexible in his attitude to any suggestions put forward.

If one peruses the minutes of the Standing Orders Committee, which are freely available from the Clerk, it is apparent that the committee was completely divided on the contentious issues and relied entirely on the casting vote of the Speaker. How many members have taken the trouble to peruse those minutes? I know that several Opposition members have done so. The Attorney this evening is pushing through this motion, a motion that will irrevocably change the situation in this place. In the light of the circumstances to which I have referred, and bearing in mind that the Speaker will have to adjudicate on these Standing Orders, I suggest that the Attorney consider and accept the amendment put forward by the Leader. Surely no harm can be done by adopting that procedure: it would be far better if Standing Orders, if they need to be altered, receive a greater degree of unanimity, especially in respect of the contentious issues. The Leader's amendment is most reasonable.

The Standing Orders Committee is a committee set up at the commencement of each Parliament. It is tragic that the future operations of this place could be affected by the obstinancy of the Attorney, who is unwilling to accept views which, expressed on the Standing Orders Committee, do not agree with his own. This evening he has not been willing to accept variations or other worthwhile suggestions put forward by the Opposition: his attitude has been most inflexible. He now has an opportunity if he is a mediator, which I suppose he has been in his professional life, to consider the suggestions put forward. I believe the amendment is worth while and that he could in all conscience support it.

The Hon. L. J. KING: I oppose the amendment because I believe nothing could be gained by further reference to the Standing Orders Committee. Probably few matters

that have come before members during the time I have been a member have been more carefully and earnestly considered than these proposals. They are matters that I have turned over in my mind for about four years. The provisions have been the subject of extensive discussions with my own colleagues and of a long series of discussions with the Leader of the Opposition (when I had the opportunity to consider his views and he had the opportunity to consider mine), and there were references back to our respective Parties. No doubt discussions followed in the Party rooms and these were followed by further discussions at meetings of the Standing Orders Committee. In addition, the matter has been debated in this place.

I can hardly believe that, after all that, any fresh light is likely to be thrown on the matter. As I have already indicated, I believe the proposals embodied in the report of the Standing Orders Committee are a well thought-out programme for the improvement of the way business is transacted in this place. Having heard everything that has been said over that long period by everyone interested, I am convinced that we have here the best that can be done in the interests of all members in this place and of members of the public of South Australia. If experience shows that some modification is required, that is the time for further reference to the Standing Orders Committee to see whether improvements are needed. For the moment, however, I am satisfied that referring the matter back to the committee at this stage would produce nothing more than the return of the same proposals to this Committee.

I believe that the advantages to be derived from the operation of the new Standing Orders are so substantial that the Standing Orders should be put into operation as soon as practicable. If they are as valuable as I believe they are, the earlier they are put into effect the better. We have debated this matter tonight and previously. Everything has been said that could be said, and every point of view has been put. Far from there having been no changes, as suggested by the member for Torrens and others, the original proposals the Government had in mind have been modified substantially as a result of my discussions with the Leader of the Opposition. I am indebted to him for some sensible and practicable suggestions that modified my ideas on various topics. Now the time has come to put the revised Standing Orders into operation and to see how they work. If further modifications are needed, the Standing Orders Committee will again look at the matter.

The Committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes (18)—Messrs. Allen, Arnold, Becker, Blacker, Boundy, Coumbe, Eastick (teller), Evans, Goldsworthy, Gunn, Mathwin, McAnaney, Nankivell, Rodda, Russack, Tonkin, Venning, and Wardle.

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

Pairs—Ayes—Messrs. Dean Brown and Chapman. Noes—Messrs. McRae and Wells.

Majority of 4 for the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

The CHAIRMAN: The motion is "That the report of the Standing Orders Committee, 1974-75, including the proposed amendments to Standing Orders, be adopted." Those in favour say "Aye"; those against say "No". The "Ayes" have it.

Dr. Eastick: Divide!

The CHAIRMAN: Ring the bells.

The division bells having been rung:

The CHAIRMAN: The motion before the Chair is "That the report of the Standing Orders Committee, 1974-75, including the proposed amendments to Standing Orders, be adopted." The Ayes will pass to the right of the Chair, the Noes to the left. I appoint the honourable Attorney-General teller for the Ayes and the honourable Leader of the Opposition teller for the Noes.

While the division was being held:

The CHAIRMAN: As there is only one member voting for the Noes, I declare the question carried in the affirmative.

Motion thus carried.

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

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, 1934-1974.

Motion carried.

FAIR CREDIT REPORTS BILL

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

RUNDLE STREET MALL BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from February 20. Page 2494.)

Mr. COUMBE (Torrens): I consider this to be an extremely important Bill that will affect the people of South Australia, more particularly those who visit Adelaide, for many years to come. The Bill is quite extensive.

Dr. Eastick: One we thought we might have been able to know something about.

The Hon. G. T. Virgo: Well, you've had it since last week.

Mr. COUMBE: I want to make a few preliminary remarks. First, I support the concept of a mall in Rundle Street, Adelaide, and I believe that the people of South Australia will support the whole concept, provided certain criteria are met. I have had the opportunity to examine the various reports that have been made by the consultants, and I have had the opportunity to look at certain measures that the Adelaide City Council has adopted.

I consider that this project could be a big attraction, particularly for Adelaide. However, if it is to be the success that we all hope it will be, it must first be proved that the mall will be a success as a market place. There is a big difference between the concept of a mall and that of a plaza, as I hope most members understand. I am attacking this aspect quite apart from the aesthetic and tourist aspects of a mall. If the mall is to be provided and is to function properly, it must be dealt with legislatively and physically in the best possible way. In other words, the mall must be made to function, and it must be made attractive to the people who will use it for shopping purposes or as a walkway.

Therefore, in my opinion the problems, apart from those which are dealt with in the Bill and which the Select Committee will discuss, will be those associated with the financing of the whole project (which, I believe, will not be easy), egress and ingress, particularly for emergency vehicles such as fire and ambulance service vehicles, the whole question of transport, whether public

transport or taxi-cab, and the provision of parking space and parking stations for cars. All these matters must be considered carefully.

I understand the Minister wanted the Bill brought on at this stage, and perhaps he would not have been able to do that next week if the action that has just been taken was in operation. The town hall authorities have stated that they will hold a public meeting next Thursday afternoon to explain to certain ratepayers in the area concerned how they will be affected and what will be the Government's approach and the council's approach to this whole matter. These authorities will seek the views of those ratepayers. I hope to be able to attend that meeting to hear the various points of view expressed.

I know that previously two meetings of ratepayers had been held, but I consider that it would have been wiser for the Minister to wait until after Thursday's public meeting was held, so that members of this House, quite apart from the fact that the Bill is being referred to a Select Committee, could have heard some of the views put forward by the ratepayers concerned at that public meeting. I understand that the Minister is bringing the Bill on at this stage because he wishes to have it referred to a Select Committee as soon as possible. I have indicated my support for the Bill to the Select Committee stage and I should think that the committee, in fairness to all bodies concerned, would have to hold perhaps six meetings.

The committee can meet only in the morning while the House is in session, and it would have to consult authorities such as the Adelaide City Council and those dealing with transport, the ratepayers concerned, and the Retail Traders Association. All the ratepayers concerned in this area are not members of the Retail Traders Association, although I suppose that that association represents the biggest investment in the area. For instance, the proprietors of several hotels, theatres and banks are ratepayers but are not necessarily members of the association. Therefore, I think that, in all fairness, there would have to be several meetings of the Select Committee. I would have liked to speak on this matter after hearing ratepayers express their views at the meeting to be held next Thursday afternoon. Because I am in the dilemma of speaking without the assistance of the notes that I had prepared, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.11 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday, February 26, at 2 p.m.